



Local Government Performance Assessment

Gulu District

(Vote Code: 508)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	74%
Education Minimum Conditions	100%
Health Minimum Conditions	70%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	75%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	70%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	47%
Educational Performance Measures	43%
Health Performance Measures	50%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	35%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	4%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<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 following projects were sampled, and the evidence from the Field reviews indicates that the infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are NOT functional, and utilized as per the purpose of the projects by the beneficiaries. Not complete since the 2 below were phased construction projects</p> <p>The sample 3 previously completed (phase) projects were as follows;</p> <p>1) Partial Construction of Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II - Unyama S/Cty - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00011</i>. This was a phased construction of the said OPD facility. The required phase (all the walling plus the Roofing) is complete, but cannot be functional yet as the Facility is not fit for occupation yet.</p> <p>2) Partial Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms at Kiteny-Owalo P/S - Palaro S/Cty - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00022</i>. This was also a phased construction of the Classroom Block. The required phase (all the walling) is complete, but cannot be functional yet as the Facility is not fit for occupation yet, No roof yet – planned for the next phase.</p> <p>3) Maintenance and Repair of Community Based Boardroom at Gulu DLG HQtrs - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00026</i>. The Renovation that included extension is really complete as per Work Plan, and is functional. The planned lavatories attached to the Boardroom Facility are planned to be completed in the future</p>	0
2	Service Delivery Performance Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<p>a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment :</p> <p>o by more than 10%: Score 3</p> <p>o 5-10% increase: Score 2</p> <p>o Below 5 % Score 0</p>	N/A.	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>There LG had 4 projects under DDEG.</p> <p>Projects implemented were complete and were as follows;</p> <p>1) Lapela HCII; AWP, page 62; LG DP; LGPD, Page 87; and ABPR, 209/20, page 87, Shs. 65,000,000.</p> <p>2)County board room; AWP, page 103; LG DP, page 210; ABPR, page 135; Shs.14,979,708.</p> <p>3. Repairs of District Service Commission; AWP, page 32; LG DP, page 210; and ABPR, page, 47. Shs.13,134,397.</p> <p>4. 1 block, 2 classrooms in Kitenyowalo P/S; AWP, page 73; LG DP, page 219 and ABPR, page 91; Shs.33,141,000.</p>	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>The LG budgeted Shs.807,842,000 and spent all the DDEG of Shs.807,842,000 on eligible projects as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines:</p> <p>1.Gulu508/Wrks/2019-2020/00023; Construction of 1 block 2 classrooms at Kitenyowalo P/S, Shs.19,405,696.</p> <p>2. Construction and maintenance of District Service Commission Office at Headquarters- Gulu508/Wrks/2019/20/00034.</p> <p>3. Partial Construction of Standard OPD of Lapeta HCII at Pakweol Parish, Unyama Sub-county-Gulu508/Wrks/2019-20/00011 at Shs.65,000.000.</p>	2

Investment Performance	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates,	The AWP and Budget for the FY 2019/20 indicated a number of infrastructure projects funded under the DDEG and of those, the implemented projects had contract amounts according to contract documents as follows:
Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	score 2 or else score 0	<p>1) Partial Construction of Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II - Unyama S/Cty - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00011</i>, with Engineers Estimates at UGX 65,000,000/=. The contract Price was UGX 65,000,000/-. The Variation was at 0%</p> <p>2) Partial Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms at Kiteny-Owalo P/S - Palaro S/Cty - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00022</i>, with Engineers Estimates (budget amount) at UGX 37,000,000/=. The contract Price was UGX 33,141,000/=. The Variation was at -10.43%</p> <p>3) Maintenance and Repair of Community Based Boardroom at Gulu DLG HQtrs - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00026</i>, with Engineers Estimates (budget amount) at UGX 15,000,000/=. The contract Price was UGX 14,979,708/-. The Variation was at -0.14%</p> <p>The Variations were thus within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates</p>

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Out of the **6 Lower Local Governments (Subcounties)** the Assessor sampled 3 LLGs to establish the accuracy of reported information. The sampled LLGs included the Subcounties of; **Bungatira, Unyama and Paicho**.

The Assessor reviewed the "Approved Staff Establishment List" provided by the Ag. PHRO and conducted field visits to the sampled LLGs to compare and verify the accuracy of the reported information. The Assessor noted that the information about staffing (numbers of staff deployed, names and titles) were consistent with the information indicated on the staff establishment list at the PHRO office. However, at **Bungatira Subcounty** the Assessor noted that, the staff list that was displayed on the notice board (at the time of the assessment) had not been updated for almost two years and reflected staff that had long been transferred. This was deemed to be a serious issue as the communities were misinformed of the current office bearers and hence could not access the right office holders for timely service delivery: For example; the displayed staff list indicated the following staff that had been long been transferred or promoted.

- **Latim Walter** – Fomer SAS Bungatira S/C- Transferred to Awach Subcounty

- **Agnes Angee**- CDO- Promoted to Senior CDO and transferred to the district HQ.

- **Ayat Catherine**- Senior Accounts Assistant- Transferred to District Engineering Department.

- **Omona Obwa**: Agriculture Extension Officer- Transferred

The displayed list also reflected former **Parish Chiefs** at Parishes in Bungatira Subcounty who had long been transferred to Parishes within and /or outside Bungatira Subcounty.

Paicho Subcounty: Information on the positions filled as per minimum staffing standards (indicated on the approved Staff Establishment list) was verified by the Assessor at Paicho Subcounty headquarters. The Assessor established that the information was accurate in as far as the positions filled, names and titles of the position holders. The Assessor, however, noted that one position of **Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer- Ms. Otema Simon Peter** was not included on the List of staff establishment provided by the PHRO, while was included on the Staff List provided by the SAS.

Unyama Subcounty: *The Assessor could not verify any information at Unyama sub-county as there was no staff at station the time of the visit (despite that the PHRO had communicated to the SAS prior to the visit). All offices were closed. The Assessor later learnt (through a Police Officer at the Police post attached to the sub-county headquarters) that the SAS had lost a close relative and had gone for burial.*

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. <p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided Supervision and/or completion Reports on infrastructure constructed as per the AWP. The information provided shows a random sample of 3 infrastructure projects 100% completed and as follows;</p> <p>1) Partial Construction of Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II - Unyama S/Cty</p> <p>2) Partial Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms at Kiteny-Owalo P/S - Palaro S/Cty -</p> <p>3) Maintenance and Repair of Community Based Boardroom at Gulu DLG Headquarters</p> <p>The above are (some phases) complete and in Place</p>	2
5	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p>	<p><i>This indicator was considered inapplicable to this round of assessment as the central government had not yet provided guidelines for assessment of LLGs and/or trained DLGs in the assessment procedures for LLGs.</i></p>	0
5	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p><i>This indicator was considered inapplicable during this round of assessment.</i></p>	0

5	Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0	<i>This indicator was considered inapplicable during this round of assessment.</i>	0
---	---	--	---	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. Score 2 or else score 0	The Assessor was presented with evidence in form of CAO'S Request for Recruitment to PS MoPs dated 2nd December 2019, Ref: CR/156/1 which was received and stamped by the Ministries of Finance, Planning and Economic Development as well as the Ministry of Public Services on 5th December 2019. Various vacant positions per department (for staff replacement and new recruits) were stated with the associated wage bills. The submission was however, made after the deadline of 30th September.	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	The HRO presented to the Assessor a "Staff attendance Book" (current book was first used on 25th September 2019. Staff signed in daily as they reported to work). The PHRO stated that the book was placed at the reception desk and was withdrawn daily by the Deputy CAO at 8.30 a.m and stored at the registry until the following morning. Staff were urged to stop signing the book as one of the control measures to contain the spread of Covid 19. No monthly attendance analysis reports were compiled during the previous FY.	0

Performance management	i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:	The Assessor reviewed the personal files of the Heads of Department (HoDs) that were provided by the HRO and established that NOT ALL HoDs were appraised by the CAO as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY. The details of the reviewed files were as indicated below:
Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous	
	FY: Score 1 or else 0	<p>1. Chief Finance Officer. Nyero Paska completed a Performance Agreement on 3rd December 2019 and was appraised by the CAO on 9th September 2020.</p> <p>2. Acting District Planner: Omar David: No appraisal documents were on file for FY 2019/2020, at the time of the assessment</p> <p>3. Acting District Engineer: Nyeko Samuel: No appraisal documents were on file for FY 2019/2020, at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>4. Acting District Natural Resources Officer: Ojera Alex: No appraisal documents were on file for FY 2019/2020, at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>5. Acting District Production and Marketing Officer; Lakor Jackson: No appraisal documents were on file for FY 2019/2020 at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>6. District Community Development Officer; Okech Gorreti: No appraisal documents were on file for FY 2019/2020 at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>7. Acting District Commercial Officer; Oketta Keneth; completed a Performance Agreement on 8th October 2019, but there was no Performance report on file.</p> <p>8. Acting District Health Officer: Idiba Yoweri: No appraisal documents were on file for FY 2019/2020 at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>9. District Education Officer; Mr. Akena Ceasor: No appraisal documents were verified by the Assessor. DEO's personal file was at the DSC commission for consideration for confirmation.</p>

Performance management	ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:	A review of the personal files for HoDs indicated (as report above) that very few HoDs were appraised. In addition the reviewer observed that there was no evidence for review by the Assessor to confirm that administrative rewards and sanctions were implemented after performance appraisal.
Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	Score 1 or else 0	

7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional. Score 1 or else 0	Gulu DLG had not yet constituted a Consultative Committee at the time of the assessment.	0
8	Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: Score 1.	<p>There was no readily available staff list for the newly recruited staff at Gulu DLG for FY 2019/2020. The acting PHRO however, reviewed the the DSC minutes for recruitment for FY 2019/2020 and ascertained that 7 staff were newly recruited during FY 2019/2020. The Assessor took a random sample of 4 staff from the 7; for review to confirm whether they all accessed the salary payroll within two months after assumption of duty. After the review, the Assessor confirmed that <i>all the newly recruited staff accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after assumption of duty</i> as indicated in the examples below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sarah Anena, was appointed as an Education Assistant II and assumed duty on 2nd December 2019. Sarah accessed the salary payroll of January 2020 under IPPS No. 1054087. 2. Dickens Ojok was appointed as an Education Assistant II and assumed duty on 2nd December 2019. Dickens accessed the salary payroll of January 2020 under IPPS. No. 1053641. 3. Norah Nenwa, was appointed as an Education Assistant II, and assumed duty on 4th December 2019. Norah accessed the salary payroll of January 2020 under IPPS No. 1053959. 4. Sarah Akumu, was appointed as an Education Assistant II and assumed duty on 3rd December 2019. Sarah accessed the salary payroll of December 2019 under IPPS No. 1053686. 	1
9	Pension Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: Score 1.	The list of retired staff at Gulu district was not readily available. The Assessor requested the acting PHRO to retrieve the pension payroll for review by the Assessor and the acting PHRO; to identify staff that retired during FY 2019/2020 and ascertain whether the retired staff accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement. Despite the numerous reminders, the Acting PHRO did not retrieve and avail the pension payroll information to enable the Assessor score this indicator.	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs of Shs. 448,471,227 were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget.</p> <p>The DDEG received by LLGs were Shs.448,471 227 as follows;</p> <p>Q 1 Shs. 140,490,409</p> <p>Q 2 Shs. 140,490,409</p> <p>Q 3 Shs. 140,490,410</p>	2
10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided the amounts in hard copy transferred but did not provide warranting and transfer dates of DDEG to LLGs from the IFMIS system.</p>	0
10	<p>Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not provide the dates of invoicing of DDEG transfers from the IFMIS system to LLGs.</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District did not supervise nor mentor all LLGs in the District.</p>	0

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

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p><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 LG provided the assets register was maintained by the District up to-date to 30th October 2020. This was as per records seen during the period of assessment 19th-20th November 2020. The assets register which was printed from IFMIS, included land and buildings, motor-vehicles, motor cycles, furniture, office equipment and stores consumables. The copies of print outs were availed to the assessor.</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 provided the Board of Survey Report that showed Assets Management decisions on procurement and disposal of existing assets and disposal of assets. The decisions recommended that some assets. The procurement of furniture, computers and motor-vehicles were done (pages-28,31, 32 and 35) and disposal of old computers, printers and moto-cycle was also done (pages-39, 50, 52,60 and 65). Recommendations were made and improvements in Internal Control and Storage facilities (BOS, page ix). The recommendations were also to title land of sub-counties that were not having land titles.</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The District had a functional physical planning committee of 11 members in who had appointment letters of members. There was no approved physical development plan like most districts. The plans submission register was provided. They submitted 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD and were dated as follows;</p> <p>Q 1 -17/6/2019</p> <p>Q 2 14/2/2020</p> <p>Q 3 29/3/2020</p> <p>Q 4 29/6/2020</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d.For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence that the District conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget and the prioritized investments were derived from the LG Development Plan eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source. The desk appraisal were conducted for 35 as derived from the LGDP, pages,34, 43, 45 and 47. This was as per list provided by the planner ref. CR/105/1 dated 29/4/2019.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The assessor was provided with evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customized design for investment projects reports dated; 19th December 2019, 30th April 2020, 24th May 2020, 1st June 2020, 2nd June 202, 29th June 2020.</p> <p>The sample projects were;</p> <p>1. Construction of 1 bock of 4-unit staff house at Burcoro P/S.2-Gulu508/Wrks/2019-2020/00005.</p> <p>2.Construction of 2 classrooms with a staff room at Panykworo P/S- Gulu508/2019-2020/00002.</p> <p>3. Construction of standard OPD at Lapeta HCII in Pakwelo Parish, Unyama Sub-county-Gulu508/Wrks/2019-2020/00011.</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>Evidence that project profiles with costing were developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines. This was as per minutes dated 15th November 2019. The 3 samples were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of OPD at Lapata HCII Shs.60,000,000. 2. 4 stance latrine at Otoko, Shs.30,000,000. 3. Construction of of teachers house at Buchoro P/S, Shs.100,000,000. 	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had not screened for environmental and social risks/impact and mitigation measures required before projects funded by the DDEG this is because the current year 2020/2021 projects had not yet started .Procurement process was still ongoing</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>As per the Approved Budget Estimates, all infrastructure projects (to be funded under DDEG) were incorporated in the AWP and Procurement Plans for the current FY including;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Construction of District Stores at New District HQtrs - Awach S/Cty - Estimated (budget amount) at UGX 100,000,000/=. 2) Completion of Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II - Unyama S/Cty - Estimated (budget amount) at UGX 70,000,000/= 3) Completion of Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms at Kiteny Owalo P/S - Palaro S/Cty - Estimated (budget amount) at UGX 32,000,000/= 	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Contracts Committee approved, among others the implementation of DDEG funded infrastructure projects current FY. These were approved by the 4th Contracts Committee meeting held on 22/10/2020 - under Min No. GULU508/CC 04/2020-2021</p> <p>The sampled 3 projects included;</p> <p>1) Completion (Phase II) of Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II with Incinerator - Unyama S/Cty - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2020-2021/00003</i></p> <p>2) Construction of District Stores at New District Headquarters - Awach S/Cty - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2020-2021/00009</i>.</p> <p>3) Completion of Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms at Kiteny Owalo P/S - Palaro S/Cty</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>No documentary evidence or records of Proper establishment of PITs (full team) were seen by the Assessor for the sampled projects</p> <p>Copies of appointment of the Project Manager – A.DHO (Yoweri. I), dated 4/2/2020; and Project Supervisor/CoW – AEO (Okello. F), dated 21/1/2020 for the supervision of Partial Construction of a Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II; signed by CAO accordingly were seen by the Assessor. Contract Management Plan was seen on file, but not Signed</p> <p>A copy of appointment of the Project Supervisor/CoW – AEO (Lagen B. P), for the supervision of Partial Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms at Kiteny-Owalo P/S; signed by CAO dated 3/4/2020 was seen by the Assessor. Contract Management Plan was seen duly Signed</p> <p>Also, a copy of appointment of the Project Supervisor/CoW – Snr. AEO (Kilama. B), for the supervision of Maintenance and Repair of Community Based Boardroom; signed by CAO dated 3/4/2020 was seen by the Assessor. Contract Management Plan was seen duly Signed by the Project Supervisor.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Infrastructure projects under DDEG Funding were found to be compliant with the standard designs and specifications as provided by the LG engineer The sampled projects included;</p> <p>1) Partial Construction of a Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II - Unyama S/Cty; – with the finished phase all set as per the technical specifications (MoH design for OPD) – with waiting Area (to have concrete benches), Examination room, etc; all wall exterior walls in 200mm thick bricks-sand Mortar, etc as physically viewed by the Assessor</p> <p>2) The partial Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms at Kiteny-Owalo P/S - Palaro S/Cty also followed Standard technical designs - that called for each Classroom to measure 8000x6000mm on the interior, 230mm thick bricks-sand Mortar – in well burnt clay bricks reinforced with hoop iron at intervals; the Ring beam cast at 2400mm height. The roofing and other completion phases were planned for the current FY. These conditions were met accordingly as per the supervision report from the AEO, and also the Assessors Physical site checks</p> <p>3) The Maintenance and Repair of Community Based Boardroom at Gulu DLG Head Quarters was also up to standard with all masonry walls in being 220mm thick for the extension part, etc. The painting was also done on the interior and front, with rough cast on the Rear and Sides of the extension part. No defects were observed. Completion of attached Lavatories (tile works, etc) was planned for the future</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Only the DE and/or his representative (AEO - CoW) were present during the supervision of works.</p> <p>Prior to verification and certification of Works the inspection reports seen were also not satisfactory for all the projects sampled in regards to presence of the Environmental Officer and the DCDO</p> <p>The sampled projects included;</p> <p>1) Partial Construction of a Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II - Unyama S/Cty;</p> <p>2) Partial Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms at Kiteny-Owalo P/S - Palaro S/Cty</p> <p>3) Maintenance and Repair of Community Based Boardroom at Gulu DLG Head Quarters</p>	0

Procurement, contract management/execution	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement):	Interim and Completion certificates were prepared after technical supervision and issued/paid within the Specified times as per the contracts
Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	Score 1 or else score 0	For example; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payment for the Partial Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms at Kiteny-Owalo P/S - Palaro S/Cty - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00022</i> to the Contractor - <i>M/S Hoture Technical Services-SMC Ltd</i>; the Invoice from the Contractor was raised on 10/6/2020, certification by the AEO/DE/DEO by 12/6/2020 and the payment made on 19/6/2020 - UGX 29,594,913/= • Payment for the Renovation and Extension of Community Based Boardroom at Gulu DLG Headquarters; <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00026</i> to the Contractor - <i>M/S Majosha Engineering Works Ltd</i>; the Invoice from the Contractor was raised on 4/6/2020, certification by the AEO/DE on the 8/6/2020 and the payment made on 25/6/2020, EFT #, 30515417 – UGX 14.100,000/

Procurement, contract management/execution	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:	From the Procurement Plan and procurement Files; there were complete procurement file for the sampled projects; including the Contract documents, approved Evaluation reports, memos of Bid Acceptance and Award of Contract indicating the Contracts Committee (C.C) approvals like
Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	Score 1 or else 0	1) Partial Construction of Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II - Unyama S/Cty - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00011</i> ; by the C.C under Min No. GDLD 04/CC 04/2019-2020 2) Partial Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms at Kiteny Owalo P/S - Palaro S/Cty - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00022</i> ; approved by the C.C under Min No. GDLD 07/CC 05/2019-2020 3) Maintenance and Repair of Community Based Boardroom at - Gulu DLG HQtrs - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00026</i> ; approved by the C.C under Min No. GDLD 07/CC 05/2019-2020 in a their meeting held on 11/3/2020

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District did not have a designated focal person to coordinate response to feed-back in the LG and there was no established Grievance Redress Committee (GRC)</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not have a specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which included a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action at the time of assessment</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG did not publicize the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress</p>	0

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

The evidence was seen by the assessor indicating that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with. The environmental & Social Safeguards 7 Screening Forms dated 7th February 2020.

The 3 samples investments were;

This was in the LG DP, page 9, 1.2.6. The interventions are;

Trainings in HIV/ AIDS prevention.

a. Vegetation safeguard against deforestation.

b. Waste management

c. Harvesting of water

d. Planting of trees against wind to blow off roofs of schools and health centers.

e. Non-employment of under age children as they have to go to school.

The 3 samples are;

1. Construction of OPD at Lapata HCII

2. 4 stance latrine at Otoko.

3. Construction of of teachers house at Buchoro P/S.

Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.

Maximum 11 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management score 1 or else 0

The LG disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines that strengthened and included, environment, climate change mitigation and adaptation and social risk management. This was contained in circulars dated, 15th May 2020. The activities included;

a. LLG planning process and planning tools, March 2020.

b. LG DP Planning Guidelines.

c. DDEG Budget and Implementation Guidelines.

d. Information flow with planning tool chart.

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation):</p> <p>c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary:</p> <p>score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG incorporated and costed (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for other DDEG projects for the previous FY .examples include;</p> <p>Under community services, maintenance and repair of community based board room REF GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00026. Contractor, Majosha Engineering works Ltd. contract Sum 14,979,708.environmental mitigation under Bill No 9 costed at UGX 580,000.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change.</p> <p>Score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change from the infrastructure projects Example;</p> <p>Construction of 4 stances drainable latrine at OPD at Patiko HC III .environmental mitigation under Bill No 10.6 costed UGX 3,723,000 and included planting of trees for windbreaks example Teak, Mvule and Mahogany and appeared on page 5 of the BOQ which is a climate change adaptation</p> <p>Construction of 1 block of 4 units teachers staff house at Bucoro PS. environmental mitigation under Bill No 10.6 costed at UGX 5,620,000 Included planting of tree seedlings for windbreak ie Teak ,Mvule and Mahogany, Ashok flowers, umbrella and evergreen trees. a climate change additional cost</p> <p>Construction of 1 block of 2 classroom with staff room at Panykwo PS environmental mitigation was costed at 2,170,000 under element No 10 page 12 which included planting of trees for windbreaks and beautification, stakeholder trainings on environmental safeguards, environment impact screening and monitoring by district which is an additional impact from climate change</p>	3

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no proof of ownership, access, and availability of land without any encumbrances that was seen for the projects implemented FY 2019/2020 by the time of assessment.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Environmental officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs example;</p> <p>Support supervision with compliance report on compliance on environmental and social requirements for district infrastructural projects. Example, construction of OPD at Lapeta sub county, Patiko HC III, Teachers house at Bucoro PS and borehole sites signed by DCDO and Senior Environment officer on 25th June 2020.</p> <p>Issues discussed were use of PPEs across all projects, construction wastes properly to be disposed off, planting of trees to be done and water pints to be fenced off.</p> <p>There were monthly compliance monitoring reports seen for June and August 2020. These were signed by the Senior environment officer and DCDO on 25th June 2020 and 20 August 2020 respectively.</p>	1
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>E&S compliance Certification forms for education projects were completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO. However contractor payment certificates were not signed by Environment officer or DCDO;</p> <p>Certificate of environmental restoration for Construction of 1 block of 2 classroom with staff room at Panykworo PS signed by DCDO,D/Eng and Environment officer dated 26th June 2020</p> <p>Certificate of environmental restoration for Construction of 1 block of 4 units teachers staff house at Bucoro PS signed by DCDO,D/Eng and Environment officer dated 26th June 2020.</p>	1

Financial management

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence that the LG made monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment on 19-20th November 2020. The bank accounts had been reconciled for the months of August, September and October 2020.</p> <p>The banks and balances printed from the IFMIS as at 31st October 2020 for the 3 sampled banks were as follows;</p> <p>1. DFCU-District Agriculture, a/c no. 0109365705549, Shs.26,175.</p> <p>2. Orent Bank-Genral Fund a/c no. 2771164401011, Shs.191,346,472.</p> <p>3. BOU, TSA a/c no. 5080528000000, Shs.0 (zero).</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports and submissions dated as follows;</p> <p>Q 1 05/10/2019</p> <p>Q 2 13/03/2020</p> <p>Q 3 13/07/2020</p> <p>Q 4 25/08/2020</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 LG provided information to the Council and chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings. The Chief Administrative Officer provided also information on follow up on audit queries on all quarterly audit reports 4th October 2019. There were follow-up as per Minutes dated, 31st July 2020 and 12th September 2019.</p>	1
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that all quarterly audit reports should were reviewed, discussed and a followup was made by the LG. The minutes available were for Q 1 and Q 2 when LG PAC reviewed and discussed them and a follow-up was made by LG. But there were no minutes which indicated that LG PAC reviewed, discussed and the LG made a follow-up on Q 3 and Q 4 audit reports.</p>	0

Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>Actual Revenue collection for 2019/20 was Shs.910,413,854 and planned was Shs.1,259,040,473. This implies a difference of Shs.248,626,61 indicating -20%. This was more than -10%.</p>	0
19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>The actual OSR for the fy 2018/19 was Shs. 1,032,618,771 and 2019/20 was Shs. 910,413,854. There was a decrease of Shs. 122,204,917. This indicates a decrease of 12%, which is less than -10%.</p>	0
20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence that the LG did not remit the mandatory LLG share of local revenues for the fy 2019/20 to LLGs in full. The amount to be remitted was SHS.249,000,00 but only Shs.180,640,000 was remitted. The LLGs were; Awach, Bungatira, Patiko, Palaro and Unyama.</p> <p>The remittance to LLGs were as follows;</p> <p>Q 1 Shs. 22,000,000</p> <p>Q 2 Shs. 37,500,000</p> <p>Q 3 Shs. 42,500,000</p> <p>Q 4 Shs. 78,640,000</p> <p>The CFO explained that the balance of Shs.68,360,000 was used for other activites during COVID-19 pandemic.</p>	0

Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Procurement Plan, and Awarded Contracts were duly published/displayed on the Gulu DLG Notice boards for Public View.</p> <p>Examples of Projects included;</p> <p>1. Contract to M/S Brotto's (U) Ltd; for Deep Boreholes (10N0.) Construction, Site Identification, Drilling, Well development, Test pumping and carrying out water quality Analysis, Apron Casting and hand pump Installation (Lot) – Under DWSCG - Procurement Reference No. GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00014; with a Contract sum - UGX 198,640,000/=. The display was signed (by CAO) and done/displayed on the 22/11/2019, and date of removal was 6/12/2019</p> <p>2. Contract to M/S Wan Aye Co Ltd; for Construction of 1 block of 2 Classrooms at Olel Hill P/S - Procurement Reference No. GULU508/WRKS/2020-2021/00002; with a Contract sum - UGX 69,309,858/=. The display was signed (by CAO) and done/displayed on the 25/10/2020, and date of removal was 6/11/2020</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG performance results were displayed as per memo dated 10th October 2020 signed by the CFO. The results were also displayed in various noticeboards including the Administration one at the Administrative block. The results showed that Gulu Overall performance was in position 84, with a score of 67%. Performance of other sectors were; education, 56%; water 80%; health 54%; accountability requirements and crosscutting issues 74%.</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>The LG did not conduct discussions with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation programmes.</p>	0
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not publicly avail information on, tax rates, collection procedures, and procedures for appeal.</p>	0

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on
this Performance
Measure

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

The LG did not have any cases of corruption or fraud as confirmed by the CFO, Clerk to Council and CAO during the assessment period.

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>We obtained and reviewed the PLE results for 2018 and 2019 and calculated the percentage change in performance. We noted that the PLE performance increased by 10.9% as evidenced below:</p> <p>1,500 out of 2,319 (64.7%) pupils who sat PLE in 2018 passed between grade 1 and 3 (D1=121, D2=752 & D3=627)</p> <p>1,862 out 2,463 (75.6%) pupils who sat PLE in 2019 passed between grade 1 and 3 (D1=124, D2=1,081 & D3=657)</p> <p>Thus, the percentage increase was 10.9%</p>	4
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>We obtained and reviewed the UCE results for 2018 and 2019 and calculated the percentage change in performance. We noted that the UCE performance increased by 4% as evidenced below:</p> <p>281 out of 337 (84.4%) students who sat UCE in 2018 passed between grade 1 and 3 (D1=113, D2=110, & D3=58)</p> <p>298 out 341 (87.4%) students who sat UCE in 2019 passed between grade 1 and 3 (D1=113, D2=109 & D3=76)</p> <p>Thus, the percentage increase was 4%</p>	2
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 2 • Between 1 and 5% score 1 • No improvement score 0 	<p>To be scored Zero for all LGs in Y1 & Y2</p>	0

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>The review of the LG quarterly performance report (Q4) FY 2019/20 revealed that development grant of UGX2,719,297,000 was approved for FY 2019/20. We noted that UGX1,363,294,000 was released but only 8% was spent during FY 2019/20. Thus, a total of UGX1,260,596,000 was unspent.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>We established that all the payment certificates for the education construction projects implemented FY 2019/20 were not certified by the Environment Officer and District Community Officer as required in the LGPA manual (2020).</p> <p>Certification of works was done by Project Supervisor, District Engineer, DEO, and CAO as evidenced by the (3) sampled payment certificates below:</p> <p>a) Payment Certificate No.02-Ref.no. MoES/Wrks/2018-2019/00119: Construction of Seed Secondary school at Palaro Senior Secondary School, Amount paid Ugx741,911,156 dated 28th August 2020. Certified by Project Supervisor, DE, DEO, and CAO</p> <p>b) Payment certificate No.1, Ref.no. Gulu508/Wrks/2019-2020/00022: Partial Construction of 1 block of 2 classrooms at Kiteny-Owalo primary school; Amount paid Shs.31,483,950. Certified by Project Supervisor, DE, DEO, and CAO dated 15th June 2020</p> <p>c) Payment certificate No.4: Ref. no.Gulu508/Wrks/2019-2020/0001:Construction of (2) classrooms with staffroom at Panykworo PS. Amount paid Shs.44,659,884. Signed by Contractor, DE and CAO</p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

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

From the DE and DEOs offices, the following
Works contracts were sampled; and the Engineers
estimates (Budgets) Vs. the Contract Prices are as
listed with the corresponding Variation
percentages:

1. Construction of *Palaro Seed Sec School*, Palaro
S/County - MoES/WRKS/2018-2019/00119 with
MoES (Engineers) Estimates (budget amount) at
UGX 2,100,000,000/=. The contract Price was
UGX 1,757,391,000/=. **The Variation was at -**
16.31%

2. Construction of 1 Block of 4-Units Staff House at
Burcoro P/S - Awach S/Cty -
GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00005, with
Engineers Estimates (budget amount) at UGX
115,000,000/=. The contract Price was UGX
102,922,786/=. **The Variation was at -10.5%**

3. Partial Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms
at *Kiteny-Owalo P/S* - Palaro S/Cty -
GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00022, with
Engineers Estimates (budget amount) at UGX
37,000,000/=. The contract Price was UGX
33,141,000/=. **The Variation was at -10.43%**

The variations were thus within +/-20% of the
MoES/LG Engineers estimates

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

Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure

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

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

The Contract for Construction of **Palaro Seed Sec
School**, Lungulu S/County is ongoing – 3 year
Contract running from June 2019 to June 2021.

However, the work seems to be behind schedule
as per the monthly reports sampled from the Clerk
of Works (CoW) with reference to the submitted
Contractor's work Schedule. A **55% Physical
Status** shall be used for the expected stage by the
end of the previous FY, thus the Zero (0) since that
completion rate is below 80%.

This indicator as per the **LGPA 2020 manual
reviews calls for Ref. Seed Sec. School.**

However, the following Education/School
infrastructure developments were completed as per
Work Plan as evidenced by the project Completion
reports from the DE and DEO

- Construction of 1 Block of 4-Units Staff House at
Burcoro P/S - Awach S/Cty, and
- Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms with
Staffroom at *Panykworo P/S - Bungatira S/Cty*

4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 	<p>Gulu had a total of 791 teachers as per the approved staff structure. The number of teachers posted was 757 as per the staff lists submitted in PBS FY 2020/21. This implies that the district had filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision at 95.7% $(757/791)*100$. The total wage bill provision was UGX 8,775,549,000 as per the approved budget estimates the FY 2019/20</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	<p>The LG education department maintained a Consolidated Schools Asset Register for the (55) UPE schools and (6) USE secondary schools as of FY 2019/20. The asset register covered both primary and secondary schools; captured the number of classrooms, number of latrines, number of desks and teacher accommodation as per the format provided in the planning, budgeting and implantation guidelines for LGs for the education sector (May 2019)</p> <p>The review of the consolidated schools asset registers for FY 2019/20 revealed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During FY 2019/20; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 41 out of 55 (74.5%) registered UPE schools met the prescribed DES minimum standards o 2 out of 6 (33.3%) registered USE schools met the prescribed DES minimum standards o On average, 54% (both UPE and USE schools met the prescribed DES minimum standards for FY 2019/20 • Consolidated Asset register for FY 2018/19 not prepared. 	0

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 list of primary school teachers 2020, obtained from the DEO's office revealed that a total of 757 teachers were deployed in 55 UPE schools in FY 2020/21

Verification was done in 3 sampled UPE school and the following was established as per the deployment list from the DEO's office.

The number of (21) teachers on the DEO's deployment list was consistent with the number of teachers (21) on the school staff list in Bungatira primary school, Laliya S/C

The number of (19) teachers on the DEO's deployment list was not consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (18) in Gulu PTC Demonstration School (Unyama S/C).

The number of (22) teachers on DEO's deployment list for Cwero primary school (Paicho Sub-county) was not consistent with number of teachers (19) on the school staff list

It was noted that the total number of teachers as indicated on the DEO's deployment list was not consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list in two (2) out of the (3) sampled schools i.e. Gulu PTC Demonstration School and Cwero PS as indicated above. Thus, the score is zero since the information on DEO's deployment list is not 100% accurate.

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 review of Gulu LG education department consolidated asset register for FY 2019/20 and school asset registers of the sampled 3 UPE schools, revealed that the information in the LG consolidated Asset Register is not consistent with information on school asset registers in the sampled schools. Specific details are documented below:

Bungatira PS: The consolidated school asset register for FY 2019/20 indicated that the school had (15) classrooms, (12) latrines, (247) desks and (8) teacher houses while the school asset register had (8) classrooms, (10) latrines, (280) desks and (8) teacher houses.

Cwero PS: The consolidated school asset register for FY 2019/20 indicated that the school had (-) classrooms, (15) latrines, (237) desks and (10) teacher houses while the school asset register had (15) classrooms, (10) latrines, (133) desks and (5) teacher houses

Gulu PTC Demonstration School: The consolidated school asset register for FY 2019/20 indicated that the school had (9) classrooms, (15) latrines, (167) desks and (7) teacher houses while the school asset register had (9) classrooms, (12) latrines, (144) desks and (2) teacher houses

We noted that the school asset register format does not provide for equipment

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 noncompliance to MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines. There was no evidence of submitted Annual School Reports and budgets covering school performance and plans, a reconciled cash flow statements, annual budget and expenditure report and asset register to DEO by January 30th

It was noted during school visits that head teachers were not inducted on the guidelines (Budgeting and Implementation guidelines for primary and secondary schools-May 2019) yet others claimed that they never received the guidelines.

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 review of the support supervision report for Term 3 QTR 1 FY 2019/20 indicated that 27 out of 55 (49.1%) UPE schools were supported to develop their school improvement plans.</p> <p>Verification was done in (3) UPE schools and it was found that all the (3) sampled UPE schools had in place SIPs i.e. Bungatira PS, Cwero PS and Gulu PTC DEM. School.</p>	2
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 	<p>The list of government aided primary schools (55) captured in Gulu DLG Performance contract FY 2019/20 is Not consistent with the number of schools (56) in excel data sheet (OTIMS) for FY 2019/20</p>	0

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Gulu DLG budgeted for a head teacher and minimum of (8) teachers per school or a teacher per school in all the (55) UPE schools as per the staff list for the FY 2020/21. The total wage bill provision for teachers was UGX8,775,549,000 as per the Approved Budget Estimates for the FY 2020/21. The budget covers salaries for (757) primary teachers in the (55) primary schools as per the staffing lists submitted in PBS FY 2020/21. We noted that all the (55) UPE schools had substantive head teachers.</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

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

The list of primary school teachers 2020, obtained from the DEO's office revealed that a total of 757 teachers were deployed in 55 UPE schools in FY 2020/21 as per sector guidelines as indicated below:

All the (55) UPE schools had a minimum of (8) teachers per school;

The Pupil-Teacher Ratio (PTR) for two (2) schools was good since it was below the standard ratio of 1:53 i.e. Bungatira PS (1:46); and Gulu PTC demonstration school (1:30). Meanwhile Cwero PS had a PTR (1:65) above the standard ratio of 1:53.

Verification was done in 3 sampled UPE school and the following was established as per the deployment list from the DEO's office.

The number of teachers(19) on staffing list is not consistent with the number of teachers (19) on the deployment list and the number of teachers (18) on the school list for Gulu PTC DEM. School

The number of teachers(21) on staffing list is consistent with the number of teachers (21) on both the deployment list and the school list for Bungatira PS

The number of teachers(22) on staffing list is not consistent with the number of teachers on the school staff list (19) for Cwero PS

It was validated that the number of teachers on the staff list was not consistent with the number of teachers on both the deployment list and school staff lists as indicated in the above sampled schools.

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

c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,
score: 1 else, score: 0

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

There was evidence that the teacher deployment list had been displayed at the LG noticeboard and in the DEO's office notice board. The list indicated the school name for the (55), enrolment figures, total number of teachers and Pupil teacher ratio. We noted that the names of individual teachers were not included on the list

The information on the teacher deployment list was verified with the school list of teachers on its payroll displayed on school notice boards in the 03 UPE schools and the findings are as indicated below:

Bungatira PS - the list of teachers displayed on the noticeboard had (21) teachers i.e. (13) were male and (8) female.

Cwero PS- the list of teachers displayed on the noticeboard and had (19) teachers i.e. (9) were male and (4) female

Gulu PTC DEMO. School the list of teachers displayed on the noticeboard had (18) teachers i.e. (8) were male and (10) female

We also reviewed the attendance books/registers filled by all teachers on a daily basis and it was validated that the teachers displayed on the noticeboards were actually present in schools.

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.

a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO
Score: 2 or else, score: 0

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

There was no evidence of appraisal reports 2019 for the 55 primary school head teachers submitted to HRM with copy to DEO by Senior Assistant Secretaries (SAS) at the LLG. The information obtained from DEO/HRM indicated that staff performance appraisal for 2019 not conducted due to Covid-19!

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The secondary school head teachers for the (6) USE schools were not appraised by the Chairperson of the Board of Governors/DCAO during 2019</p>	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>The Assessor reviewed personal files of Education Management staff and established that the DEO did not appraise all the staff during the previous FY. While 4 staff had on file, appraisal documents for FY 2019/2020, the Education Officer-Special Needs- and the Senior Education Officer, had no appraisal documents on file for FY 2019/2020 and hence the Assessor deemed it that the officers were not appraised. The appraisal details for the respective officers were as indicated below:</p> <p>1. Senior Inspector of Schools: Obot Robinson was appraised by the DEO and the report was endorsed by the CAO on 13th July 2020.</p> <p>2. Inspector of schools. Obol David: was appraised by the DEO on 31st October, 2019 and the CAO endorsed the report on the same date.</p> <p>3. Inspector of Schools: Adimola Margaret Amongi was appraised by the DEO on 13th July, 2020 and the CAO endorsed the report on the same date.</p> <p>4. Senior Education Officer: Akena Ceaser: <i>No appraisal documents for FY 2019/2020 were on file at the time of the assessment.</i></p> <p>5. Sports Officer: Ojara Sunday Braxton; was appraised by the DEO on 9th January 2020 and the CAO endorsed the report on 20th January 2020.</p> <p>6. Education Officer Special Needs: Opio Quinta Latigo; <i>No appraisal documents for FY 2019/2020 were on file at the time of the assessment.</i></p>	0

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,

score: 2 Else, score: 0

There was evidence of a draft Capacity Building Plan FY 2019/20 for the Department of Education and Sports. Key training needs outlined in the plan included:

Build capacity of head teachers on how to conduct appraisal of staff

Training of newly appointed members of SMCs on roles and responsibilities

Refresher training on school support supervision for inspectors of schools, head teachers and deputy head teachers

Train both inspectors of schools and head teachers /deputies o Early Grade Reading (EGR) pedagogies

Etc.

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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.

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

We noted from DEO, that the DLG was compliant hence there was no need of rectification of IPFs for the list of schools and enrolment figures submitted in PBS by 15th December as required.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

We reviewed the LG quarterly performance report FY 2019/20 –QTR4 report (page 98) under output 078401 Monitoring and supervision of primary and secondary education and established that UGX100,046,000 was allocated to monitoring and inspection functions. We noted that Shs.79,260,000 (79%) was released during FY 2019/20. Information obtained from DEO indicated that UGX36,403,998 was spent on monitoring and inspection of schools as per sector guidelines. Activities included fuel, SDA, vehicle maintenance, photocopying, stationery, and internet bundle.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

The evidence shows the LG did not submit warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters. They were warranted on the following dates;

Warrant	Submission
Q 1 - 10/07/2019	15/07/2019
Q 2 – 10/10/2019	15/10/2019
Q 3 - 10/01/2020	24/01/2020
Q 4 - 15/04/2020	22/04/2020

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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.

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

Gulu DLG had evidence of disclosure of releases of UPE funds for the (55) primary schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants during the FY 2019/20 on the public noticeboard as indicated below:

Transfer of Capitation grants for Quarters (1, 3 &4) FY 2019/20 were displayed on the LG noticeboard.

The payment of capitation grant to schools for QTR1 2019/20 was requisitioned on 19th August 2019 by DEO and EFT payment voucher was dated 27th August 2019. We noted that money was received by Bungatira PS on 31st January 2020

The transfer of capitation grant for 3rd quarter FY 2019/20 was requisitioned on 21st January 2020 and EFT payment voucher was dated 31st January 2020 We noted that the money was received and acknowledged by Ajulu PS and Bungatira PS on 5th February 2020.

Etc.

We noted evidence of posting of non-wage recurrent grants on school noticeboards in all the (3) sampled UPE schools. For example, It was indicated on the noticeboard that Gulu PTC Demonstration School received: a) UGX2,506,000 for Term III QTR 1 FY 2019/20; UGX 2,199,000 for Term II 2019 QTR3; and UGX 2,506,000 for Term I 2020 QTR2 FY 2019/20

However it was not possible to determine whether the DEO communicated/publicized capitation to schools within 3 working days after the release of funds.

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 	<p>There was evidence of inspectorate work plan FY 2019/20 for Term II 2020, 4th Quarter dated 25th May 2020. We noted the minutes of the Senior Staff meeting held on 29th January 2020 under ESSM/4/4: Discussion of development of inspection work schedule and dissemination of inspection tools by DIS.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>School inspection reports for (2) school terms were obtained and reviewed to establish the number of schools inspected as indicated below:</p> <p>School Inspection Report for 1st Term 2020 QTR3 FY2019/20 dated 25th May 2020 conducted by (6) Associate Assessors and DIS. It covered 46 out of 55 (83.6%) UPE schools</p> <p>School Support Supervision Report Term III QTR I FY2019/20 dated 17th December 2019. All the 55 (100%) UPE schools were covered</p> <p>Thus, the number of schools inspected were $101/110 \times 100 = 92\%$</p>	1

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,

Score: 2 or else, score: 0

We obtained and reviewed the minutes of the education senior staff meeting (ESSM) held on 16th December 2019. Under Min. ESSM/3/19/3 Inspectorate; the DIS presented inspection findings for support supervision report for Term III QTR 1 FY 2019/20. Key findings were on supervision of teachers, school feeding, and school improvement plans, and recommended construction of new classrooms in the affected schools.

However the review of the inspection files in the 3 sampled UPE schools revealed that:

- o Bungatira PS was inspected/supervised three times i.e. 11th March 2020-major gaps identified for follow up support supervision by DIS; 4th February 2020-Planning of Term 1 2020 by AA-Obol David and 16th October 2019- school performance at inspection by Laloch Elviria (Inspector of Schools)

- o Cwero PS there was no evidence of inspection reports during FY 2019/20. Noted inspection visit dated 8th October 2020 by District Health Officer

- o Gulu PTC Demonstration School was inspected twice in FY 2019/20 i.e. 5th December 2019- school feedback report on monitoring of inspection activities and 3rd February 2020

There was evidence that the DIS made follow up visits to check whether corrective actions have been implemented in 2 out of the 3 sampled schools as indicated above. Thus, the score is zero since follow up on inspection recommendations not done in all schools.

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

There was evidence that the LG Education department had submitted one school inspection report to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) during FY 2019/20 as shown below:

School Inspection Report for Term I 2020 3rd quarter FY 2019/20 was submitted and received by Assistant Commissioner DES Northern Region as per the official stamp dated 28th July 2020.

However it was established during the school visits that Cwero PS, one (1) of the (3) schools sampled had no evidence of inspection reports during FY 2019/20 as detailed below

Bungatira PS was inspected/supervised three times i.e. 11th March 2020: Major gaps identified for follow up support supervision by DIS; 4th February 2020: Planning of Term 1 2020 by AA-Obol David and 16th October 2019: School performance at inspection by Lalocho Elviria (Inspector of Schools)

Cwero PS there was no evidence of inspection reports during FY 2019/20. Noted inspection visit dated 8th October 2020 by District Health Officer

Gulu PTC Demonstration School was inspected twice in FY 2019/20 i.e. 5th December 2019: school feedback report on monitoring of inspection activities and 3rd February 2020

Routine oversight and monitoring

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

The LG provided evidence minutes dated;28/6/2029-CUNC/5/2019; 26/9/2019-COUN/1/2019/20; 30/12/20219-COU/2/2019; 30/04/2020-COUN/2/20120, of sector committee of council responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports. Among issues discussed were;

a. Nomination of School Management Committees (SMC) by foundation bodies.

b. Training of SMCs.

c. District to recruit professional counselor to handle psychological cases on schools.

d. District to sensitize parents to ensure schools register better performance on how to handle their children and advice on career guidance.

e. Lobby partners to procure and prioritize procurement of desks.

f. Construction of Palaro seed secondary schools.

G. Delayed turn-up of students and pupils to go to school.

h. Pupils and students do manual labour instead of going to school in order to go to video halls and gambling.

i. Headteachers and teachers late coming and absenteeism.

j. Drunkenness of some teachers hence affecting students/pupils drop in national exams performance.

Mobilization of parents to attract learners

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,

score: 2 or else score: 0

There was no evidence to show that education department conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school during calendar year 2019

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was no evidence of an up to-date LG asset register. The review and validation of the LG consolidated register FY 2019/20 in the sampled schools revealed that all the (3) sampled schools had no asset registers in the format prescribed in the budgeting and implementation guidelines for primary and secondary schools, and information in the consolidated asset register not consistent with school asset registers as indicated below</p> <p>Bungatira PS: The consolidated school asset register for FY 2019/20 indicated that the school had (15) classrooms, (12) latrines, (247) desks and (8) teacher houses while the school asset register had (8) classrooms, (10) latrines, (280) desks and (8) teacher houses.</p> <p>Cwero PS: The consolidated school asset register for FY 2019/20 indicated that the school had (-) classrooms, (15) latrines, (237) desks and (10) teacher houses while the school asset register had (15) classrooms, (10) latrines, (133) desks and (5) teacher houses</p> <p>Gulu PTC Demonstration School: The consolidated school asset register for FY 2019/20 indicated that the school had (9) classrooms, (15) latrines, (167) desks and (7) teacher houses while the school asset register had (9) classrooms, (12) latrines, (144) desks and (2) teacher houses</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget and investments were derived from the LGDP, eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source. The sector project appraisal is in accordance to AWP (pages, 117-122) education Department; The activities for Education department to be undertaken include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of classrooms at Kiteny P/S; Tegot P/S; Awach P/S; Burcoro PS/. Teachers' houses construction at; Awach Central P/S; Borcoro P/S; Supply of Desks School Inspection and monitoring Provision of Safe Water source. 	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0</p>	<p>The LG provided a field Appraisal for, technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and customized designs. This is as per report dated 4h April 2020, by Atto Francisca Kisembo. The projects were all compliant in regard to technical feasibility and environmentally acceptable. There were also screening checklist forms availed and the three samples are;</p> <p>a. Construction of Lapeta OPD, Unyama sub-county.</p> <p>b. Construction pf drainable pit latrine at Patiko HCIII, Patiko Sub-county.</p> <p>c. Construction of teachers' house at Burcoro P/S.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>As per the Approved Budget Estimates and the Education Sector Work Plan, the following projects were incorporated in the AWP and Procurement Plans for the current FY</p> <p>1) Construction (continuation) of Palaro Seed S/S - Palaro S/Cty - (UGX 669,417,000/=), for the continuing/Ongoing works on the project</p> <p>2) Completion of Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms at Kiteny-Owalo P/S - Palaro S/Cty - Estimated (budget amount) at UGX 32,000,000/=.</p> <p>3) Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms at Omoti Hill P/S - Patiko S/Cty; (Estimated at UGX 70,000,000/=)</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School infrastructure Projects were approved before commencement of Works. For example the Construction of Palaro Seed S. S was approved under Min No. GDLG 10/CC 04/2018-2019 of the Contracts Committee meeting held on 17/4/2019 • Under Min No. GDLD 07/CC 05/2019-2020, other projects like the Partial Construction of a 2-Classroom Block at Kiteny-Owalo P/S, etc were also approved. • The Solicitor General (S/G) cleared the contract Award (UGX 1,757,391,000/=) to M/S Davrich Co (U) Ltd for the construction of Palaro Seed School project. The letter is dated and stamped 10th May, 2019, endorsed by Nyeko Joseph, on behalf of the S/G 	1

Procurement, contract management/execution

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. *score: 1, else score: 0*

There was No records of Proper Establishment of PITs (full team) for School Construction Projects were seen by the Assessor as per the sampled projects below;

Copies of appointment of the Project Manager – D.I.S, dated 4/2/2020; and Project Supervisors – DE and AEO, dated 21/1/2020 for the Construction of 1 Block of 4-Units Staff House at Burcoro P/S; signed by CAO accordingly were seen by the Assessor.

A copy of appointment of the Project Supervisor/CoW – AEO (Lagen B. P), for the supervision of Partial Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms at Kiteny-Owalo P/S; signed by CAO dated 3/4/2020 was seen by the Assessor.

Also, Copies of appointment of the Project Manager – D.S.O (Ojara, S. B), dated 4/2/2020, and Project Supervisor/CoW – AEO (Kinyera, J B. O), for the supervision of Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms with Staffroom at Panykworo P/S; signed by CAO dated 21/1/2020 was seen by the Assessor

A 2 year contract appointment of the Clerk of Works (Mwaka Patrick) for the Palaro Seed School project and others, dated 20/12/2019 was also seen by the Assessor.

However, there was **NO documentary evidence on properly composed PIT** as per LG PA 2020 manual guidelines

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>The sampled projects as per the physical checks during the sites visits were implemented following MoES technical designs.</p> <p>1) The number of Blocks (Classrooms, Sci. Lab, ICT/Library Block, Main Hall, the twin Staff houses including the corresponding Kitchen and latrine Blocks) at Palaro Seed School Project.</p> <p>All the structural elements in beams and Columns were done,.</p> <p>The regular due reports from the Works supervisors – Clerk of Works, DE were as well documented.</p> <p>2) The partial Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms at Kiteny-Owalo P/S - Palaro S/Cty, and the Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms with Staffroom at Panykworo P/S - Bungatira S/Cty also followed Standard technical designs - that called for each Classroom to measure 8000x6000mm on the interior, 230mm thick bricks-sand Mortar – in well burnt clay bricks reinforced with hoop iron at intervals; the Ring beam cast at 2400mm height. The roofing and other completion phases were planned for the current FY. These conditions were met accordingly as per the supervision report from the AEO, and also the Assessors Physical site checks</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY</p> <p><i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>Site Meetings were held regularly at the Construction of Palaro Seed Secondary School; and minutes of the 25/9/2019, 22/1/2020, 12/2/2020, 16/3/2020 sittings, including Monitoring visits were seen by the Assessor.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted</p> <p><i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was NO proper documentary evidence that the Joint Technical supervisions at the Construction of Palaro Seed Secondary School have been regular (w.r.t Critical stages).</p> <p>The Participation of the environment officers, CDOs, was also not evidenced, even in the other Schools Infrastructure Projects like at Burcoro P/S, Kiteny-Owalo P/S, etc</p>	0

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>The CFO provided evidence to the assessor that indicated the sector infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract. The projects were certified by the DEO and District engineer and also had certificates of site handover. The sample project were;</p> <p>a. Davrich Co. (U) Ltd-Construction of Pajaro Seed Secondary School; MoES/UgIFT/Wrks/ 2018-19/00119; Request on 22nd May 2020. Certified on 10/6/2020. Paid on 18th June 2020 by EFT No. 30056924, Shs.421,277,315.</p> <p>b. Alabama Crown Ltd, Gulu- GULU508WRKS/2019-2020/00005. Construction of one block 4 unit teachers house at Burcoro P/S. Request 22/5/2020. Certified on 10/6/2020. Paid on 18th June 2020, by EFT No. 30056974, Shs.88,938,835.</p> <p>c. Hoture Technical Services-SMC-Guluted- Request 10th June 2020. Certified on 15/6/2020. Paid on 18th June 2020 by EFT No. 30057007, Shs.29,594,913.</p>	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>No documentary evidence that the Education Department timely submitted their Procurement Plan for the FY 2019/20 by April 30.</p> <p>Some Contract Management Plans were seen</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>Complete Procurement files for all the school infrastructure projects with Evaluation Reports and Minutes of the Contract Committee were present, For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction (Continuation) of School Facilities at Palaro Seed Sec School at - Palaro S/County - MoES/WRKS/2018-2019/00119 • Completion of Construction of 1 Block of 2 Classrooms at Kiteny Owalo P/S - Palaro S/County 	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There were no log of grievances that were recorded investigated, responded to and redress reported.</p> <p>No grievances recorded neither investigated in education sector in the LG.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation</p> <p><i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence of dissemination/distribution of education guidelines "Guidance on Environmental and Social Mainstreaming in Schools" addressed to all directors/headmasters/head teachers to provide for 'green' schools and energy and water conservation-dated November 2018. We noted however that the guidelines did not provide for access to land (without encumbrance), and proper siting of schools</p>	3

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

Environmental and social Safeguard requirements were incorporated in the BoQs of education projects contracts as seen on the Following BOQs ;

Construction of 1 block of 4 units teachers staff house at Bucoro PS REF GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00005 Contractor, Majosha Engineering works Ltd. contract Sum UGX 102,922,756 .environmental mitigation under Bill No 10.6 costed at UGX 5,620,000 Included planting of tree seedlings for windbreak ie Teak ,Mvule and Mahogany, Ashok flowers, umbrella and evergreen trees

Construction of 1 block of 2 classroom with staff room at Panykwo PS REF GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00001, Contractor Wan Aye Co Ltd, Contract sum UGX 106,381,720. environmental mitigation was costed at 2,170,000 under element No 10 page 12 which included planting of trees for windbreaks and beautification, stakeholder trainings on environmental safeguards, environment impact screening and monitoring by district

Construction of 1 block of 2 classrooms at Kiteny Owalo PS REF GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00022 Contractor, Hoture Technical services contract Sum UGX 33,141,000 .Environmental mitigation under Item 101 costed at UGX 2,170,000 Included; stakeholders training in environmental and social safeguards, environmental screening, issuance of certificate of restoration and monitoring by district

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There was no documentation on land acquisition status example land title, land agreement or formal consent for the implementation of education projects that was seen at the time of assessment.

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

There was monitoring and engagement throughout the contract period by CDO and Environment Officer for education projects.

For education projects there was compliance reports on environmental and social safeguards at Construction of Teachers house at Bucoro PS ,construction of 1 block of 2 classrooms with staff room at Panykwo PS and Partial construction of 1 block of 2 classrooms at Kiteny owalo PS signed by the Environment officer and DCDO on 25th June 2020.

The environmental and social safeguards include;

Waste management was perfectly done, screening was done and trees that were not planted were finally planted and certificate of environmental restoration issued.

Monthly reports for environmental compliance monitoring infrastructural projects were seen for August and signed by the DCDO and Environment officer on 20th August 2019

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 were education contractor payment certificates but were not signed by the Environment Officer and CDO examples include;

Construction of 1 block of 4 units teachers staff house at Bucoro PS certificate No 1 amount 102,922,786, contractor Alabama Crown Ltd .amount payable 90,403,147 dated 25th may 2020

Construction of 1 block of 2 classroom with staff room at Panykwo PS.certificate No 4 amount 106,381,720, contractor Wan Aye Co Ltd .amount payable 44,659,884 dated 8th June 2020 signed by Contractor,DEng and CAO on 10th June 2020.

Education compliance certificates included;

Certificate of environmental restoration for Construction of 1 block of 4 units teachers staff house at Bucoro PS signed by DCDO, DEng and Environment officer dated 26th June 2020.

Certificate of environmental restoration for Construction of 1 block of 2 classroom with staff room at Panykwo PS signed by DCDO,DEng and Environment officer dated 26th June 2020

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total OPD attendance, and deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>The OPD utilization registered an overall increase of 12 % while deliveries registered an increase of 20%. The assessment team reviewed health unit annual reports (HMIS 107) for three sampled health facilities for FY 2018/2019 and FY 2019/2020. The findings were as described below;</p> <p><u>OPD ATTENDANCE</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Awach HC IV: FY 18/19 was 29,565 while 19/20 was 31,786=8% increase 2. Laroo HC III: FY 18/19 was 11,875 while 19/20 was 14,178=19% Increase 3. Cwero HC III : FY 18/19 was 13,496 while 19/20 was 15,362= 14% Increase <p>The total OPD attendance for FY 18/19 was 54,936 while FY 19/20 was 61326= $[61,326-54,936]/54,936 \times 100 = 12\%$</p> <p><u>DELIVERIES</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aawch HC IV Increased by 13% (FY 18/19 was 548 and FY19/20 While 619) 2. Laroo HC III: Increased by 150 % (FY 18/19 was 16 while FY19/20=40) 3. Cwero HC III : Increased by 32% (FY 18/19 =124 while FY19/20 = 164) <p>The total deliveries were; FY 18/19=688 and FY19/20=823 which represents an overall increase of 20% for the 3 randomly sampled health facilities.</p> <p>Therefore based on DELIVERIES with an overall 20% increase in the utilization of health care, Gulu DLG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services as per the requirements of the performance measure.</p>	2

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%; score 2 • 50 – 69% score 1 • Below 50%; score 0 	NOT APPLICABLE	0
2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p> <p>Note: To have zero wait for year one</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quarterly quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 75%; score 2 • 65 – 74%; score 1 • Below 65% ; score 0 	<p>Gulu DLG had just been recently re-enrolled on the Result Based Financing (RBF). By the time the end of last quarter of FY 2019/2020, Eight (8-7 HC IIIs and 1 HC IV) health facilities were on the RBF program. The assessment team reviewed the reports on RBF facility assessment for the last quarter of the FY 2019/2020 and established that the score was 84.5%. The details of the specific health facility scores were as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Awach HC IV: 88% 2. Aywee HC III: 95.5% 3. Patiko HC III: 84.1% 4. Bardege HC III: 80.7% 5. Laroo HC III: 71.7% 6. Cwero HC III: 77.7% 7. Pabwo HC III: 89.5% 8. Angaya HC III: 89% 	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines. The activities in the Approved Budget Performance report shows the budget of Shs.115, 705,000 (ABPR, page 17) The amount released was Shs.35,751,000 (ABPR,2019-20,page, 17) this was spent on construction of Lapeta HC III and construction of 4 stance drainable latrine at Patiko HC II. The balance of Shs.79,954,000 is claimed to have been on other activities for example during COVID-19 pandemic of whose accountability was not disclosed to the assessor.</p>	0

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/suppliers score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DHO, Ag. District Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors.</p> <p>They were;</p> <p>a. DIN Engineering Company Ltd. <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-20/00023</i>. Construction of 4 drainable latrine at Patiko HC III. Request of funds, 10/6/2020. Certified on 16/6/2020. Paid on 26/6/2020 by EFT. No. 30515415, Shs.18,418,966.</p> <p>b. Full Dose Engineering Ltd. <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-20/00011</i>. Construction of Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II. Request on 4/6/2020. Certified on 6/6/2020. Paid on 25/6/2020 by EFT. No. 30515368, Shs.61,145,149.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/- 20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the DE and DHOs offices, the following Works contracts were sampled; and the Engineers estimates (Budgets) Vs. the Contract Prices are as listed with the corresponding Variation percentages:</p> <p>1 Partial Construction of Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II - Unyama S/Cty - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00011</i>, with Engineers Estimates at UGX 65,000,000/=. The contract Price was UGX 65,000,000/-. The Variation was at 0%</p> <p>2 Construction of 1 Block of 4-Stance Drainable Latrine for OPD at Patiko HC III - Patiko S/Cty - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00023</i>, with Engineers Estimates (budget amount) at UGX 21,621,000/=. The contract Price was UGX 19,405,696/=. The Variation was at -10.25%</p> <p>The variations were thus within +/-20% of the MoWT/LG Engineers Estimates</p>	2
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 	<p>This indicator as per the LGPA 2020 manual reviews calls for Ref. HC II to HC III Upgrade. Gulu DLG had no such health infrastructure development.</p> <p>However, the following were completed as per Work Plan</p> <p>1. Partial Construction of Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II - Unyama S/Cty - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00011</i> completed</p> <p>2. Construction of 1 Block of 4-Stance Drainable Latrine for OPD at Patiko HC III - Patiko S/Cty - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00023</i> completed as per work plan</p>	2

Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure

- If above 90% score 2
- If 75% - 90%: score 1
- Below 75 %: score 0

Gulu DLG recruited staff for all the 5 government HCIIIs and Awach HCIV as per staffing structure. The staff structure obtained from PHRO indicated that HC IVs required to have 49 staff while HC IIIs required to have 19 staff. According to the FY 2020/2021 approved budget, Generated on 29/06/2020 02:23; page 26, the allocated conditional Sector Conditional Grant (Wage) was 2,387,542,000/= to cater for the 125 deployed staff out of the 144 staffing norm for the available HC IV and HC IIIs. This implies that only 86.8% position of health workers for HC IVs and HC IIIs were filled. The details of the percentage of health workers positions filled for facilities was as follows;

1. Awach HC IV; 49 staff were deployed out 49 required staffing norm. This represents 100% of filled positions.
2. Angaya HC III; 14 staff were deployed out 19 required staffing norm. This represents 73.2 % of filled positions.
3. Pabwo HC III; 16 staff were deployed out 19 required staffing norm. This represents 84.2 % of filled positions.
4. Cwero HC III; 17 staff were deployed out 19 required staffing norm. This represents 89.5 % of filled positions.
5. Patiko HC III; 14 staff were deployed out 19 required staffing norm. This represents 73.6 % of filled positions.
6. Labworomor HC III; 13 staff were deployed out 19 required staffing norm. This represents 68.4 % of filled positions.

Therefore 86.8% of health workers positions were filled which falls in the If "75% - 90%" category this scored 1.

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <p>• If 100 % score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>This indicator as per the LGPA 2020 manual reviews calls for Ref. HC II to HC III Upgrade. Gulu DLG had no such health infrastructure development.</p> <p>However, the following were implemented as per approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs</p> <p>1 Partial Construction of Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II - Unyama S/Cty – with the finished phase all set as per MoH design for OPD – with waiting Area (to have concrete benches), Examination room, etc; all wall exterior walls in 200mm thick bricks-sand Mortar, etc as physically viewed by the Assessor</p> <p>2 The Construction of a 4-Stance Drainable Latrine block at Patiko HC III - Patiko S/Cty - the block as per designs provided by the LG DE had indeed 4 stances for toilets and 2 others as a bathrooms. The access to the stances was ramped and an inspection cover was provided to allow for emptying.</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 information given by Gulu DLG on the position of health workers filled was not accurate as evidenced below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Angaya HC III had 14 deployed health workers as per staff list obtained from the DHO and 14 workers were found on facility list and attendance register. 2. Cwero HC III had 17 health workers deployed as per staff list obtained from the DHO. However, Lawoko William (Porter), Ajok Milly (Nursing Assistant), Akello merry Margret (Nursing assistant) were not found on the facility list and in the attendance register. The in-charge stated that these had been transferred earlier. 3. Punena HC II had 6 health workers deploy as per staff list obtained from the DHO and all the 6 health workers were found on facility list and in the attendance registers. 	0
5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The Assessment Team reviewed the list of constructed facilities from DHO's office which indicated the following; 1) Construction four stance VIP latrine at Patiko HCIII in Patiko Subcounty and 2) Construction of Standard OPD at Lapeta HCII phase 1 in Unyama Subcounty. The assessment team established that the information in 4th Quarter PBS report for 2019/2020 (Pages 86 and 87) submitted by CAO on 14/09/2020 rhymed with the list of upgraded and constructed facilities from DHO's office.</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>All the annual work plan and budget for sampled facilities (3) conformed to the prescribed formats as provided in the MOH Primary Health Care Non-Wage Recurrent Grant and Budget Guidelines to Health Centre II, III and IV, and General Hospitals. The details were as follows;</p> <p>Cwero HC III; Submitted it's AWP and Budget FY 2019/2020 to the DHO on 12th August, 2020; Labworomor HC II submitted its AWP and Budget FY 2019/2020 to the DHO on 26th August 2020 while Angaya HC III submitted its AWP and Budget to the DHO on 4th – August, 2020.</p> <p>However, although the facility work plans and budgets conformed to the prescribed formats, there was no evidence on file to confirm if the facilities made the submissions by 31 March of the FY 2019/2020.</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>Health facilities should have sent their Annual Budget Performance Reports for FY 2019/2020 to the DHO/CAO by 15th July 2020. However, there was no evidence of submission of annual budget performance reports by the health facilities</p>	0

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

• Score 2 or else 0

There was evidence to confirm that health facilities had developed and reported on the implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports. The assessment team randomly sampled PIPs for three (3) facilities and established the following;

1. Cwero HC III had submitted its Performance Improvement Plan for FY 2020/2021 to the DHO on 31st August 2020. The PIP among others prioritized procuring additional drugs using RBF from JMS to reduce the burden of stock outs for the essential medicines.
2. Angaya HC III had submitted its Performance Improvement Plan for FY 2020/2021 to the DHO on 7th August 2020. Included improvement of tracking of all mothers who attend ANC, counsel, track and follow them up to ensure completeness of 4th qtr. ANC.
3. Patiko HC III had submitted its Performance Improvement Plan for FY 2020/2021 to the DHO on 31st August 2020.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

• score 2 or else score 0

The health facilities in Gulu DLG did not submit 100% up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter). In addition, conclusions on this performance measure were drawn from partial sets of facility HIMIS reports because the bio-statistician failed to retrieve all the 12 sets and 4 quarterly facility reports for review by the assessment team.

1. Cwero HC III submitted the April report on 10th May 2020 and February report on 9th March 2020 and the quarterly HMIS reports for October-December 2019 on 15th January 2020, January-march on 16th April 2020 and April –June report on 12 July 2020.
2. Awach HC IV; timely submitted all the availed reports and quarterly monthly. For instance, the June report was submitted on 5th July 2020, April report was submitted on 5th May 2020 and January report on 6th February 2020.
3. Aywee HC III submitted the April report on 10th May 2020.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Gulu DLG just enrolled into the RBF in the FY 2019/2020 with Enabel - Belgian Development agency providing the support under the Enabel EHA project. There was no evidence to confirm if health facilities submitted their RBF invoices timely (By 15th of the month following end of the quarter). The DHO stated that the verified Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 invoices were submitted to the Enabel focal point person sometime in August 2020 to process quarterly releases to the health facilities. However, there was no evidence availed to confirm the timeliness of submission by the eight (8) participating health facilities.

In addition, the review of the fund's disbursement confirmation letter (REF 20/024/EHA /ADM) dated Monday, 14th September 2020 indicated that 8 facilities had received the RBF funds for Q3 AND Q4 FY 2019/20. This letter was endorsed by Dr IMI Monica – Intervention Manager- Health Program. The facilities included; Angaya HC III, Awach HC IV, Aywee HC III, Bardege HC III, Cwero HC III, Laroo HC III, Pabwo HC III and Patiko HC III.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

There was no documented evidence to confirm if GULU DLG had timely (By the end of 3rd week of the months following the end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH/Enabel facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities. However a review of the fund's disbursement confirmation letter (REF 20/024/EHA /ADM) dated Monday, 14th September 2020 indicated that 8 facilities had received the RBF funds for Q3 AND Q4 FY 2019/20 as per the validated invoices, For instance, in Quarter 4, Awach HC IV received 36,849,749/=, Cwero received 3,758,409 /= while Laroo HC III received 2,783,575/=.

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG compiled but did not submit all 4 quarterly Budget Performance Reports in time.</p> <p>They were submitted on the following dates;</p> <p>Q 1 - 10/12/2019</p> <p>Q 2 – 01/02/2020</p> <p>Q 3 – 25/05/2020</p> <p>Q 4 – 14/09/2020.</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to confirm that Gulu DLG developed an approved performance improvement plan for the weakest performing facilities in the FY 2020/2021. Among the 8 health facilities on RBF program, Laroo performed weakest by obtaining a score of 71.7%. According to the scores, it performed poorly on human resources, Health financing, Health information and health infrastructure. The DLG health department PIP planned for targeted support supervision of this facility as a measure aimed at improving its performance.</p>	1
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no specific Performance Improvement Plan reports to aid the establishment of whether the Gulu DLG implemented the Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing health facilities.</p>	0

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to confirm that Gulu DLG health department budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms. The approved staff structure obtained from DHO's office, indicates an approved structure of 272 health care workers. However the review of the approved performance contract for FY 2020/2021 Generated on 30/06/2020 11:28 Pg.15 revealed that PHC wage allocation for Gulu DLG district health department was: 2,387,542,000/= to cater for only the 224 staff in post. Therefore the local government did not budget for the health workers as per guidelines /in accordance with the staffing norms.</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Gulu DLG health department did not deploy health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms. The assessment team randomly sampled 3 health facilities and the findings were as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Angaya HC III: Had 14 deployed staff out of 19 required staff = 73.7% 2. Cwero HC III ; Had 17 deployed staff out of 19 required staff = 89.5% 3. Punena HC II: Had 6 deployed staff out of 9 required staff =66.6% <p>The DLG did not meet the requirements of the performance measure (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) hence score 0.</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 3 or else score 0</p>	<p>The assessment team reviewed the deployment list for FY 2020/2021 and compared it with the logs in the attendance book at the sampled health facilities, it was established that the two were not in agreement. The assessment team sampled three health facilities (Cwero HC III, Angaya HC III and Punena HC II) and established no variance between the deployment list obtained from DHO's and logs in the staff attendance books found at the health facilities as described below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Angaya HC III: 14 health workers deployed. Staff list found the facility was in agreement with the list obtained from the DHO's office 2. Cwero HC III: 17 health workers deployed. 2 Nursing assistants (Ajok Milly and Akello Merry Margaret) and 1 porter were not found at the facility although their names reflected on the deployment obtained from the DHO. 3. Punena HC II: 6 health workers deployed. Staff list found the facility was in agreement with the list obtained from the DHO's office 	0

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

The current list of health care workers for FY2020/2021 in each of the sampled health facilities; Cwero HC III, Angaya HC III, and Punena HC II was found pinned on the facility notice boards at the time of the assessment.

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

Gulu District has 1 HC IV, 4 HC IIIs and 16 HC IIs:

The Assessor reviewed personal files of Health Facility In-charges of HC IV, III, and some files for HC II to establish whether the DHO conducted Performance Appraisals for health facility In-charges. ***The Assessor established that all the Health Facility In-charges were not appraised by the DHO during the previous FY.*** Details were as indicated below:.

Awach HC IV: Dr. Chana Keneth: A Medical Officer and In-charge at Awach HC IV: There were no appraisal documents on file for FY 2019/2020 at the time of the assessment

1. **Patiko HC III: Komakech Dennis,** a Senior Clinical Officer and In-charge Patiko HC III: No appraisal documents were on file for FY 2019/2020

2. **Labworomoro HC III: Komira Moresco** a Senior Clinical Officer and In-charge Labworomoro HC III was not appraised by the DHO during FY 2019/2020.

3. **Pabwo HC III: Kiden Nancy Odong,** a Senior Clinical Officer and In-Charge at Pabwo HC III, was not appraised by the DHO for FY 2019/2020.

4. **Cwero HC III: Okong Bernard** a Senior Clinical Officer, and In-charge Cwero HC III: No appraisal documents for FY 20-19/2020 at the time of the assessment.

5. **Angaya HC III: Nyeko William,** a Senior Clinical Officer and In-charge Angaya HC III: No appraisal documents for FY 2019/2020 were on file at the time of the assessment.

Appraisals for HC II In-charges:

Out of the **16 Health Centres II** in Gulu district, the Assessor took a random sample of 5 personal files of health facility In-charges to establish whether they were appraised by the DHO. The Assessor confirmed that all the In-charges for HC II were not appraised during FY 2019/2020 as indicated in the examples below:

1. **Oroko HC II: Otim Richard Ajalia,** an Enrolled

Nurse and In-Charge at Oroko HC II was not appraised for FY 2019/2020.

2. **Pawel HC II: *Ochan Patrick***, an Enrolled Nurse and In-charge at Pawel HC II: No appraisal documents for FY 2019/2020 were on file at the time of the assessment.

3. **Lugore HC II: *Olanya Jacquie*** Grace, an Enrolled Nurse and In-charge at Lugore HC II: No appraisal documents for FY 2019/2020 were on file at the time of the assessment.

4. **Orayama HC II: *Ajok Jovana***, an Enrolled Nurse and In-Charge at Orayama HC II: No appraisal documents for FY 2019/2020 were on file at the time of the assessment.

5. **Lapeta HC II: *Ajok Bosco Andrew***, an Enrolled Nurse and In-Charge at Lapeta HC II: No appraisal documents for FY 2019/2020 were on file at the time of the assessment,

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>APPRAISAL OF HEALTH WORKERS</p> <p>There was no evidence presented to the assessor (in form of personal files) for review to establish whether the In-charges appraised the health workers under their jurisdiction. The PHRO strongly argued that there was no need to retrieve the files, well knowing that the In-charges did not appraise the health workers since in general terms, no health staff at all levels were appraised during the previous FY</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The DHO and the In-charges did not conduct Performance Appraisal exercises for the In-charges and the staff at the health facilities respectively. Accordingly, there was no evidence to be reviewed by the Assessor (in form of appraisal reports) to confirm whether corrective actions were taken based on the appraisal reports.</p>	0
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to confirm if Gulu DLG conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District. There was no training plan available in the DLG to be shared with the assessment team.</p>	0

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no documented training (CPD) activities and related database at the DHO's office.</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>Gulu DLG has a total of 23 health facilities receiving PHC NWR grant. The assessment team reviewed the Gulu DLG approved budget for FY 2020/2021 Generated on 29/06/2020 02:23; Pages 27 to 28. The assessment team established that the list of health facilities (GoU and PNFP facilities receiving PHC NWR grants) rhymes with the list the CAO submitted in the LG budget for FY 2020/2021. The letter from the CAO notifying the MOH in writing of the list of facilities accessing the PHC NWR Grants (GoU and PNFP that received PHC NWR grants) for the FY 2020/2021 was not required since none of the 23 (health facilities had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous on the list.</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG did not make the 15% 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).</p> <p>The amount spent on PHC NWR Grant was Shs.79,942,000 (page 6, Annual Budget Performance Report-2019/20). Amount spent on monitoring and service delivery was Shs15,135.000, (ABPR-2019/20-page-89), which was 19%.</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 LG timely warranted direct transfers to health facilities in accordance to the requirements.</p> <p>The warrants were made on the following dates;</p> <p>Q 1 -10/7/2019</p> <p>Q 2 -10/10/2019</p> <p>Q 3 -10/01/2020</p> <p>Q 4 -10/04/2020.</p>	2

9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of funds release in each quarter. The funds were invoiced within 5 working days from the date of release in each quarter.</p> <p>The amount released per quarter was as follows;</p> <p>Q 1- 29/7/2019- Shs.56,074,000</p> <p>Q 2- 21/10/2019- Shs.56,074,000</p> <p>Q 3 -26/01/2020-Shs.56,074,000</p> <p>Q 4 - 27/05/2020-Shs.56.077.532</p>	2
9	<p>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>A list of the quarterly financial releases (PHC non-wage recurrent releases) signed by the ag. DHO to all health facilities for all 4 quarters were displayed at the district health office notice-board. However, there was no evidence to confirm if the public display was made within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED hence the scored 0</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>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>One set of Quarterly DHMT review meetings for FY 2019/2020 held on 2nd October was shared with the assessment team. Review of this report showed that Gulu DLG implemented actions (S) recommended during this meeting. According to the minutes contained in the above quarterly review meetings report, there was a minute to have all midwives and health facility in charges reside with the facility. This was effected as evidenced by a letter seen on file at DHO's office instructing the midwife at Oroko HC II to occupy house that was previously occupied by Health assistant.</p> <p>There were no other no other DHMT quarterly performance review meetings minutes shared with the assessment team to confirm recommendation were implemented in other quarters thus justifying the score 0.</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>In the DHMT meeting held on 2nd October did not involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department. Review of the attendance list reflected 14 participants most of whom were from DHO's office including; ADHO- MCH, ADHO environment, senior health educator, Ass. Inventory management officer, Biostatistician among others.</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 PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>Gulu DLG had only one PNFP hospital (Lacor hospital) and one HC IV (Awach HC IV). During FY 2019/2020 the DHO supervised Lacor hospital and Awach HC IV at least once every quarter during FY 2019/2020. The supervision reports are contained in the 4 quarterly reports: Quarter one report dated 30th September 2019, Quarter two report dated 30th December 2019, Quarter three report dated 30th March, 2020, Quarter four report for supervision conducted on 18th -29th May 2020. Some of the findings included the following:</p> <p>HUMC members be displayed with their contacts, most staff found on at the facility in uniform, Facility work plans and budget present with supported partners, facilities maintained proper storage of medicine available among others.</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>Gulu DLG had 1 HSD located at Awach HC IV. There was evidence that DHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the FY 2019/2020. The assessment team randomly sampled three 3 facilities (Patiko HC III, PABWOR HC III and OROKO HC II) and the findings were as follows;</p> <p>Patiko HC III; Supervised by HSD on the following days; Quarter 1; 28th August 2019, Quarter 2; 19th December 2019; Quarter 3; 12th February 2020 and Quarter 4; 13th April 2020.</p> <p>Pabwor HC III; Supervised by HSD on the following days; Quarter 1; 13th August 2019, Quarter 2; 4th December 2019, 14th February 2020 and 16th April 2020.</p> <p>Oroko HC II: Supervised by HSD on the following days; Quarter 1; 16th August 2019, Quarter 2; 6th December 2019, Quarter 3; 18th February 2020 and Quarter 4; 22nd April, 2020.</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG Health department (DHO) had used the information contained in the supervision reports to take action and lobby support: For instance; At Patiko HC II, the DHT recommended to have additional staffs at the facility in response Odongo Lot (Enrolled Nurse) was brought in from Labworomor HC II, Anying Jane and Apiyo Susan (Enrolled midwives) were transferred to Patiko to fill the staffing gap. In addition disciplinary action to be taken on health workers that were perpetually absent.</p> <p>In addition, a review of the DHT minutes for a meeting held on 19th June 2020 under Min. 2/2 reflected that 50 community sensitization radio talk shows had held in the entire financial year.</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>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The GULU DLG conducted quarterly SPARS support supervision to all the facilities. There was evidence in the reports that recommendations were made to facility in charges on secure, safe storage and disposal of medicines and health supplies. In Q1 supervision was conducted between 24 August, 2019 and 30th August, 2019; Q2 supervision was done from 17th to 23rd December 2019.</p> <p>Q3 supervision was from 17th to 31st March 2020; while the Q4 supervision was carried out from 2nd to 4th June 2020.</p> <p>The support supervision visits also looked at prescribing quality, stock management, dispensing quality, among others.</p>	1
11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>LG did not allocate at least 30% of District Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities. The budget for health services less wages was Shs.1,013,868,000 (page, 15, ABPR). The amount allocated for promotion and prevention activities was Shs. 163,027,000 (page, 65, ABPR), which was 16%.</p>	0

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>During FY 2019/2020 Gulu DLG implemented the following Health Promotion, Disease prevention and Social mobilization activities:</p> <p>Conducted measles, rubella and polio sensitization activities held in Layibi division on 18th -21st October 2019. There was a report to confirm that was polio, measles and rubella vaccination activities in schools held on 25th -29th September 2019.</p> <p>Conducted community outreach focusing on family planning (Sayana press method) as evidenced by a report submitted on 16th June 2020.</p> <p>Using the VHTs, Gulu DLG conducted community sensitization on COVID 19 as evidenced by a report submitted to DHO on 15th May 2020.</p> <p>With support from UNICEF, Conducted community awareness sensitization about immunization via radio message. The messages ran on radio for five days (25th- 29th September 2019).</p>	1
----	---	--	---	---

11	<p>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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>Follow-up actions were taken by the DHMT on health promotion and disease prevention issues as reflected below:</p> <p>The 4th quarter DHMT meetings minutes under previous action point observed that current COVID 19 IEC materials were in place at the facilities. This was a follow to 3rd Quarter DHMT meeting where the chairperson reminded the DHE and health facility in-charges to ensure that all IEC materials were displaced in all corners of the health facilities.</p> <p>During the health coordination meeting held on 7th August 2019, the chairperson reminded members to make sure that the health workers attend taskforce meetings. The task force was formed to spur awareness and implementation of activities related to measles, Ebola, malaria and scabies outbreak.</p>	1
----	---	--	---	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Gulu DLG did not have an updated asset register. The register was not setting out the health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards as per the format annexed in the health facility budget and grant guidelines 2020/2021.</p>	0
----	--	--	--	---

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and (iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)): score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence of that the prioritized investments in the health sector were derived from the LG Development Plan, desk appraisal and eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source, development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant DDEG. These are on page 331 of the LG DP.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of 4 stance latrine at Patiko HCIII, Shs.21,621,000 (ABPR-2019/20.page 168) 2. Construction of Lapeta HCII, Shs.65,000,000 (ABPR, page 170). 3. Construction of 4 stance latrine at Kitinota P/S , Shs.13,553,893. 4. Construction of 2 stance latrine at Cwero market.Shs.9,578,780. 	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided no evidence that conducted field Appraisal to check for technical feasibility, environment and social acceptability, customized designs to site.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Screening was done and ESMPs prepared and costed for the following health projects;</p> <p>Construction of standard OPD at Lapeta HC II located in Unyama sub county impacts identified and mitigation measures addressed with recommendations signed by Senior environment officer and DCDO on 18th December 2019</p> <p>ESMP costed at UGX 650,000 signed by DCDO and senior environment officer on 4th April 2020</p> <p>Construction of 4 stances drainable latrine at OPD at Patiko HC III Patiko sub county REF GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/000023 signed by Senior environment officer and DCDO on 15th December 2019</p> <p>ESMP costed at UGX 450,000 signed by DCDO and senior environment officer on 4th April 2020</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Assessor did not see procurement input submissions from the Health Department to PDU by April 30th for all of its Infrastructure Procurement requests for the current FY.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>The LG Health Department submitted Procurement Requisition Forms – LG PP Form 1s to the PDU by the first Quarter of the current FY as per forms seen by the assessor signed by the Snr. Medical Officer (Originating Officer), and Approved by the DHO on the 3/8/2020, with confirmation of funding by CAO endorsed on 6/8/2020.</p> <p>A sample of the required projects included the following:</p> <p>1) Completion (Phase II) of Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II with Latrine and Incinerator - Unyama S/Cty - Estimated (budget amount) at UGX 70,000,000/=</p> <p>2) Construction of 1 Block of 4-Stance Drainable Latrine for OPD at Rwotobilo HC III - Bungatira S/Cty - Estimated (budget amount) at UGX 32,000,000/=</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Contracts Committee approved at its <i>4th meeting</i> held on 22/10/2020 - under Min No. GULU508/CC 04/2020-2021, among others the implementation of Health infrastructure investments/ projects for the current FY.</p> <p>The projects included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion (Phase II) of Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II with Incinerator - Unyama S/Cty - GULU508/WRKS/2020-2021/00003 	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>No documentary evidence for letters/memos of establishment/ designation of PITs for health Infrastructure Projects for the current FY</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The sampled projects included the following, and were Compliant as per approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs</p> <p>1) Partial Construction of Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II - Unyama S/Cty – with the finished phase all set as per MoH design for OPD – with waiting Area (to have concrete benches), Examination room, etc; all wall exterior walls in 200mm thick bricks-sand Mortar, etc</p> <p>2) Construction of a 4-Stance Drainable Latrine block at Patiko HC III - Patiko S/Cty - the block as per designs provided by the LG DE had indeed 4 stances for toilets and 2 others as a bathrooms. The access to the stances was ramped and an inspection cover was provided to allow for emptying.</p> <p>The above project sites were visited , and found to be up to Standard Technical Designs</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>Inspection and Status reports, for the Partial Construction of Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II in Unyama S/Cty, were seen from the designated CoW/Project Supervisor (Mr. Okello Fred – AEO). The report dated 2/6/2020 by the CoW to the D.E copied to the CAO, DHO, PDU etc was very elaborate with progressive pictorial evidence of the stages of construction</p> <p>The reports was indeed a consolidation of the daily/weekly records of site activities on site</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was NO documentary evidence of regular/monthly site meetings for the health infrastructure projects implemented in the last FY as NO minutes were seen by the Assessor.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>The LG Engineer's dept. /Project Supervisors (Mr. OKello F., and Lagen B. P – AEOs) carried out regular technical supervision as per the supervision reports for;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partial Construction of Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II in Unyama S/Cty, and • The Construction of a 4-Stance Drainable Latrine block for OPD at Patiko HC III in Patiko S/Cty. <p>However, there was NO record of regular participation by other relevant officers including the Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction.</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>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG provided evidence to the assessor shows that the DHO verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified time frames. There were also certificates of site hand over.</p> <p>The samples were;</p> <p>a. DIN Engineering Co. Ltd. Request on 10th June 2020. Certified for payment on 16/6/2020. Paid on 25th June 2020 by EFT No. 30515415, Shs.18,418,966.</p> <p>b. Full Dose Engineering Ltd. Request on 4th June 2020. Certified for payment on 4/6/2020. Paid on 25th June 2020 by EFT No. 30515368, Shs.61,145,148.</p> <p>The last payment was not within two weeks.</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>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Complete Procurement files for the health infrastructure contracts with <i>Evaluation Reports</i> and <i>Minutes of the Contract Committee</i>, and the very <i>Contract documents</i>.</p> <p>Files for the following projects were sampled accordingly;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partial Construction of Standard OPD at Lapeta HC II - Unyama S/Cty - GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00011, • Construction of 1 Block of 4-Stance Drainable Latrine for OPD at Patiko HC III - Patiko S/Cty - GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00023 	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no log of grievances neither investigated nor responded to in the health department at the time of assessment</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There we no new guidelines that were issued by the MoH in the FY 2019/2020 , however all the sampled health facilities had charts on segregation of medical waste displayed in the laboratories of the facility. The sampled facilities were Cwero HC III, Angaya HC III and Punena HC II.</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>There was evidence that the LG had in place a functional system for Medical waste management. The evidence available indicates that a registered waste management service provider (Green Label services Ltd) was providing the services to GULU DLG.</p> <p>There was also waste collections form dated 22nd January 2020 available on file. The assessment team established that the contract to provide the service was signed between USAID Rihites N Lango (Implementing partner supporting the activity) and service provider. The Gulu DLG health department failed to trace their copy during the assessment.</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>A report for a training that took place from 17th -22nd March 2020 titled training of health workers in WASH/waste management held at Little Palace Hotel was available on file. This report was submitted to the DHO on 12th March 2020. The target group of the training was 5 staff of the selected health facilities. Some of the key topics covered among others included; Heath care treatment and disposal, handling, storage and transport of health care waste and segregation of waste.</p>	1

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>ESMPs for health projects for the FY 2019/20 were incorporated in contract documents and BOQs seen for;</p> <p>Construction of 4 stances drainable latrine at OPD at Patiko HC III Patiko sub county REF GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00023 Contractor, DIN Engineering Company Ltd. contract Sum UGX 19,405,696 .environmental mitigation under Bill No 10.6 costed UGX 3,723,000 and included planting of trees for windbreaks example Teak, Mvule and Mahogany and appeared on page 5 of the BOQ</p> <p>Construction of 4 stances drainable latrine at standard OPD at Lapeta HC II, Unyama subcounty .Contractor, Full disc engineering. contract Sum UGX 65,000,000 .environmental mitigation under item 12 costed UGX 943,000 and included planting of trees for windbreaks example Teak, Mvule and Mahogany</p>	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>Documentation on land acquisition status such as a land title, Land agreement., Formal Consent or MoU for Health projects for the FY 2019/20 was not seen at the time of assessment</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was monitoring and engagement throughout the contract period by CDO and Environment Officer for health projects such as;</p> <p>Support supervision with compliance report on compliance on environmental and social requirements for district health infrastructural projects. Example, construction of OPD at Lapeta subcounty, construction of 1 block of 4 stances drainable latrine at Patiko HC III, signed by DCDO and Senior Environment officer on 25th June 2020.</p> <p>Issues discussed were use of PPEs across all projects, construction wastes properly to be disposed off, planting of trees to be done</p> <p>There were monthly compliance monitoring reports seen for August 2019. These were signed by the Senior environment officer and DCDO on 20th August 2019</p>	2

<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>There were Health contractor payment certificates but were not signed by the Environment Officer and CDO examples include;</p> <p>Construction of 1 block of 4 units teachers staff house at Bucoro PS certificate No 1 amount 102,922,786, contractor Alabama Crown Ltd .amount payable 90,403,147 dated 25th may 2020</p> <p>Construction Of 1 block of 4 stances drainable latrine for OPD at Patiko HC III.Certificate No 1 amount 19,405,696, contractor Alabama Crown Ltd .amount payable 17,646,027 dated 8th June 2020 signed by project supervisor ,DEng,DHO and CAO on 17th June 2020</p> <p>Partial construction of standard OPD at Lapeta HC II in Pakwelo parish, Unyama subcounty.Certificate No 1 amount 65,000,000 contractor Full Disc Engineering Ltd .amount payable 57,527,756 dated 4th June 2020 signed by contractor,DEng,DHO and CAO on 10th June 2020.</p> <p>Certificate of environmental restoration for Construction of health projects were not issued since contractor did not comply with environmental and social safeguards</p>
--	---	---

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. % of rural water sources that are functional. If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is: o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	The MIS records for Gulu DLG at the beginning of the current year, FY 2020/21, indicated that the functionality of rural water sources was 78%.	0
1	Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is: o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0	MIS records at the beginning of the current year, FY 2020/21, indicated that Gulu DLG had 247 functional WSCs out of the established 309 WSCs for water sources. This translates to $(247/309) \times 100 = 92.3\%$ functionality of WSCs.	2
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0 (Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)	At the time of assessment, there had been no prior LLG performance assessments.	0
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment <i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Records indicated that 83.3% of the budgeted water projects were implemented in sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the FY 2019/20. Gulu DLG MIS records, at the beginning of the FY 2019/20, indicated that the average rural access to safe water was 93%.	1

measure

o If 80-99%: Score 1

o If below 80 %: Score 0

The same records indicated that the safe water coverage of each of the sub-counties in rural Gulu District were as follows:

- Awach: 95%
- Bungatira: 91%
- Paicho: 89%
- Palaro: 95%
- Patiko: 95%
- Unyama: 95%

Therefore two sub-counties, *Bungatira and Paicho*, B had safe water coverage below the rural district average of 93% at the beginning of FY 2019/20.

The Annual Work Plan FY 2019/20 indicated under water development projects planned as indicated below:

I. Drilling of 15 deep boreholes, each budgeted for UGX 24,250,000, hence total budget was UGX 363,750,000/- in the following sub-counties (DWSCG)

Awach S/C

1. Otum pili village
2. Lalaro Village
3. Lacede Village

Bungatira S/C (two boreholes)

4. Loyolero Village
5. Ogoto Village

Palaro S/C

6. Palaro Senior Secondary

Patiko S/C

7. Purundi village
8. Pamin Lumiri Village

Paicho S/C (three boreholes)

9. Boke B Village
10. Laywee Oket Village
11. Lapuda Village

Unyama S/C

12. Kwot Ki Tong Village
13. Kutbwobo Village
14. Wang Nen B Village

15. Oguru B Village

II. Designs of Piped water Supply in Cwero in Paicho S/C for UGX 51,500,000 under DWSCG

The Annual Sector Performance report dated 7th July 2020 indicated that all the borehole projects were completed as planned while the designs for water supply scheme were not conducted. Therefore, this translates to five projects implemented in Bubgatira and Paicho S/C out of the planned six for both sub-counties, or:

[5 projects out of 6 projects] = 83.3%

It was noted that another borehole was constructed at Paicho S/C headquarters under the LLG funds. However, this project was not considered in the computation above because it was not included in the AWP and Budget of FY 2019/20.

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

*Maximum 8 points on
this performance
measure*

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

o If within +/-20% score 2

o If not score 0

The projects implemented in FY 2019/20 did
not indicate contract variations exceeding +/-
20%.

The AWP and Budget for the FY 2019/20
indicated that two projects were planned
under water supply and sanitation
development and they were implemented as
follows:

Drilling of 15 deep boreholes; each
budgeted for UGX 24,250,000/-, hence total
budget was UGX 363,750,000/- under
DWSCG.

However, during implementation, the
Construction of 15 boreholes was further sub-
divided into two projects Lot I and Lot II
according to contract documents and the
Annual Sector Performance report FY
2019/20 namely:

- Deep borehole drilling and construction for
10 boreholes_ LOT 1 by the Contractor, M/s
Brottos Uganda Ltd for UGX 198,640,000/-
- Deep borehole drilling and construction for
6 boreholes_ LOT 2, by the Contractor, M/s
Icon Projects Ltd for UGX 116, 249,904/-

Total cost of implementing the boreholes was
UGX 314,889,904/-

**Designs of Piped water Supply in Cwero in
Paicho S/C** for UGX 51,500,000 under
DWSCG. However, these works were not
implemented during the financial year.

Therefore, the contract amounts varied from
the budget amounts was as follows:

Project	Variation Amount % Variation
Borehole Drilling	-UGX 48,860,096 -13.4%

2	<p>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <p>o If 100% projects completed: score 2</p> <p>o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1</p> <p>o If projects completed are below 80%: 0</p>	<p>93.7% of the WSS development projects which were planned were fully implemented in FY2019/20.</p> <p>According to the AWP and Budget of FY 2019/20, sixteen projects were planned under WSS development projects namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drilling of 15 deep boreholes; for a total budget of UGX 363,750,000/- under DWSCG • Designs of Piped water Supply in Cwero, Paicho S/C for UGX 51,500,000 under DWSCG. <p>According to the Annual Sector Performance report for the FY 2019/20 dated 7th July 2020, indicated that all the fifteen boreholes were constructed and completed fully during the FY 2019/20, including an extra sixteenth borehole; while the project for piped water designs was not implemented.</p> <p>This translates [15 projects out of 16 projects] = 93.7% of the projects were implemented.</p>	1
3	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <p>o If there is an increase: score 2</p> <p>o If no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>There was an increase of 1% in functionality of rural water sources in Gulu DLG between FY 2018/19 and FY 2019/20.</p> <p>The MIS records ending FY 2018/19 indicated that functionality of rural water supply facilities in Gulu DLG was 77%.</p> <p>The MIS records ending FY 2019/20 indicated that functionality of rural water supply facilities in Gulu DLG increased to 78%</p>	2
3	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <p>o If increase is more than 5%: score 2</p> <p>o If increase is between 0-5%: score 1</p> <p>o If there is no increase: score 0.</p>	<p>There was an increase of 1.3% in functionality of WSCs in Gulu DLG between FY 2018/19 and FY 2019/20.</p> <p>The MIS records ending FY 2018/19 indicated the functionality of 224 WSCs out of 285 WSCs established in Gulu district. This translated into a functionality of 78.6% for the FY 2018/19.</p> <p>The MIS records ending FY 2019/20 indicated the functionality of 247 WSCs out of 309 WSCs which had been established in Gulu district. This translated into a functionality of 79.9% for the FY 2019/20.</p>	1

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

Annual Sector Performance Report FY2019/20 dated 7th July 2020 indicated the following completed projects under WSS development projects:

- Deep borehole drilling and construction for 10 boreholes_ LOT 1 by the Contractor, M/s Brottos Uganda Ltd for UGX 198,640,000/-
- Deep borehole drilling and construction for 6 boreholes_ LOT 2, by the Contractor, M/s Icon Projects Ltd for UGX 116, 249,904/-

The Watsup Update report dated 10th July 2020 also included the form ones (F1s) of the borehole sites which had been r constructed during the FY 2019/20.

Two of three sampled WSS sites visited confirmed the existence of the projects, fully constructed and functional as reported namely:

Ayach BH (Bungatira S/C)

Labeled DWD

Completed: 24 February 2020

Laywee Oket BH (PaichoS/C)

Labeled DWD 69708

However, the third site mentioned below was constructed and completed, and appeared like it had worked before; but on the day of assessment it was found dysfunctional, reportedly having a mechanical breakdown since two weeks prior to the assessment.

Ogul BH (Unyama S/C)

Labeled DWD 69709

Completed:

Contractor: Icon Projects Ltd

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

There was insufficient evidence of **quarterly compilations** of sub-county water supply and sanitation facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage hygiene, and community involvement. The main reason for this was that information from monitoring of water sources was not compiled quarterly, but done once during the fourth quarter of the FY 2019/20. The quarterly reports indicated the following information.

• **Quarter 1 report dated 3rd October 2019:** Indicated that sanitation statistics at the close of FY 2018/19 and water coverage of 71.92% for rural Gulu and functionality of 82% for water sources

• **Quarter 2 report dated 11th January 2019:** indicated the same statistics as the previous quarter for safe water coverage and functionality, as well as activities under sanitation improvement campaigns and statistics in the sector.

• **Quarter 3 report dated 8th April 2020:** indicated the same statistics as the previous quarter for safe water coverage and functionality, as well as activities under sanitation improvement campaigns and statistics in the sector.

• **Quarter 4 report dated 7th July 2020:** Provided information about the completed projects including 16 boreholes constructed, 48 boreholes rehabilitated. The report indicated a situational analysis of water sector as of June 2020 and F1s were prepared for recently constructed boreholes, while F4s were prepared for monitoring exercises conducted on existing water sources during the quarter. A soft ware report indicated CLTS and sanitation out-reach activities conducted during the quarter in various sub-counties.

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

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence provided to the assessors of District Water Office MIS in which quarterly updates on new facilities, population served and functionality etc were made.

However, information on WSS facilities was collected during monitoring exercises on the Form 4s and Form 1s, once during quarter four of FY 2019/20.

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>At the time of assessment, there had been no prior LLG performance assessments</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>The Assessor reviewed the approved and costed staff list and established that the critical staff in the District Water Office were duly included on the list. In addition the Assessor, reviewed the approved performance Contract for 2020/2021; generated on 30th June 2020 at 11.28 am and confirmed that the critical staff in the District Water Office were duly budgeted for as evidence by the budget provision for salaries/wages indicated on page 18 of the approved performance contract.</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 Assessor reviewed the approved and costed staff list and established that the critical staff in the District Natural Resources Office were duly included on the list. In addition the Assessor, reviewed the approved Performance Contract for 2020/2021; generated on 30th June 2020 at 11.28 am and confirmed that the critical staff in the Natural Resources Office were duly budgeted for as evidence by the budget provision for salaries/wages indicated on page 20 of the approved performance contract.</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>A review of the personal files of staff of the District Water Office indicated that there were no performance appraisal documents on file for FY 2019/2020.</p>	0

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

At the time of assessment, no record of capacity needs assessment or training plan, or training reports pertaining to training and capacity needs of the DW office for the FY 2019/20 was made available to the assessors.

It was reported that while annual appraisals were conducted for the district water office staff, a comprehensive capacity needs assessment report was not synthesized and forwarded to HR department.

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

The budget allocation for water development to the sub-counties with safe water coverage below district average was 31.1% for the FY 2020/21.

Gulu DLG MIS records, at the beginning of the FY 2020/21, indicated that the average rural access to safe water was 93%.

The same records indicated that the safe water coverage of each of the sub-counties in rural Gulu District were as follows:

- Awach: 95%
- Bungatira: 91%
- Paicho: 92%
- Palaro: 95%
- Patiko: 95%
- Unyama: 95%

Therefore two sub-counties, *Bungatira and Paicho*, had safe water coverage below the district average at the beginning of FY 2020/21.

The AWP and Budget for the FY 2020/21 planned for water supply development as follows in the different sub-counties.

1. Boreholes for Construction: (UGX 688,500,000)

Awach S/C:

- Paromo (Dog-Abera): 22,500,000 DWSCG
- Lacwene: 22,500,000 DWSCG
- Yaya, Lacede and Bunga: 77,250,000/- (External Financing) , each 25,750,000/-

Bungatira S/C

- Oitino: 22,500,000 DWSCG
- Kulukeno: 22,500,000 DWSCG
- Katikai B, Agonga & Lukodi: 77,250,000/- (External Financing), each 25,750,000/-

Palaro S/C

- Oroko (Tecal): 22,500,000 DWSCG
- Lupe, Ocetoke & Mede: 77,250,000 (External Financing), each 25,750,000/-

Patiko S/C

- Adak: 22,500,000 DWSCG
- Balkomi, Adak Central & Penywii: 77,250,000 (External Financing) , each 25,750,000/-

Paicho S/C

- Barolemo: 22,500,000 DWSCG
- Ogwari: 22,500,000 DWSCG
- Apem, Pakwac and Pagik dog nam: 77,250,000 (External Financing), each 25,750,000/-

Unyama S/C

- Tepwoyo: 22,500,000/- DWSCG
- Akonyobedo A: 22,500,000/- DWSCG
- Ngomrom, Coopil Can Coya & Ajuku B: 77,250,000/- (External Financing) , each 25,750,000/-

2. Engineering, Design Studies & Plans for Capital works: 51,500,000 DWSCG

3. Construction works at Awach T/C, Awach S/C: 47,000,000 DWSCG

Total Budget for water development in rural Gulu District was therefore UGX 787,000,000/- of which UGX 244,500,000/- for ten boreholes budgeted for Bungatira and Paicho S/Cs.

This translates to a percentage budget allocation of :

$$[244,500,000 / 787,000,000] \times 100 = 31.1\%$$

It was noted that the budget for water development was to be funded by DWSCG and external financing. Two MoUs with development partners were reviewed pertaining to planned activities in FY 2020/21, namely:

- The MoU signed between PACCHEDO and Gulu DLG on 15th July 2020 indicated that

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>PACCEDO would construct one deep borehole, protect one spring, conduct WSC training and conduct training of youth groups in hand-pump and borehole repair and maintenance.</p> <p>• The MoU signed between CO2 (UK) and Gulu on 28th September 2020 indicated that CO2 would be involved mainly in software activities such as monitoring boreholes and training WSCs.</p> <p>There was no evidence of dissemination of budget allocations per source to respective LLGs for the current year FY 2020/21 in Advocacy meetings and notices on notice boards.</p> <p>It was reported that warranting of funds by the Finance and Planning department for the FY 2020/21 was done late and this affected the implementation of activities such as Advocacy meetings and dissemination of information about priority projects and budget allocations for the FY 2020/21 at LLGs through notices.</p> <p>Therefore, at the time of assessment, the DWO had not communicated to LLGs the budget allocations for projects for the FY 2020/21.</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>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4 • If 80-99% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2 • If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: Score 0 	<p>There was insufficient evidence of monitoring all 669 water sources at least once quarterly during the FY 2019/20.</p> <p>The form four slips (F4s) which were used to collect monitoring information indicated that the water sources were monitored once, during the fourth quarter of the FY 2019/20</p> <p>Quarter 4 report dated 7th July 2020: Provided information about the completed projects including 16 boreholes constructed, 48 boreholes rehabilitated. F1s were prepared for recently constructed boreholes, while F4s were prepared for monitoring exercises conducted on existing water sources during the fourth quarter.</p> <p>The district monitoring plan for the FY 2019/20 was not made available to the assessors for review during assessment.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key</p>	<p>The records provided indicated that four quarterly DWSCC meetings were held during the FY 2019/20 as follows:</p>	2

facilities and provided follow up support.

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP.
Score 2

DWSCC meeting held on 19 September 2020

Key issues discussed included:

- Aid Africa was to share specific locations for planned water points with DWO, while Fitchner Gopa was to share their strategy document on Gulu Municipal Council Water Supply Protection
- ADHO and ADWO (Sanitation and Mobilization) were to engage USHA and World Vision to harmonize interventions in Paicho Sub County.
- DPs and CSOs were encouraged to share their annual work plans with the DWO through CAO.
- World Vision, USHA, Aid Africa, PACHEDO, Water Access Consulting presented highlights of their work plans and progress made.

DWSCC meeting held 20th December 2019 :

Key issues discussed included:

- PACCHEDO planned to support district sensitization events,
- World Vision conducted CLTS, where Anganya was declared ODF and sub-county water boards were given training.
- Aid Africa had planned to drill 8 shallow wells, 8 boreholes and 20 protection springs
- Water Access Consult drilled 6 boreholes, conducted 3 water quality and well functionality tests. They planned to conduct ground water exploration for 24 sites, support world water day and help to collect data on sanitation marketing systems.
- The meeting called for continual sector coordination among stakeholders

DWSCC meeting held on 9 March 2020

The key discussion of the meeting was the planned sanitation week, with a proposed budget of UGX 10, 616,000/-, there was a tentative schedule of activities. The meeting agreed to engage sector partners and community leaders to be involved.

DWSCC meeting held on 28th June 2020

The key discussions included

- Project implementing partners were called on to include COVID-19 prevention activities

- The meeting noted the need to co-ordinate development partners in the sector and keep them informed about all activities going on
- Partners were called to provide detailed works plans to the DWO through CAO and have updated files

The DWSCC meetings had limited discussions on the findings from monitoring exercises of WSS facilities because they were conducted once, in the fourth quarter of FY 2019/20

9

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

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

0

There was no evidence of dissemination of budget allocations per source to respective LLGs for the current year FY 2020/21 through notices on notice boards.

It was reported that warranting of funds by the Finance and Planning department for the FY 2020/21 was done late and this has affected the implementation of activities such as Advocacy meetings and dissemination of information about priority projects and budget allocations for the FY 2020/21 to LLGs through notices.

Therefore, by the time of assessment, the DWO had not yet publicized budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs.

Mobilization for WSS is conducted

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:

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

The budget for mobilization activities was 6.62% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget for the FY 2019/20.

According to the AWP and Budget of FY 2019/20, under the DWSCG, the Non Wage Recurrent (NWR) budget was UGX 200,441,000/- of which the community mobilization activities were planned under **Promotion of Community Based Management**, including the following expenses:

Allowances: UGX 3,279,000

Welfare and Entertainment: UGX 2,565,000

Printing, Stationery, Photocopying: UGX 777,000

Travel Inland: UGX 2,889,000

Fuel, Lubes, Oils: UGX 3,760,000

Total: UGX 13,270,000 /-

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.

Soft ware report dated 10th July 2020, indicated that 15 WSCs were trained during the FY 2019/20, conducted by ADWO and CDO.

The WSCs were trained on the roles and responsibilities of WSCs, Composition of WSCs, COVID19- WASH response, transmission of fecal diseases, safe water chain and gender task analysis, etc. The report also included the composition of the fifteen trained WSCs. and photographs of the training.

The three sampled WSS facilities with WSCs were as follows:

Ayach BH (Bungatira S/C)

One member of the community, found at the borehole was interviewed, as members of the WSC were not easily accessible on the day of assessment. The interview revealed that each household served by the borehole contributed 1,000/- per month and these funds were collected to cover O&M expenses. The borehole was found in good working condition and the area around it was well kept.

Laywee Oket BH (Paicho S/C)

Mr. Komaketch Michael, the caretaker was interviewed by the assessor. The caretaker collected 1,000/- per household per month which contributed to O&M. Funds were given to the treasurer, who kept them until there was need to carry out repairs. The water source was protected, in good working condition and the area around it was clean, which was an indication of good O&M practice.

Ogul BH (Unyama S/C)

One member of the community led the assessment team to the borehole, which was found dysfunctional. It was reportedly out of service since two weeks prior. The caretaker and members of WSCs were not easily available at the time of assessment. However, the community member informed the assessment team that the WSCs had communicated to the community and asked them to contribute to funds for repairs. Funds had been collected earlier in the year, but with COVID-19 restrictions, many households did not meet their obligations of 1,000 per household per month. As such the WSC had less funds than required to repair the hand pump of the borehole.

Investment Management

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>At the time of assessment, no WSS asset register was made available to the assessors for review.</p> <p>The DWO reported that they used the MWE MIS for their data base usually found in the F4s as the inventory record for the water facilities in the district.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG DWO has conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines (prioritize investments for sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average and rehabilitation of non-functional facilities) and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If desk appraisal was conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP and are eligible:</p> <p>Score 4 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed to the assessor that the LG DWO conducted a desk appraisal for WSS projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding.</p>	0

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2

For the FY 2020/21, out of 28 planned borehole sites, five had community application files which were reviewed by the assessors, while the files for the remaining 23 sites were not made available to the assessors for review.

Examples of projects which had no community files available to assessors include:

Awach S/C:

- Paromo (Dog-Abera), Lacwene, Yaya, Lacede and Bunga

Bungatira S/C

- Oitino, Kulukeno, Katikai B, Agonga and Lukodi

Palaro S/C

- Oroko (Tecal), Lupe, Ocetoke and Mede

Patiko S/C

- Adak, Balkomi, Adak Central and Penywii

Unyama S/C

- Tepwoyo, Akonyobedo ANgomrom, Coopil Can Coya and Ajuku B

According to the AWP FY 2020/21, 28 boreholes were planned for development. The following community application letters were made available to assessors for review including:

Patiko S/C:

- Awornyim Village, Pugwinyi Parish: 9 Oct 2020
- Abucwinye Omoti Village, Kal Parish: 14 Jan 2019

Paicho S/C

- Te-Olam Village, Kal Ali Parish: 26 March 2019
- Boke B sub Village, Onel A village: 22 March 2020

Bungatira S/C

- Ayac Village: 21 April 2020

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 provided to the assessor that the LG conducted field appraisal to check for technical feasibility, environmental social acceptability and customized designs for WSS projects.</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>Screening was conducted for all WSS projects, costed ESMPs prepared and the proposed mitigations measures were put in place for projects implemented in FY 2019/20.</p> <p>Drilling installation and casting of Borehole Paicho sub county, signed by Environment officer and CDO on 20th March 2020</p> <p>Drilling installation and casting of Borehole in Tee Olam community in Awach sub county signed by Environment officer and CDO on 26th March 2020</p> <p>Drilling installation and casting of Borehole in Palaro seed school borehole, Palaro sub county,. signed by Environment officer and CDO on 3rd March 2020</p> <p>ESMP for drilling of 15 boreholes to be implemented during the drilling and construction phases costed UGX 6,300,000 and was signed on 4th April 2020 by DCDO and senior environment officer</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>As per the Approved Budget Estimates, the following projects among others were incorporated in the AWP and Procurement Plans for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drilling of Boreholes (8N0.); Site Identification, Well development, Test pumping and carrying out water quality Analysis, Apron Casting and hand pump Installation in different sub counties Lot 3; Budgeted for UGX 152,691,322/= • Drilling of Boreholes (7N0.); Site Identification, Well development, Test pumping and carrying out water quality Analysis, Apron Casting and hand pump Installation in different sub counties Lot 4; Budgeted for UGX 143,602,890/= 	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>The water supply and public sanitation infrastructure Projects for the Previous FY were approved before commencement of Works. These Included, among others</p> <p>1. Deep Boreholes (10N0.) Construction, Site Identification, Drilling, Well development, Test pumping and carrying out water quality Analysis, Apron Casting and hand pump Installation - Lot 1 - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00014</i>;</p> <p>2. Deep Boreholes (6N0.) Construction, Site Identification, Drilling, Well development, Test pumping and carrying out water quality Analysis, Apron Casting and hand pump Installation - Lot 2 - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00015</i></p> <p>The above projects were approved by the Contracts Committee meeting held on <i>22/11/2019</i> - under Min No. GDLG 05/CC 04/2019-2020</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>Joint appointments of only the DWO (Nyeko Samuel) and AEO (Opwonya E. Mark), and also that of DWO Nyeko Samuel) and AEO (Lagen P. Byron– dated 21/1/2020, by the CAO as the Project Supervisors for Lot 1 - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00014</i>, and Lot 2 - <i>GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00015</i> respectively were seen by the Assessor.</p> <p>However, No proper establishment of Project Implementation Team by the DWO/CAO were seen by the Assessor</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>According to the technical specifications, the borehole pedestal had to be installed with a stainless steel hand pump identical to the stand. In addition, the area around the borehole was had to have a circular concrete platform of diameter 1700mm with a waste water drain of about 150mm wide with 2% slope channeling water away from the borehole.</p> <p>The above specifications were fully met in the three sampled boreholes visited at Ayach BH (Bungatira S/C) , Laywee Oket BH (Paicho S/C) and Ogul BH (Unyama S/C)</p>	2

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

The DWO carried out regular technical supervision as per the supervision reports along with the LG AEOs. Supervision Drilling reports by the designated Supervisors (DWO and the AEOs) dated 21/2/2020 and 5/6/2020. Contract Management Plans for both projects were also seen

However, Only the DE/DWO and/or his representative (AEO - CoW) were present during the supervision of works (drilling, etc); there was **no** proper documentary evidence in regards to **presence of the other relevant technical officers** like Environmental Officer and the DCDO during supervision of WSS infrastructure projects.

The sampled projects included

- Deep Boreholes (10N0.) Construction, Site Identification, Drilling, Well development, Test pumping and carrying out water quality Analysis, Apron Casting and hand pump Installation - **Lot 1** - GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00014;
- Deep Boreholes (6N0.) Construction, Site Identification, Drilling, Well development, Test pumping and carrying out water quality Analysis, Apron Casting and hand pump Installation - **Lot 2** - GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00015

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

The assessor reviewed and sampled contracts, there is evidence that the District Water Officer and verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts. Among those paid in time were;

a. Icon Projects LLtd.-GULU508/Wrks/2019-20/00015. Request on 27/1/2020. Crtifed on 18/2/2020. Paid on 27th March 2020 by EFT. No.28793003, Shs.92,031,174.

b. Reliefline (Uganda) Ltd.-Request 19/2/2020. Certified on 26/2/2020. Paid on 8th April 2020, by EFT No. 28864144, Shs.95,790,088.

c. Brottos Uganda Ilimited-GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00014. Request 28/5/2020. Certified on 6/6/2020. Paid on 25/6/2020 by EFT No. 30515471, Shs.102,270,719.

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Score 2, If not score 0

Complete Procurement files for all water infrastructure investments are in place with Evaluation Reports and Minutes of the Contract Committee, and the very contract documents

For example; Deep Boreholes (6N0.) Construction, Site Identification, Drilling, Well development, Test pumping and carrying out water quality Analysis, Apron Casting and hand pump Installation - Lot 2 -

GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00015; approved under Min No.. **GDLG 05/CC 04/2019-2020** of the Contracts Committee sitting held on 22/11/2019 after thorough evaluation

The contract document was signed on 11th December 2019 with a Contract price of **UGX 116,249,904/=** awarded to **M/S Icon Projects Ltd**

Environment and Social Requirements

13

0

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

There was no Grievances Redress Committee appropriately recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on all water and environment related grievances

The officer in charge noted that there has not been any form of reporting or grievances

14

0

Safeguards for service delivery

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:

Score 3, If not score 0

There was water source and catchment protection and natural resource management guidelines seen for example;

There was a report following training of water source committees for 15 boreholes drilled in FY 2019/20 signed by the health inspector/assistant water sanitation dated and stamped 10th July 2020

Achievements in the report were; action plan developed to protect and sustain boreholes in the 15 sub counties such as Palaro SS, Olaro community in Agung, wang nen 'B' borehole in Unyama, Laywee oket Lalworo community, Pamin Lumin Olaro community, and Otumpuli community in Latwong. Action plan developed after training with communities to protect and sustain water sources.

However there was no evidence that the natural resource management guidelines listed above were disseminated to CDOs

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>Water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for WSS infrastructure projects constructed during the previous FY were not seen during assessment</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>There was evidence of proof of ownership of land through land agreements for eight out of sixteen projects which were implemented in FY 2019/20.</p> <p>According to Annual Sector Performance report FY 2019/20, sixteen boreholes were constructed in Gulu DLG as follows:</p> <p>Awach S/C</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Otum pili village 2. Lalaro Village 3. Lacede Village <p>Bungatira S/C</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Loyolero Village 5. Ogoto Village <p>Palaro S/C</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Palaro Senior Secondary <p>Patiko S/C</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Purundi village 8. Pamin Lumiri Village <p>Paicho S/C</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Boke B Village 10. Laywee Oket Village 11. Lapuda Village 12. Paicho S/C Headquarters <p>Unyama S/C</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. Kwot Ki Tong Village 14. Kutbwobo Village 15. Wang Nen B Village 16. Oguru B Village <p>Proof ownership in the form of land agreements was made available to the assessors for review for eight of the borehole projects as follows:</p>	0

Awach S/C

Ojok Santo of Otumpili Village, Awach S/C agreed on 13th February 2020 to provide a piece of land for a borehole. The agreement was witnessed by LC1 Oyite David.

Bungatira S/C

Okwonga Galdinus of Ayac Village, Bungatira S/C agreed on 21st April 2020 to provide a piece of land for a borehole. The agreement was witnessed by LC1 Otto Dennis and by DWO

Odoki John of Cet Kana Village, Bungatira S/C agreed on 21st April 2020 to provide a piece of land for a borehole. The agreement was witnessed by LC1 Ottema James.

Patiko S/C

Allana Jino of Lakago sub Village, Anoonyim Village, Patiko S/C agreed on 13th February 2020 to provided a piece of land for a borehole. The agreement was witnessed by LC1, Komakech Richard, and 3 other members of community.

Ojok Wilson Mogi of Adak A sub Village, Adak Village, Patiko S/C agreed on 13th February 2020 to provided a piece of land for a borehole. The agreement was witnessed by LC1, Opira Richard Yala, and 7 other members of community.

Paicho S/C

Family of Laywee Oket BH of Lalworo Village, Paicho S/C agreed on 3rd March 2020 to provide a piece of land for a borehole. The agreement was witnessed by LC1, Olum Michael, and 7 other members of the community.

Kidega Michael of Lapuda 'A' sub Village, Lakwela Village, Paicho S/C agreed on 4th February 2020 to provide a piece of land for a borehole. The agreement was witnessed by LC1, Okello Bosco.

Reonelda Angeyo of Lalworo Village, Paicho S/C agreed on 4th February 2020 to provide a piece of land for a borehole. The agreement was witnessed by LC1, Olum Michael, and 4 other members of the community.

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>Evidence that showed E&S Certification forms were completed and signed by the Environmental Officer, Ms. Atto Francisca Kisembo, the District Engineer Nyeko Samuel and CDO Ms. Gorreti Akech prior to payments of contractor invoices and certificates at interim and final stages of projects. They were signed on 26th June 2020. The assessor was only availed certificates of only 2 projects out of 3 and were as follows;</p> <p>a. Wan Ayee Co. Ltd.- Gulu508/Wrks/2019-20/00002.</p> <p>b. Albama Co. LTD. Gulu508/Wrks/2019-20/00001.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The CDO and Environment Officers undertook monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs example</p> <p>The ESMP for drilling and sitting of Boreholes was costed at UGX 6,300,000 for all boreholes in Laywee Oket Lalworo community, Oguru 'B' community, Agung Katbwobo community and Lucede community in Oguru sub counties.</p> <p>In the environment compliance monitoring report and monthly report for August signed on 20th August 2019 by DCDO and senior environment officer.compliance issues were; all sites to be fenced off, water source committees formed and tress planted on all water points</p>	2

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land Maximum score 4 Maximum 20 points for this performance area	a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts	0
1	Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land Maximum score 4 Maximum 20 points for this performance area	b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one: • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0	Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts	0
2	Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is: • Above 70%; score 4 • 60 – 69%; score 2 • Below 60%; score 0 Maximum score 4	Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	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	Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts	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 because Gulu is not among the pilot districts</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 because Gulu is not among the pilot districts</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 because Gulu is not among the pilot districts</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 Staffing structure for the extension department is such that each subcounty is supposed to have Agricultural Officer, Assistant Agricultural Officer, Fisheries officer, Assistant Fisheries development Officer, Veterinary Officer, Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer and Assistant Entomology Officer.</p> <p>Accordingly, for the 7 LLGs, the total number of extension staff should be 49 out of which only 15 are in post as per the staff list. thus the staffing level is at 38.5%.</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 	Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts	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 	Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts	0
---	--	---	--	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Three LLGs of Bungatira, Paicho and Unyama sub-counties were sampled. In Paicho and Bungatira, the staff on the list at the district were found on the LLG staff lists. The following is the summary;</p> <p>(1) Bugatira LLG had Oloya Patrick as Agriculture Officer, Lawach Julian as Veterinary Officer, Otim Thomas as assistant Entomology Officer whereas Olanya Bosco Odoch (entomological attendant) was neither on the staff list nor in the staff attendance book.</p> <p>(2) Paicho Extension staff were as reflected on the staff list.</p> <p>(3) Unyama S/C was not assessed because there was no sub-county staff at station.</p>	0
5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts	0

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts</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>Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts</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>Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts</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>No PIP was availed for the assessment.</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>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>No PIP implementation reports was availed for the assessment.</p>	0
---	---	---	--	---

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>The 2020/2021 performance contract for Gulu district (page 6) shows that the DLG budgeted UGX1,560,366,000 towards Agricultural extension services. However, the Performance contract does not give a detailed breakdown of the budget in terms of recruitment and deployment of extension staff staff.</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG has not deployed Extension workers as per guidelines. According to the staff list availed, there are gaps in the extension department for example one Assistant entomology officer was shared among the three LLGs of Bungatira, Patiko and Palaro.</p>	0
7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>For 2 of the three Sampled LLGs (Bungatira, Paicho), the staff List of extension staff is consistent with that at district level, and they signed in the attendance book whenever they were at subcounty, otherwise they are most times field-based. One subcounty(Unyama) was not assessed because there was no one at the station and another was shared among Unyama, Paicho and Awach.</p>	2

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	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	For 2 of the three Sampled LLGs, the staff Lists of extension staff were posted on the noticeboards. One subcounty (Unyama) was not assessed because there was no one at the station.	2
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: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0	The appraisal documents of only one out of the 10 sampled was available, otherwise the rest were said to be at the district service commission.	0
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 presented to the Assessor for review to confirm that corrective actions were taken after the performance appraisals.	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	No training reports were availed for review.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	No database was availed	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 score 10</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>Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>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>Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts</p>	0

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 Less than 70% score 0 	<p>Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts</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>Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts	0
	Maximum score 8			

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

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

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts	0
	Maximum score 8			

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

12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	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 because Gulu is not among the pilot districts	0
12	Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.	Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts	0

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

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	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 because Gulu is not among the pilot districts	0
	Maximum score 18			

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0	Not applicable because Gulu is not among the pilot districts	0
	Maximum score 18			

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

Environment and Social Safeguards

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

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

Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro-irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc. score 2 or else 0	Gulu district is not part of the Micro-scale irrigation pilot projects	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	Gulu district is not part of the Micro-scale irrigation pilot projects	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	Gulu district is not part of the Micro-scale irrigation pilot projects	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	Gulu district is not part of the Micro-scale irrigation pilot projects	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	Gulu district is not part of the Micro-scale irrigation pilot projects	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for micro-scale irrigation Maximum score is 70	If the LG has recruited the Senior Agriculture Engineer score 70 or else 0.	According to the records at HR, <i>vide</i> CR/GDLG/13644, Gulu DLG recruited Anywar Geoffrey as a senior Agricultural Engineer on 12/05/2020 under minute number1/03/2020.	70
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed. Maximum score is 30	If the LG: a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening, score 15 or else 0.	Gulu district is not part of the micro-scale irrigation pilot project	0
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed. Maximum score is 30	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) where required, score 15 or else 0.	Gulu district is not part of the micro-scale irrigation pilot project	0

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	If the LG has recruited: a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	Gulu District did not substantively recruit all the essential staff for the District Water Office (DWO). Out of the 6 positions under review for the assessment, only 2 positions of: Civil Engineer-Water and the Assistant Water Officer were substantively filled at the time of the assessment. Details of recruitment and/or appointment were as indicated below: Civil Engineer (water): Mr Kirama Bosco , CR/GDLG, a Senior Assistant Engineering Officer (as per Customized staff Structure for Gulu District, was substantively appointed as a Civil Engineer-Water as directed by DSC Min. No.3/09/04/2019 (ii) and by letter dated 24th April 2019; CR/156/3.	15
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	Assistant Water Officer- Mobilization: Mr. Kafonzi Opwonya Eric Mark ; CR/GDLG/13766, was substantively appointed as an Assistant Water Officer, as directed by DSC. Min. No. 4/2020 (i) and by letter dated 27th February 2020.	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Borehole Maintenance Technician: The position was vacant at the time of the assessment (was not provided for in the Customised staff Structure for Gulu District	0
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer , score 15 or else 0.	Natural Resources Officer: The position was vacant at the time of the assessment.	0

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Environment Officer: <i>Aryemo Joyce Latigo</i> , was substantively appointed as Environment officer, as directed by DSC. Min. No: 3/27/2018 (i) and by letter dated 13th August 2018; Ref. CR/156/3.	10
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Forestry Officer: <i>Ochaka James</i> : GDLG/13692, was substantively appointed as a Forestry Officer as directed by DSC Min. No. 1/13/208 and by appointment letter dated 23rd March 2028; CR/156/3.	10

Environment and Social Requirements

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	<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 ,Example;</p> <p>Drilling installation and casting of borehole in Paicho sub county. impacts and mitigation measures addressed example soak pits to trap waste water, signed by senior Environment officer and CDO on 20th March 2020</p> <p>Drilling installation and casting of borehole in Tee Olam community ,Awach sub county .Impacts and mitigation measures addressed example planting of tree species for climate change adaptation signed Environment officer and CDO on 26th March 2020</p> <p>Drilling installation and casting of borehole in Paloro seed secondary school, Paloro sub county. Impacts and mitigation measures were addressed example fencing of the water point. signed by senior Environment officer and CDO on 16 June 2020</p> <p>ESMPs for drilling and construction of 15 boreholes in sub counties costed at an amount of UGX 6,300,000 signed by DCDO and environment officer on 4th April 2020</p>	10
---	---	---	--	----

2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.	<p>The water projects in the LG did not do ESIAs and were not required. The boreholes are hand pump and of low intake of underground water volume m3</p> <p>Environmental impacts are minimal and identified during the screening process of the project</p>	10
2	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental. Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects	c. Ensured that contractors got abstraction permits issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.	<p>The LG ensured that contractors got drilling permits issued by DWRM. 2 contractors were awarded drilling permits for 16 boreholes namely;</p> <p>The contractor Brottos (U) Ltd, was granted Drilling Permit No DP21964/DW/2019 from 1st July 2019 to 30 June 2020 signed by Director DWD dated 10th July 2019 for Lot 1</p> <p>The contractor Icon Projects Ltd, was granted Drilling Permit No DP06983/DW/2019 from 1st July 2019 to 30 June 2020 signed by Director DWD dated 23rd July 2019 for Lot 2</p>	10

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>a. District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The evidence presented to the Assessor in form of personal files with appointment letters contained therein, indicated that Gulu DLG did not substantively recruit or formally requested for secondment of staff for all positions in the health department.</p> <p>Acting District Health Officer: Idiba Yoweri; CR/D/11788, a substantive Assistant DHO Environmental Health, was appointed on assignment of duty as acting DHO by letter dated 10th February 2020, CR/D/116/1.</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>Assistant DHO Maternal and Child Health: The position was vacant at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>There was no evidence presented to the Assessor to confirm that Gulu district requested for secondment from the central government to fill the position of Assistant DHO-Maternal and Child Health.</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Assistant DHO Environment: CR/D/11888; Idiba Yoweri was substantively appointed as an Assistant DHO-Environmental Health- as directed by DSC. Min. No. 3/02/11/2018 (vii) and by letter dated 31st December, 2018; CR/156/3.</p>	10
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) , score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Principal Health Inspector: The position was vacant/ not included in the customized structure for Gulu District.</p>	0

1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Senior Health Educator: CR/GDLG; Onyayi William Who was substantively appointed as a Senior Health Educator as directed by DSC Min. No. 1/03/2017/21 and by appointment letter dated 5th April 2017; Ref.CR/156/3</p>	10
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.</p>	<p>Biostatistician: Mr. Okello Elvis; CR/GDLG/13741, was substantively appointed as a district Biostatistician as directed by DSC. Min. No. 04/30/05/2019 and by letter dated 14th June 2019, CR/156/3.</p>	10
1	<p>Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>Applicable to Districts only.</p> <p>Maximum score is 70</p>	<p>g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>District Cold Chain Technician: Mr. Elong Tonny, was substantively appointed as a District Cold Chain Technician, as directed by DSC Min. No.01/03/2017/21, and by letter dated 5th April 2017; CR/156/3</p>	10
1	<p>Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>h. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>		
1	<p>Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>i. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.</p>		

1	<p>Evidence that the Municipality has in place or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to MCs only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>j. If the MC has in place or formally requested for secondment of Health Educator, score 20 or else 0.</p>
---	--	---

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>If the LG carried out:</p> <p>a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was done for health projects previous FY. examples include;</p> <p>Construction of OPD with Maternity at Lapeta HC II located in Unyama sub county impacts identified and mitigation measures addressed with recommendations signed by Senior environment officer and DCDO on 18th December 2020</p> <p>Construction of 4 stances drainable latrine at OPD at Patiko HC III, Patiko sub county REF GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/000023 at UGX 450,000 signed by DCDO and senior environment officer on 15th December 2019</p>	15
2	<p>Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects, the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)</p> <p>Maximum score is 30</p>	<p>b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs), score 15 or else 0.</p>	<p>There were no ESIAs for the health projects this is because of the environmental and social measures listed in the ESMP were identified and mitigated</p> <p>Environmental impacts were minimal and identified during the screening process of the project</p>	15

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:</p> <p><i>The maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>a) District Education Officer/ Principal Education Officer, score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>The approved staff structure for Gulu district provides for 7 staff, including the District Education Officer, Senior Inspector of schools, 2 Inspectors of Schools, Senior Education Officer, Sports Officer, and Education Officer Special Needs.</p> <p>The Assessor ascertained that all the eight staff positions were substantively filled at the time of the assessment. Details of appointment were as indicated below:</p> <p>District Education Officer: Mr. Ayiba George Butele: CR/NDLG/10440, was substantively appointed as a District Education Officer as directed by DSC.Min. No. NDLG/2/2018 and by letter dated 6TH February 2018, Ref.CR/156/3.</p>	30
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:</p> <p><i>The maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has substantively recruited or formally requested for secondment of:</p> <p>b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.</p>	<p>1. District Inspector of Schools: Obot Robinson a Senior Inspector of Schools, file No. CR/GDLG/11123, was substantively appointed as a District Inspector of Schools as directed by DSC. Min. No. 2/2007/ (f) and by letter dated 5th September, 2010; Ref. CR/156/3.</p> <p>2. Inspector of schools. Obol David: CR/GDLG/12297 was substantively appointed as an Inspector of Schools as directed by Min. No. 3/4/2017/1 and by letter dated 12th May 2017; CR/ 156/3.</p> <p>3. Inspector of Schools: Adimola Margaret Amongi: CR/D/11095 was substantively appointed as an Inspector of Schools as directed by DSC Min. No. 214/98 (A) (i) and by appointment letter dated 2nd October 1998.</p>	40

Environment and Social Requirements

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

If the LG carried out:

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

The LG Filled Environmental and Social Screening Form for the Education projects for the previous FY .Examples include;

Construction of 1 block of 2 classroom with staff room at Panykwo PS REF GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00001 , impacts identified and mitigation measures addressed with recommendations signed by Senior Environment officer and DCDO on 11th January 2020

Construction of 1 block of 4 units teachers staff house at Bucoro PS REF GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00005 located in Unyama sub county, impacts identified and mitigation measures addressed with recommendations signed by Senior Environment officer and DCDO on 10th February 2020

The Maximum score is 30

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

If the LG carried out:

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

The Education projects in the LG did not require ESIAs as the impacts were minimal and can be mitigated.

Implementation of mitigation measures as proposed in the environment and social checklist as per environmental guidelines for contracts and clause 8 contained in bidding documents.

The Maximum score is 30

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.</p> <p>Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Gulu District had not yet filled all Heads of Department (HoD) positions substantively by the time of conducting the LGPA exercise. Five (4) out of Nine (9) HoD positions had been filled. The Assessor reviewed personal files of HoDs and established their appointment status as indicated below:</p> <p>Chief Finance Officer: CR/ GDLG/10758: Nyero Pascal was substantively appointed as a District Finance Officer as directed by DSC Min, No. CR/3/27/04/2018 , and by letter dated 14th May 2018. Ref. CR/156/3</p>	3
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.</p> <p>Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Acting District Planner: Omar David, CR/GDLG/13574 a substantive Senior Planner was appointed on assignment of duty as a District Planner by letter dated 12th November 2019; Ref. CR/156/3.</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.</p> <p>Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Acting District Engineer: Nyeko Samuel, a substantive Civil Engineer, was appointed on assignment of duty as acting District Engineer, by letter dated 14th July 2020, Ref. CR/D/1045</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.</p> <p>Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>District Natural Resources Officer: CR/GDLG/10126; Ojara Alex, was substantively appointed as directed by DSC. Min. No.3/10/05/2018 (i) and by letter dated 18th May 2018, CR/156/3.</p>	3

1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	District Production Officer: CR/GDLG/10550; Lakor Jackson was substantively appointed as directed by DSC Min. No. 3/10/05/2018 (i) and by appointment letter dated 11th May 2018; CR/156/3.	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	f. District Community Development Officer/ Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0	District Community Development Officer: Akech Gorreti , CR/DLG/114545, was substantively appointed as District Community Development Officer as directed by DSC.Min. No.3/10/05/2018 (i) and by letter dated 18th May 2018 CR/156/3.	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0	District Commercial Officer: Oketta Kenneth, Akena , CR/GDLG/13681, was substantively appointed as a District Commercial Officer, as directed by DSC Min. No. 04/29/06/2018 (viii) and by letter dated 3rd December 2018. Cr/156/3.	3
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	other critical staff h (i). A Senior Procurement Officer (Municipal: Procurement Officer) score 2 or else 0.	Senior Procurement Officer: Onekal Lit Bosco , CR/ GDLGD /13693, was substantively appointed as a Senior Procurement Officer, as directed by DSC. Min. No. 1/13/2018 (b) NDSC/6/2017 and by appointment letter dated 23rd March 2018. CR/156/3	2
1	Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	h(ii). Procurement Officer (Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer), score 2 or else 0	Procurement Officer: Okumu Moses: CR/GDLG/13416, was substantively appointed as a Procurement Officer as directed by DSC. Min. No. 1/01/2016 and by appointment letter dated 29th January, 2016; CR/156/	2

1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.</p> <p>Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Principal Human Resource Officer: Mr. Labong Geoffrey, CR/GDLG/10162, was substantively appointed as a Principal Human Resources Officer as directed by DSC Min. No. 04/12/2013 and by letter dated 16th September 2019, Ref; CR/156/4.</p>	2
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.</p> <p>Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Senior Environment Officer: Ms. Francisca Kiseembo, CR/D/13090, was substantively appointed as a Senior Environment Officer, as directed by DSC min. No. 04/04/2012. (appointment letter was missing on file-at DSC for consideration for promotion</p>	2
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.</p> <p>Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Senior Land Management Officer: Ms Ochan Hilda; CR/GDLG/13/689, was substantively appointed as a Senior Land Management Officer, as directed by DSC Min. No. 30/30/05/2019 (iii) and by appointment letter dated 14th June 2019, CR/153/3.</p>	2
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.</p> <p>Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Senior Accountant: The position was vacant at the time of the assessment.</p>	0
1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.</p> <p>Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor for Districts and Senior Internal Auditor for MCs, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Principal Internal Auditor: Ms Okello Jane Lamwony, was substantively appointed as a Principal Internal Auditor, as directed by DSC Min. 4/10/2019 (iii) and by appointment letter dated 12th November, 2019; CR/156/3.</p>	2

1	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments.</p> <p>Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC): Ms. Akide Irene; CR/GDLG/10433; was substantively appointed as a Principal Human Resource Officer-Secretary to the DSC- as directed by DSC. Min. No. 4/10/2019 (viii) and by letter dated 12th November 2019 CR/156/3.</p>	2
2	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:</p> <p>a. Senior Assistant Secretaries in all LLGS,</p> <p>score 5 or else 0</p>	<p>Gulu District is constituted of eight (6) Lower Local Governments (LLGs) including 6 sub counties. The Assessor reviewed the approved and costed staff list for 2019/2020 and the approved staff structure by Ministry of Public Service, and established that Gulu district substantively filled all the essential positions of Senior Assistant Secretaries, Community Development Officers and Senior Accounts Assistants as per minimum staffing standards:</p> <p>Senior Assistant Secretaries: The Assessor reviewed the approved staff Establishment for Gulu district provided by the Ag. PHRO and confirmed that the 6 sub counties of Unyama, Paicho, Bungatira, Palaro, Patiko and Awach had the positions of Senior Assistant Secretaries substantively filled by the time of the assessment.</p>	5
2	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:</p> <p>b. A Community Development Officer or Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS</p> <p>score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>Community Development Officers: A review by the Assessor, of the "Approved Staff Establishment List for Subcounties in Gulu District Local Government (available at the HRM Office) revealed that all the 6 positions of Community Development Officers were substantively filled.</p>	5
2	<p>Evidence that the LG has recruited or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>If LG has recruited or requested for secondment of:</p> <p>c. A Senior Accounts Assistant or an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS,</p> <p>score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>Senior Accounts Assistant: The "Approved Staff establishment list" for the Subcounties in Gulu district indicated that all the 6 positions of Senior Accounts Assistants were substantively filled at the time of the assessment.</p>	5

Environment and Social Requirements

3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>a. Natural Resources department,</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>LG released 100% of funds allocated for the Natural Resources Department. The amount warranted was Shs.210,500,000 and expenditure was Shs.198,602, 695 (page 15 of the financial statement fy 2019/20). The balance of Shs.11397,805 was sent back to treasury.</p>	2
3	<p>Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:</p> <p>b. Community Based Services department.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>LG released 100% of funds allocated for Community Based Services department. The amount warranted was Shs.295,057,000 and expenditure was Shs.292,561,506 (page 15 of the financial statement fy 2019/20). The balance of Shs.2,495,494 was returned to treasury.</p>	2

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

Maximum score is 12

a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,

score 4 or else 0

The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for 15 infrastructural projects according to procurement report implemented for the previous year 19/20 using DDEG.

ESMPS were costed indicating the environmental issues, mitigation measures, and means of verification, budget and responsible person. The Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was signed by both senior environment officer and CDO. Example of projects include;

Construction of standard OPD at Lapeta HC II located in Unyama sub county impacts identified and mitigation measures addressed with recommendations signed by Senior environment officer and DCDO on 18th December 2019

Construction of 1 block of 2 classroom with staff room at Panykworo PS REF GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00001, impacts identified and mitigation measures addressed with recommendations signed by Senior Environment officer and DCDO on 11th January 2020

Construction of 1 block of 4 units teachers staff house at Bucoro PS REF GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00005 located in Unyama sub county, impacts identified and mitigation measures addressed with recommendations signed by Senior Environment officer and DCDO on 10th February 2020

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

The infrastructural projects were screened in the LG. The infrastructural projects did not require ESIAs because of simple environment and social measures listed in the ESMP

Impacts can be mitigated or avoided through appropriated and timely implementation of recommended mitigation measures and by strictly following the requirements and guidance in the screening form.

stakeholder engagements were carried out during site visits of the sites dated 4th April 2020 as per the ESMP of the projects

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

The LG costed ESMPs for the Infrastructural projects implemented using the DDEG. some ESMPs costed include;

ESMP for all infrastructural projects for previous FY 2019/20 Example;

Construction of 1 block of 4 stances drainable latrine for OPD at Lapeta HC II at UGX 650,000 signed by DCDO and senior environment officer on 4th April 2020

Construction of 1 block of 4 units teachers staff house at Bucoro PS REF GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/00005 at UGX 1,150,000 signed by DCDO and senior Environment officer on 4th April 2020

Construction of 4 stances drainable latrine at OPD at Patiko HC III Patiko sub county REF GULU508/WRKS/2019-2020/000023 at UGX 450,000 signed by DCDO and senior environment officer on 4th April 2020

Financial management and reporting

5

0

Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.

Maximum score is 10

If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;

If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5

If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0

N/A- The audit results will be ready by the end of December. Therefore, this will be issued January 2021.

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).

maximum score is 10

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),

score 10 or else 0.

The LG provided evidence seen by the assessor dated 3rd January 2020, that showed, information sent to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings. The statement included issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015). The key issues raised and responded to by the Chief Administrative Officer and were as follows;

1. Disposal of District assets was delayed.

2. Poor maintenance of District vehicles.

Non-remittance of loan deductions o financial institutions of Shs.331, 325,396.

3. Non-remittance of loan deductions to financial institutions.

4. Non-remittance of statutory deductions of statutory deductions (PAYE) Ushs.1485,552,324.

5. Irregular procurements of Shs. 4,482,500.

6. Unaccounted for funds of Shs.44,057,720.

7. Incompletely vouched expenditure of Shs.26,526,718.

8. Missing vouchers of Shs.35,156,078.

9. Nugatory expenditure of Shs. 60.000.000.

10. Dilapidated Gulu District store.

Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY

Maximum Score 4

If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,

score 4 or else 0.

The LG in Pursuant to the Public Financial Management Act of 2015, Part VII Accounting and Audit, Section 45 (3), the Accounting Officer Mr. Milton Kato an annual budget performance contract acknowledged by the PS/ST on 18th July 2019 at 5.05 pm.

8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted the Annual Performance Report on 14/09/2020 and is reflecting on the IFMIS online signed by Mr. Okaka Geoffrey, LC V Chairman. This was after 31st August.</p>	0
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>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,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for all the four quarters as follows;</p> <p>Q 1 10/12/2019</p> <p>Q 2 01/02/2020</p> <p>Q 3 25/05/2020</p> <p>Q 4 14/9/2020</p> <p>Submitted after 31st August 2020.</p>	0