



The Republic of Uganda

Local Government Management of Service Delivery Performance Assessment Manual

August, 2020

Table of Contents

Contents

Foreword.....	iv
Acronyms/Abbreviations	v
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1 Background to Management of Service Delivery Assessments	1
2 Background to Assessment of LG Management of Service Delivery	3
2.1 Scope of the LG Management of Service Delivery Assessment	3
2.2 Principles for the design of the assessment system.....	3
2.3 Overview of Minimum Conditions	3
2.4 Overview of Performance Measures and Relative Scores	4
SECTION 2: ASSESSING LG MANAGEMENT OF SERVICE DELIVERY.....	5
3 Preparatory Activities	5
3.1 Orientation of the Local Governments.....	5
3.2 Team Composition and Coordination	5
3.3 Training of the LG PA and QA teams.....	7
4 Collection of Data to Inform the Assessment Process.....	7
4.1 Collection of data from secondary sources at the national level.....	7
4.2 Field based LG Performance Assessment.....	8
4.3 Reporting.....	8
5 Quality Assurance and Results Verification	9
5.1 Spot Checks.....	9
5.2 Independent Verification of Process and Results.....	9
6 Review, Approval, Use and Dissemination of the Results	11
6.1 Grievance Handling.....	11
6.2 Approval of results	12
6.3 Synthesis Report.....	12
6.4 Use of Results and Impact.....	12
6.4.1 Use of the results to allocate part of the development grants	12
6.4.2 Use of results for performance improvement planning	13
6.5 Dissemination of Results.....	14
7 Institutional Arrangements and Timing	14
7.1 Institutional Arrangements.....	14

7.2	Timing of Activities	15
SECTION 3: INDICATORS AND ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE.....		16
8	Crosscutting Performance Assessment	16
8.1	Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	16
8.2	Crosscutting Performance Measures	19
9	Education Performance Assessment	36
9.1	Education Minimum Conditions	36
9.2	Education Performance Measures	37
10	Health Performance Assessment.....	47
10.1	Health Minimum Conditions	47
10.2	Health Performance Measures	48
11	Water and Environment Performance Assessment.....	67
11.1	Water and Environment Minimum Conditions	67
11.2	Water and Environment Performance Measures	68
12	Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Assessment	78
12.1	Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	79
12.2	Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	80
ANNEXES		91
Annex 1	Code of Ethics for the Assessment Teams.....	91
Annex 2	Exit Declaration Form.....	92

Foreword

In a bid to improve delivery of services to all citizens the Government of Uganda introduced a decentralization policy under the Constitution of 1995 and the Local Government Act Cap 243. Under the decentralization policy, LGs are mandated to deliver a wide range of basic services and the Ministries, Departments and Agencies to provide standards, guidelines as well as supervisory support. To finance the delivery of basic services, the central government make transfers to LGs.

Following a series of reviews conducted on the country's fiscal decentralization reforms, with support from the World Bank, in FY 2015/16 GoU took measures to revise its LG transfers system under the Uganda Intergovernmental Fiscal Transfer Reform. The core program objectives include; i) Restoring adequacy in financing of decentralized service delivery; ii) Ensuring equity in allocation of funds to LGs for service delivery; and iii) Improving the efficiency of LGs in the delivery of services.

The local Government Performance Assessment system is aimed at attaining the third objective of the Intergovernmental Fiscal Transfer Reform. This revised manual sets out a performance and improvement framework with more outcome driven indicators also associated with an incentive system to ensure improved institutional and service delivery performance of Local Governments. The manual has been jointly developed by relevant Ministries, Departments and Agencies(MDAs) in close consultation with local Governments. It provides detailed information and guidelines on the objectives, processes, organization and management of the Performance system to be applied including activities prior to, during and after assessment.

I trust that this manual will be efficiently utilized in order to contribute to efforts to improve LG performance and service delivery. I also encourage local Governments to embrace this manual as a key tool to not only prepare for the assessment process but also use it as a basis for continuous improvements in the execution of their mandated roles and responsibilities.

Finally, I would like to take his opportunity to thank all representatives from the various MDAs that made compilation of this manual possible. These include; Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development; Ministry of Local Government; Local Government Finance Commission; Ministry of Education and Sports; Ministry of Health; Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries; Ministry of Water and Environment; Ministry of Public Service; NEMA; and UBOS. My office also acknowledges the technical assistance funded by the Department for International Development (DFID) thorough the Overseas Development Institute-Budget Strengthening Initiative (ODI-BSI). I therefore look forward to further collaboration with all stakeholders in improving service delivery in the country.

For God and my Country

Permanent Secretary, Office of the Prime Minister.

Acronyms/Abbreviations

AAA	Automated Attendance Analysis
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
AWP	Annual Work Plan
BoG	Board of Governors
BoQ	Bills of Quantities
CAO	Chief Administration Officer
CC	Consultative Committees
CFO	Chief Finance Officer
CMU	Construction Management Unit
CNA	Capacity Needs Assessment
CPD	Continuous Professional Development
CRP	Complaints Referral Path
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
D/CAO	Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
DCDO	District Community Development Officer
DDEG	Discretionary Development Equalization Grant
DEO	District Education Officer
DES	Directorate of Education Standards
DHMT	District Health Management Team
DHO	District Health Officer
DIS	District Inspector of Schools
DPO	District Production Office
DPs	Development Partners
DSC	District Service Commission
DTPC	District Technical Planning Committee
DWO	District Water Officer
DWSCC	District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee
EMIS	Education Management Information System
ENR	Environment and Natural Resources
ESIAs	Environmental Social Impact Assessment
ESMPs	Environmental Social Management Plans
FD SC	Fiscal Decentralization Steering Committee
FDTC	Fiscal Decentralization Technical Committee
FY	Financial Year
GBV	Gender Based Violence
GRC	Grievance Redress Committee
GRM	Grievance Redress Mechanism
H/T	Head Teacher
HC	Health Center
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HLG	Higher Local Government
HMIS	Health Management Information System
HoD	Heads of Departments
HRIS	Human Resource Information System
HRM	Human Resource Management

HSDs	Health Sub Districts
HUMC	Health Unit Management Committee
IA	Internal Audit
IFMIS	Integrated Financial Management System
IGG	Inspector General of Government
IPFs	Indicative Planning Figures
IPPS	Integrated Personnel Payroll System
IVA	Independent Verification Agent
LG PA	Local Government Performance Assessment
LG PAC	Local Government Public Accounts Committee
LG QA	Local Government Quality Assurance
LGDP	Local Government Development Plan
LGFC	Local Government Finance commission
LGs	Local Governments
LLGs	Lower Local Governments
LLHF	Lower Local Health Facilities
M&E/LGs	Directorate of Monitoring and Evaluation/Local Government
MAAIF	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
MCS	Minimum Conditions
MDAs	Ministries Departments Agencies
MEO	Municipal Education Officer
MIS	Management Information System
MMOH	Municipal Medical Officer of Health
MoES	Ministry of Education and Sports
MOFPED	Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development
MoH	Ministry of Health
MoLG	Ministry of Local Government
MoLHUD	Ministry of Lands Housing and Urban Development
MoPS	Ministry of Public Service
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTPC	Municipal Technical Planning Committee
NEMA	National Environment Management Authority
NWR	None Wage Recurrent
OAG	Office of the Auditor General
OPAMS	Online Performance Assessment Management System
OPD	Out Patient Department
OPM	Office of the Prime Minister
OSR	Own Source Revenue
OTIMS	Online Transfer Information Management System
PBS	Program Budgeting System
PDU	Procurement Disposal Unit
PFMA	Public Finance Management Act
PFO	Principal Finance Officer
PHC	Primary Health Care
PHRO	Principal Human Resource Officer
PIP	Performance Improvement Plan
PIT	Project Implementation Team
PLE	Primary Leaving Examinations

PMO	Principal Medical Officer
PMs	Performance Measures
PNFP	Private Not for Profit
PPDA	Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Authority
PPEs	Personal Protective Equipment
PS	Permanent Secretary
QA	Quality Assurance
QBPR	Quarterly Budget Performance Reports
RBF	Results Based Financing
SAA	Senior Account Assistant
SAS	Senior Assistant Secretary
SFO	Senior Finance Officer
SMC	School Management Committee
SPA	School Performance Assessment
TC	Technical Committee
TF	Task Force
ToR	Terms of Reference
TPC	Technical Planning Committee
UCE	Uganda Certificate of Education
USE	Universal Secondary Education
VAC	Violence Against Children
WSCs	Water and Sanitation Committees
WSS	Water Supply and Sanitation Services

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1 Background to Management of Service Delivery Assessments

The Government of Uganda (GoU) is implementing the decentralization policy where: (i) the Local Governments (LGs) have the primary mandate of providing front line services in most basic services areas; and (ii) Central Government provides guidance through sector policies, standards, sector budget guidelines, technical supervision and support. In order to implement their service delivery mandates, Government has been transferring resources to Local Governments since 1993/94 where the funding, which was UGX 0.79 trillion (in UGX 2019/20 terms), has increased to UGX 3.81 trillion in FY 2019/20. The increase notwithstanding, there are a number of challenges notably: the limited discretion for LGs to decide on allocations of resources; visible inequities in the allocation of resources across LGs; lack of incentives for LGs to account for resources; and reduced real per capita value of transfers. Therefore, Government designed and has been implementing Intergovernmental Fiscal Transfer Reforms since 2015.

One of the key elements of the intergovernmental fiscal transfer reforms was the design and implementation of the Local Government Performance Assessment (LG PA) system under the leadership of the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM). The LG PA which has been focusing on: (i) accountability requirements; and (ii) crosscutting and sector (education, health and water) functional processes and systems, focusing on areas which were impediment for effective service delivery and bottlenecks in organization, administration and execution, has been conducted for three years where indicators were kept stable, also to ensure performance-trend analysis. The performance assessment results were used in the allocation of development grants in FYs 2019/20 and 2020/21 as well as in the design and implementation of Local Government Performance Improvement Plans (LG PIPs). The implementation of the assessment has led to improvement in the management of resources for service delivery as depicted in the improvement of LGs performance assessment results. For example, the overall average scores improved from 56% in the assessment conducted in 2017 to 68% in the assessment conducted in 2019.

The foregoing performance improvements notwithstanding, Government has noted that to address the existing constraints to the delivery of sufficient and quality services to citizens requires not only increased adequacy and equity of transfers but also strengthened: (i) Central Government oversight and support; (ii) capacity of Local Governments in the management of services; and (iii) service delivery performance at the facility level. In addition, after 3 years of implementation there is need to refine some of the indicators and up-date them based on lessons learned, e.g. removing indicators which are now largely complied with, and introducing new ones focusing on emerging challenges. Therefore, a new performance assessment and improvement framework to incentivize improved management and delivery of services has been developed under the coordination of OPM as depicted in the table below:

Table 1: Overview of the Revised Performance Assessment and Improvement Framework

Issue	Level 1 – Service Delivery Facility and LLG Performance			Level 2 LG Management of Service Delivery		Level 3 CG Management of Service Delivery
	1a) Schools	1b) Health	1c) LLGs	2a Minimum conditions (MCs)	2b: Performance measures (PMs)	Education, Health, Water & Environment, Micro-scale Irrigation and Crosscutting MDAs
1. Objective	Incentivize improvements in processes and outputs at the school level	Incentivize improvements in processes and delivery of health services	Incentivize improvements in LLG management & service delivery	Address basic safeguards and core blockages to service delivery.	Incentivize improvements in the LG management of Education, Health, Water & Environment; micro-scale Irrigation and Crosscutting issues	Incentivize improvement in Central Government Management of Service Delivery
2. Timing	To be decided	to be decided	Sept – Jan	Sept – Jan	Sept – Jan	Sept – Jan
3. Assessment Method and compilation of results	Use school inspection reports	Use DHMTC Reports	District /Municipal	Contracted private firm	Contracted private firm	MDAs reporting against agreed actions.
4. Quality Assurance and verification of results	Contracted firm	Contracted firm	Contracted firm	Contracted firm	Spot checks & Contracted firm	Contracted firm
5. Impact/use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allocation of part of the capitation grants: - Performance improvement support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allocation of part of the NWR grants; - Performance improvement support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allocation part of the DDEG; - Performance improvement support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact on the allocation of the performance component of the development grants; - Inform performance improvement support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact on the size of grant from World Bank to GoU 	

This Assessment Manual focuses on Level 2 which is Local Government Management of Service Delivery.

2 Background to Assessment of LG Management of Service Delivery

2.1 Scope of the LG Management of Service Delivery Assessment

The assessment of Local Government Management of Service Delivery has two elements:

- a) **Minimum conditions** (seen as core performance indicators) which focusses on key bottlenecks for service delivery and safeguards management.
- b) **Performance measures**, which are sectoral assessments, will be used to evaluate service delivery in the Districts/Municipalities as a whole, and for some areas aggregating performance information from facilities and Lower Local Governments (LLGs) and assessing compliance with performance reporting and improvement support.

The Minimum Conditions (MCs) and Performance Measures (PMs) were harmonized across the different assessment areas – see section 3. Below is a summary of the MCs and PMs.

2.2 Principles for the design of the assessment system

The selection and formulation of the minimum conditions and performance measures have been done using a number of core design principles for design of LG performance assessment systems. These are outlined below:

- a) Attribution of performance measures covering areas where the efforts of the LGs matter (i.e. the LGs are able to improve performance on the selected measure):
- b) Address identified core blockages to service delivery:
- c) Ensure credibility and neutrality of the assessment process
- d) Ensure effective and timely administration of rewards and sanctions:
- e) Cost-effectiveness in assessing the measures and aimed to provide sustainability in LG management and operations (value for money)

2.3 Overview of Minimum Conditions

The aspects assessed under minimum conditions include:

- a) For crosscutting:
 - Human Resource Management and Development
 - Safeguards:
 - Fiduciary safeguards (Financial management and reporting)
 - Environmental and Social requirements
- b) For Education, Health and Water and Micro-Scale Irrigation:
 - Human Resource Management and Development
 - Environmental and Social requirements

2.4 Overview of Performance Measures and Relative Scores

The Performance Measures to be assessed and how they will be scored is summarised below

	Performance Area and Performance Measures	Crosscutting	Education	Health	Water & Environment	Micro-scale Irrigation
	Total Scores	100	100	100	100	100
<i>A</i>	<i>Local Government Service Delivery Results.</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>20</i>
	Service Delivery Outcomes	4	6	2	4	4
	Service Delivery Performance	6	4	4	8	4
	Investment Performance	4	8	8	0	6
	Achievement of standards	0	6	4	4	6
<i>B</i>	<i>Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>10</i>
	Accuracy of reported information	4	4	4	3	4
	Reporting and Performance Improvement	8	12	14	7	6
<i>C</i>	<i>Human Resource Management and Development</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>10</i>
	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff	2	8	10	4	6
	Performance management	5	8	6	6	4
	Payroll management	1	0	0	0	0
	Pension Payroll management	1	0	0	0	0
<i>D</i>	<i>Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>22</i>
	Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	6	8	9	6	10
	Routine oversight and monitoring	4	10	7	8	8
	Mobilisation and promotion of service delivery	0	2	4	6	4
<i>E</i>	<i>Investment Management</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>26</i>
	Planning and budgeting for investments	12	4	4	14	8
	Procurement, contract management/execution	8	8	10	14	18
<i>F</i>	<i>Environment and Social Safeguards</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>12</i>
	Grievance redress	5	3	2	3	6
	Safeguards for service delivery	0	3	4	3	0
	Safeguards in the delivery of investments	11	6	8	10	6
<i>G</i>	<i>Financial Management</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
	Book-keeping	2	0	0	0	0
	Internal audit and follow-up on audit	4	0	0	0	0
<i>H</i>	<i>Local Revenues</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
	Predictability	2	0	0	0	0
	Revenue mobilisation performance	2	0	0	0	0
	Revenue sharing	2	0	0	0	0
<i>I</i>	<i>Governance, Oversight, Transparency and Accountability.</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
	Transparency and accountability	6	0	0	0	0
	Reporting to IGG	1	0	0	0	0

SECTION 2: ASSESSING LG MANAGEMENT OF SERVICE DELIVERY

3 Preparatory Activities

3.1 Orientation of the Local Governments

To ensure that the LGs are sufficiently prepared for the assessment, the following activities will be undertaken before the actual performance assessment is conducted:

- a) The Performance Assessment Manual will be printed and distributed to all LGs.
- b) The LG Performance Assessment Task Force will inform, orient and train LGs on the PA Manual as well as the implications of their performance scores prior to the actual assessments.
- c) The respective MDAs will provide support to the LGs in preparation for the assessments as part of their inspection, support supervision and mentoring mandates.
- d) LGs shall prepare for the assessments in advance. This will involve conducting internal 'mock' assessments to determine the extent to which they have complied with the minimum conditions and expected performance. In case there are some gaps, these should be addressed before the assessment. LGs shall collect and have ready all documents required at the point of time for the assessment. Evidence, which is not available during the assessment/field-work, will not be considered in the scoring of performance of a LG (i.e. a LG will not receive marks on these).
- e) The LGs will be informed about the assessment schedules prior to arrival of the assessment teams.
- f) The sampled LGs will also be informed about visits by any quality assurance teams, which may review the quality of the process and results of the assessment and should be available for this.

3.2 Team Composition and Coordination

The LG PA of the Districts and Municipalities will be conducted by external independent teams, which will be contracted to perform the exercise in a quality and credible manner. The teams shall be mobilized and undergo training before the assessment every year.

The Local Governments will be assessed in four (4) clusters. Each cluster will have:

- a) One (1) overall Team Leader who will also serve as an Internal Quality Assurance Person
- b) Three (3) sub- teams of eight (8) consultants each, to ensure timely implementation within each cluster. Each sub-team will nominate a sub-team leader from amongst the Assessors who will ensure compliance to the assessment process as well as comprehensive and quality reporting. The compositions of the sub-teams and indicative activities during the performance assessment exercise is summarized in the table below:

Table 2: Compositions of the sub-teams and indicative activities

No	Expert	MDAs to be visited	Activities on Day 1	Activities on Day 2
1.	LG Planning and Financial Management Specialist (Sub-team Leader) ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Office of the Auditor General (OAG) - Internal Auditor General - MoFPED 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CAO/TC office - Chief Finance Officer - Internal audit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - District Planner - Physical Planner - Clerk to the council
2.	LG Human Resource Management/ Administration Expert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MoPS - MoLG 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CAO's office - Human Resource Management (HRM) Division 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collect information from a sample of 3 LLGs (for all assessments)
3.	Project Execution Expert (Engineer)/with procurement experiences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MoH (Engineering Unit) - MoES (CMU) - MoWT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - District Engineer - Procurement and Disposal Unit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sample at least 3 construction sites (education, health and DDEG)
4.	Environment and social Management Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NEMA - MoGLSD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental Officer - DCDO - District designated Grievance Coordinator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sample at least 3 construction sites (education, health and DDEG) to assess compliance with good environmental and social safeguards practices
5.	Health Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MoH 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DHO/PMO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sample at least 3 Health Facilities (not with construction)
6.	Education Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MoES (DES, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DEO - DIS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sample at least 3 Schools (not with construction)
7.	Water Management Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MoWE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - District Water Office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sample at least 3 water sources in three different sub-counties
8.	Agriculture Engineer (for LGs eligible to receive micro-irrigation grant only)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MAAIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - District Production Office - Agricultural Engineer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sample at least 3 completed micro-scale irrigation installations in different LLGs

¹ This expert will also cover the few issues on governance/transparency which are cross-cutting.

3.3 Training of the LG PA and QA teams

The LG Performance Assessment Task Force will conduct a comprehensive training of both the assessment and Independent Verification teams before the assessment is conducted. The objective of the training will be to ensure that all team members have internalized the performance assessment manual, including the rationale behind the process, the scoring and means of verification of the performance measures. One of the elements that will be emphasized is the need for maintaining credibility of the assessment systems and team members will therefore be required to sign the Code of Ethics for the assessment. During the training, understanding of the task will be harmonized and data collection templates further refined and check lists for assessment drawn from the manual will be up-dated and linked with the particular year for assessment.

4 Collection of Data to Inform the Assessment Process

4.1 Collection of data from secondary sources at the national level

To ensure that the assessment system is cost-effective, data regarding performance measures that can be collected from secondary sources will be collected at the national level. The MDAs from which secondary data will be collected are summarized in the table below.

Table 3: The MDAs from which secondary data will be collected

No	Area	MDA to be Visited
1.	LG Planning and Financial Management	- Office of the Auditor General (OAG) - Internal Auditor General - MoFPED
2.	LG Human Resource Management	- MoPS - MoLG
3.	Project Execution	- MoH (Engineering Unit) - MoES (CMU) - MOWT
4.	Environment and social Management	- NEMA - MoGLSD
5.	Health	- MoH
6.	Education	- MoES (DES)
7.	Water Management	- MoWE
8.	Micro-scale irrigation	- MAAIF

The assessment team will compile LG draft reports identifying areas that need to be further clarified during the field-work. This will be done in conjunction with the desk-based collection of information for the review of the compliance with the minimum access conditions. During the training of the assessment teams contact focal points in various MDAs and other agencies will be provided to facilitate data availability.

4.2 Field based LG Performance Assessment

This will take place from September- December every year. The model of the field assessment will involve:

- a) Entry meeting: When commencing the LG-PA in each LG, the Consultant will meet/get in contact with the core management team in each LG and present the full Consultant's team, affirm itinerary and ensure agreement of the LGPA timeline.
- b) Data collection from the District/Municipality and a sample of LLGs and facilities: The respective LGPA team members will visit all participating LGs in their cluster and undertake the assessment process as per the LG PA Manual. The teams are expected to visit and spend two days in each Local Government. The working style of the assessors should be friendly but firm, with opportunities to provide advice to the LGs during the process. If either the individual or documentary evidence is not available by the time of the assessment, then it should be deemed not available.
- c) Exit meeting/session to highlight the emerging findings, seek clarifications and give the LG an opportunity to provide more information. The Consultant will strictly use a pre-determined format to present at the exit meeting, take minutes of the meeting and fill the Exit Form (to be provided) which will be signed by the CAO/TC with comments from the LG.
- d) Compiling of the LG Performance Assessment Reports which will be a detailed report per LG, consolidating performance findings and scores from both the desk-based review and field work. Each assessor shall compile the findings and up-load in the Online Performance Assessment Management System (OPAMs) not later than 2 days after the assessment of each LG.
- e) Each contracted firm must have an Internal Quality Assurance (QA) person per cluster to review the reports done by the assessors and save the results as "complete" not later than 5 days after the field work in a LG. The process of compiling the reports will be automated to ensure standardization, make the process easier, allow for deeper analysis and better publication of the results.

4.3 Reporting

Based on the above process and consultations, the LG PA team will provide a report of the results up-loaded in the OPAMs.

5 Quality Assurance and Results Verification

5.1 Spot Checks

The spot check will among other issues review a sample of LGs and their assessments, and review whether the LG PA teams are in place and operation as per TOR, duration of the field work, sampling and assessment procedures followed, working styles, and procedures. The Spot Check Teams will be composed of experienced members from the LG PA task force and will work in sub-teams.

The spot check will provide detailed reports, on the findings and observations as well as recommendations for the future assessment procedures, using a reporting format developed by the Task Force with core findings and recommendations. This will also provide observations on the weaker and strong areas of LGs performance, and input to the Performance Improvement planning.

The report from the spot check should be ready by the team leaders for the spot check teams (with input from each team member), and be presented and discussed in the LG PA Task force as well as in the FD Technical Committee.

5.2 Independent Verification of Process and Results

The purpose of quality assurance (QA) is to verify whether the process and results of the LGPA conducted by the Assessment Team(s) are valid, reliable, and hence overall credible. To achieve this the QA firm will undertake the following tasks:

- a) Participate in the training to be organized by the Office of the Prime Minister and conducted by the LG PA Task Force. The objective of the training will be to ensure that **all** team members have internalized the LG PA manual, including the rationale behind the process, the scoring and means of verification of the minimum conditions and performance measures. One of the elements that will be emphasized is the need for maintaining credibility of the assessment system and QA team members will therefore be required to sign the Code of Ethics for this role before executing the assignment.
- b) Review and verify the LG PA team composition prior to their departure to the field, against their team members (experts) indicated in the technical proposal.
- c) Prepare and submit a draft Inception Report to OPM which will present the QA findings regarding (b) above and an indicative mobilization plan, with a schedule for secondary data collection and review, amongst others.
- d) Collection and thorough review of requisite data from secondary sources at the national level as stipulated in the LG PA Manual.
- e) Sample LGs to be visited: With the guidance of OPM, progressively sample LGs per assessment cluster to be visited by the QA team, with justification for selection, for prior approval by the client. The sampling will be done progressively to allow for review of reports, discussion, and reconciliation with the assessment firms, facilitated by the Local Government Performance Assessment Task Force (LGPA

TF)².

- f) Conduct field-based Quality Assurance of LG Performance Assessment. This will involve:
- i. Entry meeting: When commencing the LG-PA QA in each LG, the Consultant will meet/get in contact with the core management team in each LG and present the full Consultant's team, affirm itinerary and ensure agreement of the LGPA QA timeline.
 - ii. The QA team shall check whether the LGPA team mobilization in the field is identical to the one presented by the assessment firm(s) during procurement and orientation training of assessors, carried out by the Task Force and check their working process/style. If firms have presented different persons, OPM should ask them to stop the affected personnel and replace the right persons (this should be within a limited time frame or else their contract is terminated, or other contractual sanctions will be undertaken).
 - iii. Data collection from the District/Municipality and a sample of LLGs and facilities: The respective QA team will visit the sampled LGs for QA (same sample LGs as for the LG PA). **They will undertake the assessment process as per the LG PA Manual but with use of the results of the LG PA team as the starting point for reference.** The teams are expected to visit and spend two days in a Local Government to enable comparison of the results.
 - iv. Exit meeting/session to, seek clarifications and give the LG an opportunity to provide more information. The Consultant will strictly use a pre-determined format to present at the exit meeting, take minutes of the meeting and fill the Exit Form which will be signed by the CAO/TC with comments from the LG.
 - v. Compiling of the LG QA Performance Assessment Reports which will be a detailed report per LG, consolidating performance findings and scores from both the desk-based review and field work. Each QA team member shall compile the findings and up-load in the Online Performance Assessment Management System (OPAMs) using the QA format no later than 2 days after the assessment of each LG. The QA format in OPAMs will provide for reporting against the Assessment reports submitted as "complete" by the assessors, exploring the reasons for any deviations in results (if any) and with a section requiring the opinion of the QA based on their findings³. The contracted firm must have an internal reviewer of their reports before they are saved in OPAMS as "complete" no later than 1 day after the field work in a LG. The process of compiling the reports will be automated as much as possible to ensure standardization, make comparison with the LG PA reports easier, allow for a section to adduce the opinion of the QA based on the LGPA results posted thus far.

² Sample of the first half of LGs to be quality assured should be done towards the end of week 1 of the LGPA and the 2nd half after week 3 of the LGPA, subject to direction by OPM.

³ A specific format will be provided.

- g) Each of the QA sub-teams are expected to cover 2 sampled LGs per week, compile a report on those, with findings, and comparison of results with the LG PA team, provide narrative for reasons for any deviation, and present at a meeting convened by the LG PA Task Force to reconcile the findings with the assessment firm(s) in the following week. Based on this the IVA will meet with the Task Force to review findings and identify major deviations in results if any. The LG PA Task Force will follow up on the deviations during the spot checks. Based on the outcome of such a meeting and spot check findings the assessment firm(s) will uphold the exercise as is, adjust where recommended or, if there are major deviations, be required to do re-assessment of LG(s) in question. Similarly, the IVA team may be requested to review original findings and evidence.
- h) Compile a synthesis report summarizing key highlights of the findings and scores for all LGs sampled, comparison with the scores of the LGPA and narrative on each indicator of reasons for deviations and providing a succinct opinion on the validity of the LG PA results. This report will also encompass a review of changes made by the LG PA, based on the findings from the IVA, and the subsequent Task Force interventions and whether these adhere with the IVA findings. This report will follow a format provided by OPM before the exercise.

6 Review, Approval, Use and Dissemination of the Results

6.1 Grievance Handling

The LGs will have a short window to submit grievances as the system has other inbuilt quality checks and balances to ensure neutrality and objectivity as outlined below.

- a) The LGs should raise issues during the exit meeting focusing on processes and evidence (and sign Exit Form);
- b) LGs will be given an opportunity to review their respective reports online (OPAMS) after the results have been approved by the LG PA Task Force;
- c) The LGs will communicate grievance(s) (if any) in writing by the CAO/TC with supporting evidence to the Secretariat of the Performance Assessment Task force, Permanent Secretary OPM within a period not exceeding 5 working days from the time when the reports have been opened for LGs to review;
- d) The LG PA Task Force will consider the grievances provide feedback to the LGs.
- e) The LG PA Task Force will request the assessment teams in writing to make any adjustments that may arise from addressing of the grievances.

6.2 Approval of results

The LG Task Force will send the final LG PA results to the Fiscal Decentralisation (FD)– TC for approval. The FD-TC will review and discuss the recommendations made by the LG PA Task Force and approve the final results of the LG Performance Assessment. Results will be shared with FD-SC comprised of the core Permanent Secretaries for the performance-based grant system (OPM, MoPS, MoFPED, MoLG, MoLHUD; MoWE, MoH, MAAIF, MoES) and the Secretary of LGFC and the political oversight committee for buy-in and information.

6.3 Synthesis Report

Based on the reports from the LG PA firm, the LG Performance Assessment Task Force with its Secretariat under OPM, will produce the synthesis report, purely based on the results up-loaded in the OPAMs.

6.4 Use of Results and Impact

The results of the assessment will be used to:

- a) Allocate part of the development grants
- b) Inform performance improvement planning

6.4.1 Use of the results to allocate part of the development grants

The allocation formulae for the performance grants will have two components:

- Component 1: Allocation drawn on a need-based formula:
- Component 2: Allocation based on the performance assessment results computed as: % of Minimum Conditions met multiplied by the results of performance measures, divided by 100 and then weighted with the basic formula, see below.

Table 4: Weight of the basic component and performance component as at FY 2020/21

Grant	Ad hoc/core minimum allocations	Performance Grant	
		Basic Formula %age	Performance element (% MC met X PM score/100 then weighted with the basic formula)
DDEG	N/A	50	50
Education	Costs for construction of secondary schools	50	50
Health	Costs for up-grading health centre II to III.	0	100
Water and Environment	NA	50	50
Micro-scale Irrigation	NA	60	40

Table: Factoring in of compliance with minimum conditions (“key performance measures”):

For example, if

Percentage (%) of MCs met is as	With the PM Scores being (%) – example	Then the Final Score will be (%) which must be weighted to the basic formula
100	70	70 points
75	70	52.5 points
50	70	35 points
25	70	17.5 points
0	70	0 points

The implications are:

- If all MCs are met, then the final score will be equal to the score from the PMs.
- Every MCs not met reduces the final score.
- If all MCs are not met, then the final score is 0 irrespective of the PM score. Therefore, the LG forfeits the performance component of the grant if it does not meet all the MCs.
- This system stresses the importance of MCs (and give this a significant impact) on a continuous calibrated scale, rather than a system of on/off to the entire performance component of the grant.

6.4.2 Use of results for performance improvement planning

The results of the LG PA exercise are used to support the development and implementation of (i) performance improvement plans for LGs that have performed poorly; and (ii) thematic performance improvement plans.

6.5 Dissemination of Results

The results will be disseminated through websites, (OTIMS/OPAMS) publications, and feed back to each of the LGs. The results will also be included in the GAPR. A national dissemination event will also be organised by OPM.

7 Institutional Arrangements and Timing

7.1 Institutional Arrangements

The table below shows the main tasks of each of the stakeholders in the assessment system.

Table 5: Main Tasks of Stakeholders in the LG PA System

Stakeholder	Indicative Tasks
LG PA Task Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop and review the LG PA Manual; - Training of the contracted Assessment Firm and IVA - Conduct spot checks of the LG PA exercise - Review and recommend the results for approval to the FD TC
FD TC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Verifies and approve the results of the LG PA and informs FD SC
OPM (Secretariat)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordinates and chairs the LG PA task force - Operates the OPAMs - Guiding and supervising the contracted assessment and IVA firms - Coordinates the work on the synthesis report and publication of results - Use the results in the GAPR and other M&E tools - Follow-up of actions and recommendations
MoLG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordinates the performance improvement planning and follow-up on results
MoFPED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports on all aspects of finance, including timely releases of funds against results - Uses the results for allocation of grants - Uses results for general LG monitoring and evaluation systems
Sector ministries including MoPS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support the LG PA and sharing of information on guidelines, support PIP, and follow-up - Use the results to explore areas where legal and institutional framework as well as guidance should be strengthened - Develop mitigating measures to enhance performance
LGs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide information for the LG PA - Use results to address capacity gaps and performance improvements - Follow-up on results, and develop PIPs
OAG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides audit opinion of LGs to be used for the LG PA
Private assessors (teams)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct neutral and objective assessment
Private IVA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide quality assurance of the results

7.2 Timing of Activities

The table below provides a snapshot of the overall process and timing⁴.

Table 6: Overview of the timing of the assessment of HLGs

Core steps in the LG PA and QA process	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov.	Dec	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	June
Team mobilized for the LG PA and the IVA											
Training of the LG PA and IVA teams											
Data collection central level											
Field level assessment											
Review of grievances based on draft reports											
Quality assurance (through-out the process)											
Spot checks by LG Task Force (through-out)											
Reconciliation between LG PA & QA reports											
Incorporation of audit results of LGs											
Finalization of the LG PA											
Final review in LG PA task force											
Approval by FD TC											
Impact on grant allocations											
Synthesis report											
Communication to LGs											
Follow up on results, PIP, guidelines etc.											

⁴ Due to up-start of the new LG PA system, the timing is indicative and may be adjusted as need be.

SECTION 3: INDICATORS AND ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE

8 Crosscutting Performance Assessment

8.1 Crosscutting Minimum Conditions

Performance Area	No.	Minimum Condition	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
A) Human Resource Management and Development	1.	<p>The LG is compliant if it has recruited (where there is a wage bill provision) or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments as below:</p> <p>All HoDs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deputy CAO/Deputy Town Clerk 2. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer 3. District Planner/Senior Planner 4. District Engineer/Principal Engineer 5. District Health Officer/Municipal Medical Officer of Health Services 6. District Education Officer/Principal Education Officer 7. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer 8. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer 9. District Community Development Officer/ Principal CDO 10. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer <p>Other critical staff:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. A Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer). 12. Principal Human Resource Officer 13. A Senior Environment Officer and Senior Land Management Officer. 14. A Senior Accountant 15. Principal Internal Auditor for Districts and Senior Internal Auditor for MCs 16. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) 	<p>From the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, obtain the appointment letters of the District/Municipal Council department's staff as listed to establish that they are substantively recruited.</p> <p>In case the positions are not filled, get evidence from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division that the LG requested for secondment from the Central Government (CG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment letters • Copy(ies) of letter(s) from LG to CG requesting for secondment of staff to District/Municipal Council departments.

Performance Area	No.	Minimum Condition	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
		17. District/Municipal Inspector of Schools		
	2.	The LG is compliant if it has recruited (where there is a wage bill provision) or formally requested for secondment of staff for all essential positions in every LLG namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Senior Assistant Secretary b. A Community Development Officer or Senior CDO in case of Town Councils. c. A Senior Accounts Assistant or an Accounts Assistant. 	From the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, obtain the appointment letters of the LLG staff as listed to establish that they are substantively recruited. In case the positions are not filled, get evidence from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division that the LG requested for secondment from the Ministry of Local Government (MoLG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment letters • Copy of letter from LG to MoLG requesting for secondment of staff to District for deployment to LLGs.
B) Environment and Social Requirements	3.	The LG is compliant if it has made allocations for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards to the departments of Natural Resources and Community Based Services.	From the Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer obtain and review the LG Approved Budget for the current FY and check whether allocations have been made to Natural Resources and Community Based Services departments for implementation of environmental and social safeguards as per guidelines.	LG Approved Budget for the current FY
	4.	The LG is compliant if it 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. The LG is compliant if it has carried out: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening and; ii. Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG). 	From the LG Environment officer and CDO, obtain the Environmental and Social Screening Form (or where applicable: ESIAs reports, ESMPs) for all projects implemented using the DDEG for the previous FY, to verify whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E&S screening was completed, ESIA/ESMPs prepared and costed as required and implemented/followed up where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and Social screening Forms • ESIAs reports • Annual Expenditure Report
C) Financial Management and Reporting	5.	The LG is compliant if it does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.	From the Office of the Auditor General (OAG) obtain and review the list of LGs which have been audited to establish the audit opinion. <i>Note: The audit results are supposed to be ready by the end of December. Therefore, this will be the last issue to be reviewed in January.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audit Report • Annual Financial statement from previous FY
	6.	The LG is compliant if it has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General	From MoFPED's Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled "Actions to	MoFPED's Inventory of LG submissions of statements

Performance Area	No.	Minimum Condition	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
		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).	Address Internal Auditor General’s findings”, Check whether a LG submitted a complete response to the Internal Auditor and Auditor General’s report(s).	entitled “Actions to Address Internal Auditor General’s findings”
	7.	The LG is compliant if it has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY	From MoFPED inventory/schedule of LG submissions of performance contracts, check dates of submission and issuance of acknowledgement receipts.	MoFPED inventory/schedule of LG submissions of performance contracts From the Uganda budget website: www.budget.go.ug , check and compare recorded date therein with date of LG submission to confirm.
	8.	The LG is compliant if it has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31 , of the current Financial Year	From MoFPED’s official record/inventory of LG submissions of Annual Performance Reports to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the Annual Performance Report.	MoFPED’s official record/inventory of LG submissions of Annual Performance Reports
	9.	The LG is compliant if it has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31 , of the current Financial Year	From MoFPED’s official record/ inventory of LG submissions of QBPRs to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the Quarterly Performance Reports: <i>Note: Timely submission of each quarterly report is not a minimum condition. However, by August 31, all quarterly reports should be available).</i>	MoFPED’s official record/ inventory of LG submissions of Quarterly Budget Performance Reports

8.2 Crosscutting Performance Measures

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
A. Local Government Service Delivery Results. Maximum points: 14 points on this thematic area	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 	From the Planner receive the list of all projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select a sample of 3 previously completed projects, e.g. a classroom, health center, park, service etc. funded by DDEG and review if the structure or service is used by beneficiaries as per design/ profile. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AWP for previous FY Annual budget performance report for previous FY Review sample of 3 projects financed by DDEG in the previous FY.
	2.	Service Delivery Performance Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	a. If the average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment ⁵ : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> by more than 10%: Score 3 5-10% increase: Score 2 Below 5 % Score 0 	From OPM receive and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The approved results from the annual performance assessments of the LLGs for the current year as well as the previous assessment year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance assessment results from the report produced by OPM
			b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100%: Score 3 80-99%: Score 2 Below 80%: 0 	From MoFPED obtain and review the annual budget performance report to determine whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investment projects implemented with DDEG funding in the previous FY were completed within the planned FY as per the AWP. <p><i>See <u>Note 1</u> for calculation of the % and weighting.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AWP Annual budget performance report
	3.	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget,	From the Planner obtain a list of DDEG projects, select a sample of 3 and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether these are within the eligible expenditures as defined in the DDEG guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AWP for the previous FY Annual budget performance report for the previous FY

⁵ Note: Scores can only be provided when there has been two years of assessments conducted of LLGs. Hence a LG will be availed a score 0 until then. This is similar for all LGs and will therefore not impact on the grant allocations for each LG before this performance measure kicks in.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			and implementation guidelines: Score 2 ⁶ or else score 0.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DDEG grant guidelines for the previous FY
			b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	From the Works Department, obtain and sample 3 (or all if less than 3) DDEG funded projects for the previous FY and calculate the variations in the contract price to determine whether they are all within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sample DDEG funded infrastructure projects for the last FY Cost estimates as per the AWP
	4.	<i>Achievement of standards</i> <i>No score provided on this indicator, as it is only for M&E and PIP purpose.</i>	<i>% of LLGs meeting equipment and facilitation minimum norms, i.e. a) % having at least one motorcycle and b) % with a personal or tablet computer and c) % with internet connectivity, available for use by CDOs, and d) % with one motorcycle available for the SAS.</i> <i>NA: No score provided on this measure, as it is only for M&E and PIP purpose.</i>	<i>From the CFO receive and review the Board of Survey Report to get an overview of the assets of the LLGs and calculate the % fulfilled for each of the equipment/ facilitation means (a-d)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assets registers Budget performance reports
B. Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum points: 12 points on this thematic area	5.	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	From the HRM Division obtain the staff structure and staff lists for LLGs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Take a random sample of 3 LLGs and review whether the staffing is in place as per the minimum standards and staff list 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LLG Staff lists for the current FY

⁶ In cases where only one score is provided, "other instances/non-fulfilment of the text" will be ranked as: Score 0.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<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><i>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</i></p>	<p>From the Planner receive and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether there are reports on infrastructure constructed and information provided within these Take random sample of 3 infrastructure projects completed last year or under completion and compare the actual level of completion with the reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AWP Reports Sample of 3 projects.
	6.	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement⁷</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If difference in results is less than 5 % and no LLG is above 10% deviation Score: 4 If difference in results is 10 % or less and no LLG is above 15% deviation: Score 2 If neither of the above score 0 	<p>From the CAO/TC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receive the results from the LLGs performance assessment made by the national assessment firm and the district/ municipality. Compare and calculate the average deviation in scores between the two and review the average deviation as well as whether there are LLGs with large deviation. <p><i>(Note only applicable when the system of LLG assessments has been introduced)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment results conducted by the District/Municipality Assessment results from the National Assessment Team (sample basis)

⁷ Note: For parts of this performance measure, points can only be given in the subsequent assessments. However, until achievement, rate 0 should be given. This is similar for all LGs, and will therefore not impact on the relative scores and grant allocations before the system of LLG assessment is introduced.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<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. Score: 2 or else score 0</p> <p>c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the HRM division obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The performance improvement plans and implementation records to assess whether 30 % of the lowest performance LLGs as determined in the last LG PA have been targeted in planning and actual execution. <p><i>Note only applicable when the system of LLG assessments has been introduced)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG PA report Performance improvement plans Implementation and progress reports
C. Human Resource Management and Development Maximum points: 9 points on this thematic area	7.	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>From MoPs and MoFPED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain the letters from the HLG with the requested staffing requirements and review the timing of the submission. <p><i>Note on timing: If assessment is conducted in e.g. October 2020, the submission deadline is the month before (30th Sept 2020) for the staffing requirements for the coming FY (2021/22).</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LG Staff requirement letters to MoPS
	8.	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	<p>From the HRM Division obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tracking reports and analysis of staff attendance as per guidelines by MPS CSI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tracking reports and analysis
			b. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:	<p>From the HRM Division obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review personnel files to assess whether the HoDs were appraised during the previous FY. Whether administrative rewards and sanctions were implemented, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff structures Staff lists Performance plan Appraisal reports Personnel files

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: Score 1 - (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines: Score 1 - Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional. Score 1 or else 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • and whether a CC for staff grievance has been established and is operational (i.e. has considered cases). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of members of the consultative committee and minutes of its meetings
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Critical Staff are adequately tooled to perform their functions</i> a) <i>At the HLG level, each head of department has access to: 1) one functional motorcycle or vehicle and 2) a personal computer which has access to the internet.</i> b) <i>The Procurement Unit, Finance Office and Inspectors have adequate space to keep procurement, financial and inspection records.</i> c) <i>Registry/records- have adequate space for management of employee records</i> 	<p><i>From the HRM Division obtain staffing lists and registers of the available transport means and equipment and review the procurement unit, the FO, and inspectors to ascertain adequacy for records and operations.</i></p> <p><i>For reporting purpose (only) calculate the % of HoDS with:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>Functional motorcycle</i> b) <i>Personal computer with access to internet</i> <p><i>Review whether the following functions have adequate space for records (Yes/No):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>Procurement office</i> b) <i>Finance office</i> c) <i>Inspectors</i> <p><i>Note: Emphasis should be on staff that handle assets - to ensure that the assets are recorded, operated, maintained and reported. There should be documentary evidence that all this has been done.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff lists • Assets register

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<i>No scoring should be given on this performance measure as it is only for M&E and PIP purpose.</i>		
	9.	Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	From the HRM Unit obtain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The list of all staff that were recruited and determine whether they accessed the salary payroll during the previous FY, not later than 2 months after appointment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Salary payroll Recruited staff lists
	10.	Pension Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	From the HRM Unit obtain and check: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IPPS to determine whether staff accessed the pension payroll within two months of retirement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pension payroll Retired staff list
D. Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services. Maximum points: 10 points on this thematic area	11.	Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0	From the CFO obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether DDEG to LLGs were transferred in full as per the requirements in the budget for the previous FY. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual work-plan and budget Release letters Documentation for transfer of funds
			b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget: Score: 2 or else score 0	From the CFO obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the CFO/SFO obtain and review records of when warranting/verification was done for the previous FY releases of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs and review whether these were conducted timely (Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED) . 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copies of warrants submitted to MoFPED for the previous FY

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<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>From MoFPED obtain and review the LLG allocation release breakdowns for all the 4 quarters of the previous FY;</p> <p>From the CAO/TC obtain quarterly correspondence to LLGs on DDEG releases.</p> <p>From 3 sampled LLGs, obtain and check the dates of invoicing and correspondence from CAO/TC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish whether, for each quarter, the CAO/TC invoiced and communicated releases to LLGs within 5 working days from the release date. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LLG allocation release breakdowns for all the 4 quarters of the previous FY CAO/TC quarterly correspondence to LLGs on DDEG releases LLG records on receipt of DDEG releases
	12.	<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: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the Planner obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The supervision or mentoring reports to assess whether all LLGs have been supervised or mentored at least quarterly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field monitoring reports
			<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: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the Planner obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the monitoring reports were discussed in the TPC and evidence for corrective actions and follow-up (each quarterly meeting should discuss and follow-up on findings). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field monitoring reports Minutes from meetings in TPC Correspondence to LLGs from the District/Municipality on corrective actions to take (administrative circulars)
<p>E. Investment Management</p> <p>Maximum points: 20 points on this thematic area</p>	13.	<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</p>	<p>From CFO obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the assets register covers all assets and is up to date (note even if a LG is on IFMIS, it must be able to print out the assets register) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assets register and prints from e.g. IFMIS

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<p>in the accounting manual: 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>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: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>From the CFO obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the Board of Survey Report and/or the assets strategic plan of the previous FY was used as a source of guidance on procurement, maintenance, and disposal of assets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board of Survey Report for the previous FY Assets strategic plan
			<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>From MoLHUD establish whether the district/MLG submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD.</p> <p><i>From the Physical Planner obtain and review (not for scoring):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the committee has submitted a Physical Development Plan that was approved by Council to the National Physical Planning Board. List of the members of the Physical Planning Committee to establish whether it is properly and fully constituted. Building Plan, Registration Book and minutes of physical planning committee to determine whether all the submissions for new investments were considered within 30 days after submission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved Physical Development Plan Approved Annual work plan Plans submission register Minutes of the physical planning committee Minutes of National Physical Planning Board Appointment letters for the members of Physical Planning Committees
			<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>d. Evidence that the District/Municipality has</p>	<p>From the planner obtain and review desk appraisal reports:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LG Dev't Plan Appraisal reports (desk appraisals)

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			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 minimum 80 % of the projects are derived from the LGDP: Score 2 or else score 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish whether the desk appraisals were conducted and if investments were derived from the LG Development Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Screening notes
			For DDEG financed projects: 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: Score 2 or else score 0	From the Planner sample and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 projects (or all if less) to check whether field appraisals were conducted and if scrutiny for technical feasibility environmental and socially acceptability and designs customized for investment projects was done. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field appraisal reports
			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: Score 1 or else score 0.	From the planner check whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The minutes from the TPC indicate that all project profiles for investments were discussed by the TPC and check whether they adhere to the formats in the LG planning guideline (use a sample of 3 projects). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AWP Project appraisal reports Planning guidelines Project profiles
			g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put	From the planner and Environment Officer review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the LG during the desk and field-based appraisals and had screened projects for the current FY for environmental and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appraisal reports (desk and field appraisals) LGDP

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists: Score 2 or else score 0	social impact and mitigation measures put in place where required. (sample 3 investment projects, or all projects if the LG has less projects)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Filled E&S Screening forms Mitigation measures Sampled projects
	14.	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved annual work plan, budget and procurement plan Score 1 or else score 0	From the Procurement Unit obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The procurement plan and check that it is as per regulations and that it covers all investments (sample 3 projects for review) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AWP, budget, and Procurement plan for current FY
			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	From the PDU obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes from the meetings in the contracts committee to determine whether all DDEG infrastructure projects and the respective bidding documents were approved before commencement. (sample 3 projects) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes from the Contract Committee
			c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	From the PDU obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the LG has established the Project Implementation Team⁸ (PIT) as per guidelines. Contract Management Plan in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copies of letters from the CAO/TC designating members of the Project Implementation Team.
			d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG	From the Works Department obtain information and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A sample 3 projects implemented by DDEG funds and review evidence that projects implemented followed the technical designs (also review if there are e.g. no major or minor defects such as surface cracks in floor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field reviews Completion reports

⁸ The project implementation team comprises of: (i) Contract Manager; (ii) Project Manager; (iii) clerk of works, Environment Officer, Community Development Officer & Labour Officer

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	screed, splash apron and masonry works, peeling of finishes off masonry surfaces and cases of poor finishing of works, grille door off hinges and no handles on manhole covers etc were visible in the project facilities in the sampled projects).	
			e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	From the district/municipal engineer obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the technical officers (DE/ME, environmental officer, CDO) have supervised each project (site meetings with contractors) prior to verification and certification of works Review a sample of 3 projects which all must comply. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement files AWP Certification files Completion certificates Signed E&S compliance certification forms Supervision reports
			f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement): Score 1 or else score 0	From the Procurement Unit obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the works procurement files for the previous FY and determine whether they were appropriately certified i.e. interim and completion certificates issued for all projects based on technical supervision and whether the contracts are paid within specified time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement files AWP Certification files Completion certificates
			g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: Score 1 or else 0	From the Procurement Unit review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The contracts register and check whether there are completed files for all procurements (sample). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement Plan for current FY Contracts register Procurement files
F. Environment and Social Safeguards. Maximum points: 16 points on this thematic area	15.	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental	From the budget website or public displays at District/Municipal offices, establish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the LG has designated a person and that there is evidence that the responsible person has been designated to coordinate response to the feedback/complaints and whether a centralized GRC has been established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget web-site and displays at LG office Letter designating the person including the tasks Minutes from the GRC

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			heads/staff as relevant. Both i & ii complied with: Score: 2 or else score 0		
			b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices. If so: Score 2 or else 0	From the designated person obtain information on whether the district /municipality has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A specified 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 the public display of information at district/municipal offices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal description of the CRD system; Centralized complaints log; Web-sits, public display stands
			c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress. If so: Score 1 or else 0	From the websites or other public means review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Web-sits Public display stands
	16.	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 a) LG Development Plans, b) annual work plans and budgets: Both (a)+(b) complied with: Score 1 or else score 0 b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation	From the planner obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets (select a sample of 3 investments for review and all must comply to get a score) Whether enhanced DDEG guidelines have been disseminated to LLGs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LG Development Plan AWP Budgets Enhanced DDEG guidelines

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			(green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management score 1 or else 0		
			<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: score 3 or else score 0</p> <p>d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change. Score 3 or else score 0 (i.e. max 6 points on this indicator)</p>	<p>From the Environmental Office obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Screening forms, costing of ESMP, and from the Procurement Unit whether the costed ESMP has been incorporated in the BoQs, and contract/bidding documents and examples of costing of additional costs of addressing climate change adaptation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E & S Screening forms ESIAs/ ESMPs BoQ Bidding document and BoQ incorporating ESHS provisions Contract documents
			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: Score 1 or else score 0	<p>From the PDU or Planner obtain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A sample of at least 3 projects to check whether there is proof of land ownership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EMSP review reports Certification forms Screening files.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 1 or else score 0	From the Environmental Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESMPs for investment projects • E & S monitoring reports • Sample 3 projects which all have to comply to get score 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMSPs • E & S monitoring reports
			g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 1 or else score 0	From the Environmental Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and Social compliance certificates with EO's signature • Payment certificate • (sample 3 projects which all must comply to get score). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed E & S Compliance Certification forms • Monitoring reports • Payment records
G. Financial Management	17.	LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment: Score 2 or else score 0 	From CFO obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bank reconciliations and establish that they are done and up to-date. <p><i>(Note that up to-date means maximum of one-month delay). Review a sample of months, including the final month of the FY. In case there are multiple bank accounts, make a sample of 3 of these.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bank reconciliations from previous FY and reconciliations for the months prior to the assessment for current FY
	18.	LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90 Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	From Internal audit obtain and review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The internal audit reports • Minutes from IA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IA reports for previous FY • Minutes from IA meetings • Submission letters
			b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the	From the Internal audit obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The internal audit reports • Letters on follow up on IA recommendations • Review of minutes from IA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IA reports • Minutes from IA meetings • Submission letters

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from <u>all quarterly audit</u> reports. Score 1 or else score 0		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LG PAC minutes
			c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: Score 1 or else score 0	From the Internal audit obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The internal audit reports Letters on follow up on IA recommendations Submissions to LG accounting office and LG PAC Minutes from LG PAC on how they followed up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IA reports Minutes from IA meetings Submission letters LG PAC minutes
H. Local Revenues Maximum 6 score for this performance area.	19.	LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio) Maximum 2 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2. If deviation is more than +/- 10 %: Score 0. 	From the CFO, obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original budget and budget execution reports to determine the ratio of revenue budgeted that has been collected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual (original) budget for previous FY Annual financial statements for previous FY
	20.	The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one) Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 is more than 10 %: score 2. If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	From the CFO obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual financial accounts for the previous two FYs to calculate the percentage increase on OSR collection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual financial accounts for previous year and previous year but one.
	21.	Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the 	From the CFO obtain and review annual financial accounts to determine whether:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual financial statement from previous FY.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
		Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.	previous FY: score 2 or else score 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The HLG has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues 	
I. Transparency and Accountability. Maximum points: 7 points on this thematic area	22.	LG shares information with citizens Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0	From the PDU obtain evidence for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publicized information to citizens on awarded contracts and amounts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notice boards and other means of publication e.g. website
			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	From the Planner obtain evidence for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publicized information to citizens on LG performance assessment results and implications reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notice boards and other means of publication e.g. website
			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	From the Planner obtain and review evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meetings of feed-back to the public on status of project implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of meetings with LLGs and with the public Scripts for radio programs, etc.
			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	From the CFO and notice boards, review evidence that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i), (ii) and (iii) have been conducted and that information is available at point of time for LG PA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notice boards Other publication means
	23.	Reporting to IGG Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	From the clerk to the council obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Report on IGG with issues and measures taken Minutes from the council meetings and review actions taken 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report on IGG issues Council minutes

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<p>the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p>		

9 Education Performance Assessment

9.1 Education Minimum Conditions

Performance Area	No.	Minimum Condition	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
A) Human Resource Management and Development	1.	<p>The LG is compliant if it has substantively recruited (where there is a wage bill provision) or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) District Education Officer/ Principal Education Officer b) District/Municipal Inspector of Schools 	<p>From the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, obtain the appointment letters of the District Education/Municipal Office staff as listed to establish that they are substantively recruited.</p> <p>In case the positions are not filled, get evidence from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division that the LG requested for secondment from the Ministry of Education (MoES).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment letters • Copy of letter from LG to MoES requesting for secondment of staff to District/Municipal Education Office.
B) Environment and Social Requirements	2.	<p>Prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG is compliant if it has carried out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment. • Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) 	<p>From the LG Environment officer, obtain the Environmental and Social Screening Form (or where applicable: ESIAs reports, ESMPs) for all Education projects for the previous FY, to verify whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E & S screening was completed, ESIAs/ESMPs prepared and costed and implemented/followed up. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and Social screening Forms • ESIAs reports • Costed ESMPs

9.2 Education Performance Measures

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
A. Local Government Service Delivery Results Maximum 24 score for this performance area	1.	<i>Learning Outcomes:</i> The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates. Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If improvement by more than 5% score 3 - Between 1 and 5% score 2 - No improvement score 0 	From the District Education Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PLE results for the previous school year but one and the previous year • Calculate the percentage of pupils that passed between grade 1 and 3 for both years • Then calculate the percentage increase between the previous school year but one and the previous year 	- UNEB PLE Results
			b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If improvement by more than 5% score 3 - Between 1 and 5% score 2 - No improvement score 0 	From the District Education Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UCE results for USE schools only for the previous school year but one and the previous year • Calculate the percentage of students that passed between grade 1 and 3 for both years • Then calculate the percentage increase between the previous school year but one and the previous year 	- UNEB UCE Results
	2.	<i>Service Delivery Performance:</i> Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment. Maximum 4 points	a) <i>Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If improvement by more than 5% score 2 - Between 1 and 5% score 1 - No improvement score 0 	<i>From the District Planner obtain:</i> <i>The LLG performance report and calculate the percentage change in score of the education LLG performance assessment</i>	<i>Report on LLG performance assessment</i>
			b) <i>Average score in the school performance assessment has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If improvement by more than 5% score 2 - Between 1 and 5% score 1 - No improvement score 0 	- <i>From the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) obtain and review LG's performance in the school performance assessment (SPA) from the previous year and calculate percent change</i> <i>Note: To have Zero weight for Y1 & Y2</i>	<i>Annual SPA results report from DES</i>

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
	3.	<p><i>Investment Performance:</i> 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</p> <p>- Else score 0</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>c) If the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>d) Evidence that education projects were completed as per work plan in the previous FY</p> <p>- If 100% score 2</p> <p>- Between 80 – 99% score 1</p> <p>- Below 80% score 0</p>	<p>- From the District Education Office, obtain sector guidelines and determine eligible activities then review the budget performance report to establish whether the education development grant was used on eligible activities</p> <p>- From the Chief Finance Officer (CFO) obtain and review payment vouchers for all Education construction projects contracts for the previous FY to establish whether certification of works was done before the LG made payments to contractors.</p> <p>- From the District Education Office, obtain: (i) MoWT estimates; and (ii) contracts and calculate the variations in the contract price to determine whether they are within +/-20% of the MoWT estimates</p> <p>- From the District Education Office, obtain: (i) the contracts and work schedule; and (ii) budget performance report for the previous FY to determine whether education projects were completed as per work plan in the previous FY</p>	<p>- Budget Performance Reports</p> <p>- Education sector guidelines</p> <p>- Payment vouchers to contractors</p> <p>- Engineers Estimates</p> <p>- Contracts</p> <p>- Contracts; and</p> <p>- Budget performance report</p>
	4.	<p><i>Achievement of standards:</i> 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> <p>- If 100%: score 3</p> <p>- If 80- 99%: score 2</p> <p>- If 70 – 79% score: 1,</p> <p>- Below 70% score 0</p> <p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <p>- If above 70% score: 3</p>	<p>- From the Human Resource Office obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The staffing structure for schools • Teacher staff list • Calculate the percent of filled staff positions <p>- From the DEO, obtain list of registered UPE and USE schools; and the consolidated Schools Asset Register for both UPE and USE schools from the previous two FYs.</p>	<p>- LG approved structure</p> <p>- HRM staff registers</p> <p>- DES basic requirements and minimum standards for schools.</p>

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 - If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 - Below 50 score: 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Calculate the percent of schools that meet prescribed minimum standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - List of registered schools in performance contract - Consolidated LG school asset register
B. Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 16 score for this performance area	5.	<i>Accuracy of reported information:</i> 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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If accuracy of information is 100% score 2 - Else score: 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the LG Education office obtain teacher deployment - Sample at least 3 schools in different LLGs in a LG to verify whether the staff are in schools where they are reported deployed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher deployment list
			b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If accuracy of information is 100% score 2 - Else score: 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the LG Education office obtain information at least 3 schools per LLG and for each case, verify whether infrastructure and equipment is in place as per the consolidated asset register 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consolidated LG school asset register - Inspection reports
	6.	<i>School compliance and performance improvement:</i> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 - Between 80 – 99% score: 2 - Below 80% score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From LG, obtain and review submitted copies of annual school reports and budgets from the previous FY. - Sample at least 3 schools to establish the extent to which registered primary schools have complied with MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines and that they have submitted reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - List of registered schools in performance contract - Reconciled cash flow statement, - Annual budget and expenditure report - An asset register
			b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the LG Education office, obtain and review the inspection report from the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report on SIPs

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If 50% score: 4 - Between 30– 49% score: 2 - Below 30% score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - previous FY and identify the schools which were supported to develop SIPs - Sample 3 schools and verify whether they were supported to develop SIPs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School improvement plans in sample schools
			<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From MoES obtain and cross-check EMIS data submissions against the list of schools submitted by the LG in the performance contract. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - List of Schools from LG performance contract - EMIS data extract from MoES - List of schools from PBS and verify with that on OTIMS
C. Human Resource Management and Development Maximum 16 score for this performance area	7.	<p><i>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff:</i> 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the LG Performance Contract: i) obtain the list of schools; ii) the staff list; and establish whether the LG has budgeted for school teachers as per staffing norms/guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Performance contract - List of schools - Staff lists
			<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the DEO, obtain and review: i) the teachers’ list to establish whether teachers have been deployed as per sector guideline/staffing norms - Sample at least 3 schools to verify whether the teachers as indicated in the staff lists are deployed in those schools. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - List of schools - Staff lists - Staff attendance register
			<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,</p> <p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the DEO/HRM, information on teacher deployment - Sample at least 3 schools per sub-county and check whether the list of teachers deployed is displayed on the school notice board. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff lists and actual deployment per school on LG and school notice boards
	8.	<p><i>Performance management:</i> Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to DEO/MEO</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From DEO, obtain and review copies of H/T appraisals from SAS for the previous school year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School and head teacher lists - H/T performance plan - SAS’s H/T appraisal reports submitted to DEO

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
		the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.	b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) to HRM Score: 2 or else, score: 0	- From Human Resource Management, obtain and review copies of H/T appraisals received for the previous school year.	- Inspection report - School and head teacher lists - H/T performance plan - H/T appraisal reports
		Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans score: 2. - Else, score: 0	- From the LG HR department, obtain and review appraisals for all school inspectors and education management staff conducted in the previous FY.	- HRM staff register - Staff performance plans and appraisal reports
			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	- From the DEO/MEO, obtain and review training plan developed over the previous FY.	- LG Training plan for the Education Department
D. Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services Maximum score 20 for this performance area	9.	<i>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery:</i> 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 15 th annually. If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0	- From MoES obtain copies of LG submissions and letters communicating corrections/ revisions of school lists and enrolment numbers.	- List of schools from PBS vs. school list submitted to MoES - Letter from CAO/TC submitting or correcting list of schools and enrolment.
			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	- From the DEO obtain and review a copy of the Education sector guidelines - From the Planner, obtain and review the annual sector work plan for the previous FY alongside expenditures on the inspection and monitoring functions to check whether activities that were conducted complied to sector guidelines	- Sector Guidelines - Annual Work plan - Guidelines - Compliance reports from MoFPED
			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	- From MoFPED obtain PBS timestamp of LG warrant submission.	- PBS reports from MoFPED.
			d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within	- From MoFPED obtain and review copies of LG release circulars over the last 3 quarters, and from the LG obtain invoices	- LG Release circular from MoFPED

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<p>three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>of capitation to schools. Next, sample xx schools per sub-county to verify whether the DEO/MEO communicated/publicized within three working days of the release.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Release information on LG/School notice boards - Invoices of capitation to schools
	10.	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From DEO/MEO or DIS, obtain copies of the inspection plan and or minutes of preparatory inspection and monitoring meetings for the previous three school terms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LG inspection plan - Minutes of preparatory inspection and monitoring activities
			<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the LG inspection and monitoring reports, establish number of schools inspected and monitored from the previous three school terms, and compare with total list of registered UPE schools from PBS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School list from PBS - LG inspection plan from the previous FY - LG inspection and monitoring reports from the previous three school terms.
			<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the DEO/ MEO obtain and review: - Minutes of depart- mental meetings to determine whether: School inspection reports were discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY. - Sample 3 schools to verify whether the DIS has followed up on inspection recommendations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information from Sample schools - Minutes from Departmenta l meetings - Visitor's book at school level
			<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the LG performance contract, obtain the list of schools and sample 3 schools per subcounty to establish whether copies of the inspection reports from the previous three terms were left behind. - From DES obtain and review: A list of LGs that have submitted school inspection reports. - From DEO/MEO check whether: the DEO/MEO has a letter of acknowledgement from DES 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information from Sample schools - Minutes from Departmenta l meetings - School inspection reports - Minutes of SMC meetings - DES records on school inspection.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the Clerk to Council obtain and review: - Education sector standing committee meeting minutes – check if the council has discussed service delivery issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acknowledgement letters - Inspection reports - Minutes from sector committee meetings - Minutes from Council meetings
	11.	<p>Mobilization of parents to attract learners</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If there's evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score: 0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the LG obtain and review reports from events or meetings held with school communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minutes or reports from mobilization events held - Records of communication including posters or radio talk shows etc.
E. Investment Management	12.	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</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, score: 2, else score: 0</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, score: 1 or else, score: 0</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the LG education department obtain a copy of the asset register from the previous FY and check a sample of 3 schools in different sub-counties to validate this information. - From the LG education department obtain and review the annual work plan and ascertain alignment of plans with information from the LGDP and the eligibility criteria within the sector guidelines. - Then from the LG engineer, obtain copies of field appraisals conducted for the planned projects. - From LG engineer and environmental officer obtain and review completed copy of the project screening form/checklist: - Check a sample of 3 school construction projects to validate LG reported information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Format 1 in the Sector guidelines - LG schools' asset register - Sample of schools - LGDP - Sector Guidelines - Sector Project appraisal reports - Environmental and social safeguards screening checklist (Format 3 in the sector guidelines)
Maximum score 12 for this performance area					

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
					- Field Appraisal report in line with the checklist
	13.	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plan, score: 1, else score: 0</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 commencement of construction, score: 1, else score: 0</p> <p>c) Evidence that school construction projects constructed within the last FY were overseen by an implementation team as prescribed within the sector guidelines score: 1, else score: 0</p> <p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES Score: 1, else, score: 0</p> <p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY score: 1, else score: 0</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,</p>	<p>- From the Planner, obtain and review LG's education sector workplan and procurement plan from the previous FY.</p> <p>- From the procurement department verify submissions from the DEO/MEO.</p> <p>- From the Procurement Unit, obtain and review the sector procurement plan and minutes to establish whether planned infrastructure projects were discussed and approved.</p> <p>- From the DEO/District engineer, obtain and review reports/minutes of project supervision activities conducted over the previous FY.</p> <p>- From the MoES CMU obtain and review standard technical designs for schools.</p> <p>- Visit the school infrastructure to ascertain whether the standard technical designs provided by the MoES were followed</p> <p>- From the LG obtain and review reports/minutes of the projects site meetings that were monitored.</p> <p>- From the LG engineer obtain records/reports from site supervision activities to ensure that this involved participation of engineers, environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction.</p>	<p>- Annual sector workplan</p> <p>- Procurement request documents forwarded to procurement unit</p> <p>- Sector procurement plan</p> <p>- Minutes from contracts committee meetings</p> <p>- Project Supervision reports/ minutes from related meetings</p> <p>- MoES technical designs</p> <p>- Physical checks in sample schools</p> <p>- Clerks of works reports to Engineer and DEO.</p> <p>- List of sector specific infrastructure projects in AWP</p> <p>- Reports and Minutes from site monitoring visits</p> <p>- Reports and Minutes from site supervision and monitoring visits</p>

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted score: 1, else score: 0		
			g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, score: 1, else score: 0	- From the CFO, obtain and review of contracts and determine whether payment requests for sector infrastructure projects were initiated and executed as per contract and implementation results.	- List of sector projects from AWP - Project contracts and payments schedule - Site supervision reports - Copy of contractor payment slips
			h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, score: 1, else, score: 0	- From the DEO/MEO obtain and review submission - From the Procurement unit (PDU) and Education department, obtain files/ records on all sector infrastructure projects implemented in the previous FY to ascertain compliance.	- Sector Procurement Plan - Contract implementation progress reports - Minutes from contracts committee meetings
F. Environment and Social Safeguards Maximum score 12 for this performance area	14.	<i>Grievance redress:</i> LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework. Maximum 3 points on this performance measure	a) If the LG has a log of grievances and proof that they have been handled in line with the grievance redress framework, and there is evidence of cases successfully handled - If LG has a Grievance redress framework in place and this is displayed publicly, score: 3, else Score: 0	- From the LG grievance redress committee, obtain and review the existing framework - Establish number of cases recorded and responded to within the requisite timeframe for the previous FY.	- Grievance redress framework at LG Notice board - Log of Grievances - Minutes/ Reports from meetings held to address presented grievances
	15.	Safeguards for service delivery. Maximum 3 point on this performance measure	a) 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	- From the DEO/MEO, obtain and review Education guidelines and check a sample of 3 schools in different sub-counties to confirm whether education guidelines have been followed on access to land (without encumbrances), proper siting of	- Issuance of education guidelines incorporating E&S requirements.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			Score: 3, or else score: 0	schools, 'green' schools', tree planting, energy and water conservation measures.	
	16.	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	- From the LG procurement unit review ESMP and project BoQs to ensure that safeguard requirements within the Education guidelines have been incorporated.	- ESMP - BoQs
			b) If there is proof of land ownership, access or availability for planned school construction projects, score: 1, else score:0	- From the DEO & LG procurement unit obtain and review documents to ascertain that land is available to conduct planned school construction projects.	- Land title/ agreement - MoU or Letter of consent from landowner
			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	- From the environmental and community development officials, obtain and review project reports on monitoring and supervision activities conducted over the previous FY.	- Monthly Reports from monitoring and supervision activities
			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	- From the DEO/project management unit, obtain copy of contractor certificates and verify whether the environmental officer and CDO counter-signed at the interim and final stages of all ongoing projects.	- Dates and Signatures on Contractor certification forms

10 Health Performance Assessment

10.1 Health Minimum Conditions

Performance Area	No.	Minimum Condition	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
A) Human Resource Management and Development	1.	<p>The LG is compliant if it has substantively recruited (where there is a wage bill provision) Or Formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions:</p> <p>For the District:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. District Health Officer 2. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing 3. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health 4. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) 5. Senior Health Educator 6. Biostatistician 7. District Cold Chain Technician <p>For the Municipality:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer 2. Principal Health Inspector 3. Health Educator 	<p>From the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, obtain and review the appointment letters of the District/Municipal Health Office staff as listed to establish that they are substantively recruited.</p> <p>In case the positions are not filled, get evidence from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division that the LG requested for secondment for districts from the Ministry of Health (MoH) and Municipalities from the District</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment letters • Copy of letter from LG to MoH requesting for secondment of staff to District/Municipal Health Office.
B) Environment and Social Requirements	2.	<p>The LG is compliant if it has carried out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening and; b) Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all Health sector projects. 	<p>From the LG Environment officer and CDO, obtain the Environmental and Social Screening (E&S) Form for all Health projects for the current FY, to verify whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E&S was completed and, whether ESIAs/ESMPs were prepared and costed and implemented/followed up. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Filled in environmental and Social screening Forms • ESIAs reports

10.2 Health Performance Measures

Guidance on Sampling of sites for indicators where site visits are required: Sample 3 health facilities or all where they are less than 3. Preferably use the same sites sampled where field verification is required throughout the assessment for a given LG, to minimize on transport logistical requirements and for effective use of time.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
A. Local Government Service Delivery Results Maximum score: 18 for this performance area	1.	<i>Outcome:</i> The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services. <i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total OPD attendance, and deliveries. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By 20% or more, score 2 - Less than 20%, score 0 • Also note whether LG has registered increased immunization, family planning and antenatal care) in all health facilities (from level III, including HC IIs recently upgraded to HCIIIs), in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one (not scored) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the Biostatistician, sample 3 Health Unit Annual Reports (HMIS 107) and compare OPD attendance and deliveries in FY under assessment with the FY before. 	Health Unit Annual Reports (HMIS 107) at the District
	2.	<i>Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</i> <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i> <i>Note: To have zero wait for year one.</i>	<p>a. <i>If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Above 70%; score 2 - 50 – 69% score 1 - Below 50%; score 0 <p>b. <i>If the average score in the RBF quarterly quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs is:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Above 75%; score 2 - 65 – 74%; score 1 - Below 65%; score 0 	<p><i>From the District Planner obtain the LLG performance report and calculate the average score of health for LLG performance assessment</i></p> <p><i>From the DHO obtain and review RBF Facility assessment records to establish the average score attained by HC IIIs and HC IVs in a LG participating in RBF</i></p>	<p><i>Report on LLG annual performance assessment</i></p> <p><i>District Reports on RBF Facility Assessment for the last quarter of the Financial Year.</i></p>

⁹ Minimum Score for facilities to qualify for RBF is 65% thus should not go below.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
	3.	<p><i>Investment performance:</i> The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></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>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>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/- 20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the DHO/MMOH, obtain and review the budget performance report for the previous FY to establish whether the health development grant was used on eligible activities.</p> <p>From the Chief Finance Officer obtain and review payment vouchers for all health project contracts for the previous FY, to establish whether certification of works was done before the LG made payments to the suppliers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the DHO/MMOH, obtain and sample 3 (or all if less than 3) works/supplier contracts for the previous FY and calculate the variations in the contract price to determine whether they are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Budget Performance Report for the previous FY. LG health grant and budget guidelines for the previous FY Payment vouchers for all contractors/ suppliers Sample works/supplier contracts for Health infrastructure projects for the last FY

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<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 	From the DHO/MMOH obtain: (i) the works contracts; and (ii) the Annual budget performance report for the previous FY, to determine whether health projects where contracts were signed were completed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Works contracts for health projects for the previous FY Annual budget performance report for the previous FY
	4.	<p><i>Achievement of Standards:</i> The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If above 90% score 2 If 75% - 90%: score 1 Below 75 %: score 0 	<p>From the Human Resource Office obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The staffing structure for HCIIIs and HCIVs The LG Health wage The staff list/Human Resource Information System report/ Database Payroll <p>Calculate the %age of health facility workers that are filled</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff structure Staff List// Human Resource Information System report/ Database Appointment letters from Records/Registry Budget of the current FY showing the Wage bill Absorption level of the Wage bill of last FY
			<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 	<p>From the DHO/MMOH obtain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inventory of existing and newly constructed health facilities. For all health facilities and check whether they conform to the approved designs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoH Health facility infrastructure designs Inventory of existing and newly constructed health facilities
B. Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement	5.	<p><i>Accuracy of Reported Information:</i> The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From the Human Resource Office</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> obtain the staff list for previous FY. <p>Sample 3 health facilities from the staff list for the previous FY to establish that the health workers are in place as indicated in the staff list.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health facility staff list for the previous FY Previous FY Report on facility staffing Levels.
			<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded</p>	From the DHO/MMOH obtain:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of upgraded or constructed health

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the list of upgraded or constructed health facilities for the previous FY. Establish whether information submitted in the PBS on construction status and functionality is accurate. 	facilities for the previous FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual PBS Report for previous FY.
	6.	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></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>From the DHO/MMOH obtain copies of Health facility Annual Workplans & Budgets for the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sample submissions of 3 facilities and check whether their budgets conform to the prescribed formats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health Facility annual workplan and budget for the previous FY Local Government Planning Guidelines for the Health Sector.
			<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 Guidelines¹⁰:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Score 2 or else 0 	<p>From the DHO/MMOH obtain copies of Health facility Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY. Sample submissions of 3 facilities and check whether their Annual Budget Performance Reports conform to the Budget and Grant Guidelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health Facility Annual Budget Performance Report for the previous FY
			<p>c) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p>	<p>From the DHO/MMOH obtain copies of submission of Health facility improvement plans for the current FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sample submissions of 3 facilities and check whether their improvement plans incorporate performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health Facility improvement plans for the current FY DHMT monitoring and assessment reports

¹⁰ The guidelines prescribe the format to include: a) highlights of performance, b) a reconciled cash flow statement, c) an annual expenditure and budget report, d) an asset register and f) the report has been endorsed by the in chargee and the chair of the HUMC/Hospital Board

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			Score 2 or else 0	issues identified in DHMT monitoring and assessment reports:	
			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	From the DHO/MMOH check for the record of submissions and establish timeliness of monthly and quarterly Reports. Sample submissions of 3 facilities and check for timeliness of all monthly (12) and quarterly (4) reports for the previous FY.	Health Facility HMIS Reports 104 and 105 for the previous FY.
			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 <i>Note: Municipalities submit to districts</i>	From the DHO check for the record of submissions and establish timeliness. Sample submissions of 3 Health facilities RBF invoices and check for timeliness of submission for the previous quarter.	Health Facility record of submissions of RBF invoices
			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	From the MoH obtain copy of DHMT submissions of facility RBF invoices, and check submission dates.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DHMT submissions of facility RBF invoices to MoH
			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	From the District/Municipal Planner obtain copy of Health Department Submissions of Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY and note the dates of submission to Planner for Consolidation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LG submissions to MoFPED Health Department quarterly performance reports
			h) Evidence that the LG has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for 	From the District Health Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i)the Approved Performance Improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved Performance Improvement Plan. PIP implementation reports

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<p>the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0 	<p>Plan; and (ii) PIP implementation reports to establish whether the LG developed and implemented Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing health facilities.</p>	
<p>C. Human Resource Management and Development</p> <p>Maximum score 16 for this performance area</p>	7.	<p><i>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff:</i> The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0 ○ 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>From the LG Performance Contract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check the LG approved structure • Check wage bill provision • Establish the positions substantively filled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LG Performance contract • Approved structures • Advertisements • Wage IPFs for the current FY
			<p>b) Evidence that health workers are working in health facilities where they are deployed, score 4 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the DHO/MMOH, obtain the health workers deployment list and sample 3 health facilities. At each of these 3 health facilities, review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (i)the Health workers' staff lists; (ii) facility attendance book/register (DHMT supervision/ monitoring reports; Automated Attendance Analysis (AAA) report to determine that health workers are working where they are deployed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health worker's deployment list for the current FY • Work Attendance books/registers • DHMT supervision/ monitoring reports for current FY • Automated Attendance Analysis (AAA) report • HRIS Database
			<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers</p>	<p>From DHO/MMOHs:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health Facility notice boards

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, score 2 or else score 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> obtain and check circular on deployment of health workers to health facilities <p>Sample 3 health facilities and check whether list of health workers deployed is displayed on the health facilities notice boards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Circular from DHO/MMOH to health facility in-charges
	8.	<p><i>Performance management:</i> The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to DHO/MMOH during the previous FY score 1 or else 0 Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0 <p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0 Documented training activities in the training/CPD 	<p>From the LG HR department, obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A sample of 10 health personal files for health workers to determine whether they were appraised during the previous FY <p>From the DHO/MMOH obtain and review for the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) training reports; (ii) training database to establish that training activities were conducted and documented in the training database 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personal files of health facility in-charges and staff Appraisal reports Training reports Training database/ CPD Database CPD plans

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			database, score 1 or else score 0		
D. Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services Maximum score 20 for this performance area	9.	<i>Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery:</i> The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	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	From the CAO/Town Clerk obtain a copy of the letter notifying MoH of the list of facilities accessing the PHC NWR Grants for the current FY. Obtain and review the Budget and Grant Guidelines for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check whether the list of health facilities (GoU and PNFP facilities receiving PHC NWR grants) rhymes with the one the CAO/TC submitted in the LG Budget for the current FY. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LG Budget and Grant Guidelines for current FY Copy of letter from the CAO/Town Clerk notifying the MOH of status of list of health facilities if correct or wrong.
			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.	From the DHO/MMOH obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Budget Performance Report for the previous FY and check whether allocations for management of District/Municipal health services was made. 	Annual Budget Performance Report for the previous FY
			c. If the LG made timely ¹¹ 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	From the CFO/SFO obtain and review records of when warranting/verification was done for the previous FY releases of PHC NWR grant to facilities	Copies of warrants submitted to MoFPED for the previous FY

¹¹ Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of receipt of releases from MoFPED.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<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>From MoFPED obtain and review the cost centre list & LLG allocation release breakdowns for all the 4 quarters of the previous FY.</p> <p>From the CAO/Town Clerk obtain quarterly correspondence to facilities on PHC NWR grant releases.</p> <p>From 3 sampled health facilities, obtain and review bank statements to establish the dates; compare with the correspondence from CAO/Town Clerk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish whether, for each quarter, the CAO/Town Clerk invoiced and communicated releases to health facilities within 5 working days from the release date. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost centre list & LLG allocation release breakdowns for all the 4 quarters of the previous FY CAO/Town Clerk quarterly correspondence to health facilities on PHC NWR grant releases Health Facility records on receipt of PHC NWR grant releases
			<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>Check the LG Notice Boards and LG website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> establish if the LG (CAO/Town Clerk) publicized all health facilities receiving non-wage recurrent grants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LG notice boards LG website
	10.	<p><i>Routine oversight and monitoring:</i> The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the</p>	<p>From the DHO obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the DHMT quarterly review meetings Reports on implementation of actions arising from the quarterly review meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of Quarterly review meetings DHO/MMOH quarterly implementation reports

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			previous FY, score 2 or else score 0		
			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	From the DHO/ obtain and review minutes of the quarterly DHMT performance review meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish attendance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of DHMT quarterly performance review meetings
			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 <i>If not applicable, provide the score</i>	From the DHO/MMOH: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain the LG quarterly support supervision reports Minutes of DHT/MHT meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LG quarterly support supervision reports
			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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>If not applicable, provide the score</i> 	From the DHO/MMOH sample 3 facilities and review (for the previous FY): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HSD Support Supervision and Monitoring visit reports Feedback from the LG Health department to HSDs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HSD supervision and monitoring reports for the previous FY Feedback from LG health department to HSDs during the last FY
			e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make	From the sampled 3 health facilities, determine whether the Health department provided recommendations from the supervision visits and evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback from the LG Health department to facilities Health facility activity reports

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<p>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>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>that their implementation was followed-up</p> <p>From the DHO/MMOH obtain medicines and Health supplies management supervision reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check to determine whether guidance was given to health facility in-charges on secure, safe storage and disposal of medicines and health supplies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supervision Book Feedback to health facility in-charges on medicines management supervision recommendations support supervision reports
	11.	<p><i>Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization:</i> The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></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>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>c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their</p>	<p>From the DHO/MMOH obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the DHO/MMOH budget for the previous FY the Annual Budget performance report for Health for the previous FY <p>Establish whether at least 30% of the budget was allocated.</p> <p>From the DHO/MMOH Obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly Health Promotion Activity reports and meeting minutes to establish whether the DHT/MHT implemented health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities in the previous FY <p>From the DHO/MMOH Obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly progress reports, DHT/MHT minutes to check whether follow-up actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LG Approved Annual Budget for the previous FY LG Annual Budget Performance Report for the previous FY Quarterly progress reports Meeting minutes Quarterly progress reports Meeting minutes

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0	were taken on the health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization aspects.	
E. Investment Management Maximum score 14 for this performance area	12.	<p><i>Planning and Budgeting for Investments:</i> The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></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>From the MoH, obtain the standard list of medical equipment for Health Facilities and service standards.</p> <p>From the DHO/MMOH obtain a Health Facilities Asset Register for the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and compare both to establish whether the Asset register details health facilities and equipment in the LG, relative to the medical equipment list and service standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health Facilities Asset Register Service Standards list for health facilities Medical Equipment List
			b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the LG Development Plan; (ii) desk appraised 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>From the Planner, obtain and review minutes of DTPC for the previous FY, to check if prioritized AWP investments for health:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> are derived from the Local Government Development Plan desk appraised by DTPC/MTPC eligible under sector or funding source grant guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Five-year development plan Minutes from TPC AWP Project appraisal reports
			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	<p>From the DHO/MMOH obtain field visit reports and check if prioritized AWP investments for health:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> were field appraised for technical feasibility, environmental and social 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project field appraisal reports

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			conditions: score 1 or else score 0	acceptability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> had their designs customized to suit site conditions, where applicable 	
			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	From the Environment Officer obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Filled screening forms to ascertain whether screening was done and ESIA/ESMPs prepared and costed review site visit reports to check for compliance to the risk mitigation plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Filled screening forms ESIAs/ESMPs Site visit reports
	13.	<i>Procurement, contract management/execution:</i> The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	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 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 c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the current FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before	From the DHO/MMOH obtain and review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> submissions to PDU. From PDU crosscheck <ul style="list-style-type: none"> submission from DHO/MMOH 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission letters to the PDU/memos AWP for the sector for current FY. Submission letters / memos of copy of Form PP5 to PDU.
				From the Procurement Unit obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of the Contracts Committee to determine whether the health infrastructure investments were approved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contracts Committee minutes for the current FY Letter from the Solicitor General

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter from the Solicitor General, where applicable 	
			d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) ¹² : score 1 or else score 0 <i>If there is no project, provide the score</i>	From the DHO/MMOH check the project files for the current FY to establish whether the Project Implementation Team was appropriately established	Copies of letters/memos from the CAO/TC designating members of the Project Implementation Team.
			e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0 <i>If there is no project, provide the score</i>	From the MoH obtain the standard technical designs issued to LGs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sample 3 health facilities, check and determine whether: Foundation, walling, room sizes, roof structure etc.. are as per designs (according to the applicable level of the construction) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> standard technical designs Site visit
			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 <i>If there is no project, provide the score</i>	From the DHO/MMOH obtain a copy of the reports from the Clerk of Works: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> review to determine whether the weekly reports are consolidated from the daily site reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copy of Clerk of Work's consolidated site report
			g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town	From the DHO/MMOH obtain and review minutes of site meetings:	Minutes of site meetings for health infrastructure projects implemented in the last FY

¹² The project implementation team comprises of: (i) Contract Manager; (ii) Project Manager; (iii) clerk of works; (iv) Environment Officer; (v) Community Development Officer & Labour Officer

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<p>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><i>If there is no project, provide the score</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check whether they are held monthly as per guidelines; attendance to establish if the listed stakeholders participated 	
			<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><i>If there is no project, provide the score</i></p>	<p>Sample and visit 3 health infrastructure sites. Obtain a site instruction book and site visitor's book from the site Foreman/construction team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review site instruction and visitor's books to determine whether LG team(s) supervised at least monthly. Review monthly monitoring and supervision reports to ascertain whether the Environment Officer and CDO participated in technical site visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site instruction book Site visitor's book Monthly supervision and monitoring report (including E & S aspects)
			<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>From the CFO obtain: A sample of 3 contracts, review and determine whether payment requests were certified and recommended on time</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sample contracts Payment requests from contractors/suppliers
			<p>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by</p>	<p>From the DHO/MMOH obtain and review procurement files for health infrastructure projects for the current FY to determine whether they are complete.</p>	<p>Procurement files for health infrastructure projects</p>

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			the PPDA Law ¹³ score 1 or else score 0		
F. Environment and Social Safeguards Maximum score 14 for this performance area	14.	<i>Grievance redress:</i> The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework <i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievances prominently in multiple public areas score 2 or else 0 	<p>From the DHO/MMOH:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check if GRM is displayed on the Health department noticeboard. Also check in the 3 sampled Health Facilities if GRM is displayed on their noticeboards <p>From the DHO/MMOH obtain and review log of grievances and check whether they were investigated and responded to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LG Health Dept noticeboard Health Facility noticeboards
	15.	<i>Safeguards for service delivery:</i> LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities¹⁴: score 2 points or else score 0</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</p>	<p>From the sampled health facilities, find out whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management including guidelines on construction of medical waste facilities, where applicable. Evidence that LGs follow up on the implementation of the health care waste management guidelines by HCs <p>From the DHO/MMOH:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm whether there is a dedicated/operational budget for health care waste management Check whether there is a registered service provider engaged for collection, storage, transportation, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidelines on medical waste management LG Annual budget for current year Copy of contract with waste management service provider LG with functional/equipped system for health care waste management

¹³ A complete procurement file must have the Evaluation Report approved by the Contracts Committee, Works Contract, and minutes of Contracts Committee decisions

¹⁴ Medical waste includes domestic; non-infectious; infectious; highly infectious; expired medicines and supplies

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			provider): score 1 or else score 0	disposal/treatment of health care waste or whether the LG has its own functional system for Medical waste management	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
			c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0	From the DHO/MMOH obtain and review training reports to establish whether training and awareness raising on waste management was done	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training records on waste management
	16.	<p><i>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management:</i> LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></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	From the DHO/MMOH obtain and check the contract documents of all ongoing contracts and variation orders for integration of ESHS safeguards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract documents for the previous FY Variation orders
			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	From the DHO/MMOH establish whether there is documentation on land acquisition status.	<p>Document on land ownership/access which could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a land title, Land agreement. Formal Consent, MoU
			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>From the CDO and Environment Officer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check the monthly monitoring report from the time of contract award till the end. Check for consistent monitoring and engagement throughout the contract period. Evidence during site inspection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance E&S monthly Monitoring reports from the time of contract award to date

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence on follow up by LGs on recommended corrective measures <p>Site visit to 3 sampled facilities and check mitigation measures</p> <p><i>Examples include (a) overall site maintenance, e.g. well-managed working areas, oily waste and solid waste properly stored for disposal; (b) all PPEs are in use; and (c) tree planting / landscaping being done or done or survival rate. (d) traffic control signs / site signage's; (e) sensitization of workers on labor influx related social issues such as HIV/AIDS, Gender Based Violence (GBV), and Violence Against Children (VAC), including Child Labor (f) guidance issued to HCs and follow up made on health care/medical waste including guidelines for the construction of medical waste disposal facilities, where applicable. These mitigation measures may pertain to the implementation or operation & maintenance phase.</i></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</p>	<p>From the DHO/MMOH obtain and check all the contractor payment certificates for their prior Environmental and CDO advice.</p>	<p>Contractor payment certificates</p>

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			projects score 2 or else score 0		

11 Water and Environment Performance Assessment

11.1 Water and Environment Minimum Conditions

Performance Area	No.	Minimum Condition	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
A) Human Resource Management and Development	1	<p>The LG is compliant if it has recruited (where there is a wage bill provision) or formally requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions.</p> <p>For the District Water Office:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Civil Engineer (Water). 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer <p>For the Natural Resources department:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Natural Resources Officer. 1 Environment Officer. 1 Forestry Officer 	<p>From the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, obtain the appointment letters of the District Water Office staff as listed to establish that they are substantively recruited.</p> <p>In case the positions are not filled, get evidence from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, that the LG requested for secondment from the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appointment letters Copy of letter from LG to MWE requesting for secondment of staff to District Water Office
B) Environment and Social Requirements	2	<p>The LG is compliant if it has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects</p>	<p>From the LG Environment Officer, obtain the Environmental and Social Screening Form (or where applicable ESIAs reports) for all water infrastructure projects for the previous FY, to verify whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E&S screening was completed and, where mitigations measures were assessed, the risk mitigation plans were developed and implemented/followed up. <p>From the DWO check for copies of abstraction permits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Filled Environmental and Social Screening Form ESIAs reports Abstraction permits

11.2 Water and Environment Performance Measures

N.B: For all indicators where sampling of facilities and records is to be done, assessment teams should use a sample of 3 units in different sub-counties

Performance area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment procedures	Means of verification
A) Local Government Service Delivery Results Maximum score: 20 points for this performance area	1	<i>Water & Environment Outcomes:</i> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	From the Ministry MIS for current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check data on functionality of the district rural water sources • Check data on facilities with functional water and sanitation committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry MIS
	2	<i>Service Delivery Performance:</i> 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 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Above 80% score 2 b. 60 -80%: 1 c. Below 60: 0 (Only applicable when LLG assessment starts)	From the District Planner: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain and review the verified sub-counties water and environment performance assessment results change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verified sub-counties Performance assessment results
			b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2 o If 80-99%: Score 1 o If below 80 %: Score 0 	From the DWO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain and review the annual progress reports and check whether the district water department implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget for previous FY • MOU with other DPs/CSOs • Annual progress reports for previous FY
		c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates	From the Procurement Unit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the annual budget and a sample of 3 WSS contracts (or all if 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample contracts • AWP/Budget 	

Performance area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment procedures	Means of verification
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If within +/-20% score 2 ○ If not score zero 	less than 3) for previous FY and check whether variations are within +/-20% of engineer's estimates	
			d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If 100% projects completed: score 2 ○ If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 ○ If projects completed are below 80%: 0 	From DWO/MWE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain and review the annual budget performance report to determine whether WSS infrastructure projects were completed within the planned FY 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AWP • Annual budget performance report
	3	<i>Achievement of Standards:</i> The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the increase is 1% or more: score 2 ○ If there is a decrease: score 0. 	From the Ministry MIS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain data on functionality of water facilities for previous FY but one and • Compare functionality of water facilities for the previous FY • Compute the percentage increase in functionality of water supply facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry MIS
		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). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the increase is more than 5% score 2 ○ If there is a decrease: score 0. 	From the Ministry MIS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain data on functionality WSCs for previous FY but one and compare functionality of WSC for the previous FY • Calculate the percentage increase on functionality of WSCs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry MIS 	
B) Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement	4	<i>Accuracy of Reported Information:</i> The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3	From the DWO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain the annual performance report for previous FY and check list of constructed WSS facilities. • Sample 3 WSS facilities to determine whether WSS facilities were constructed and are functional as reported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Performance report • Sample WSS facilities
	5	<i>Reporting and performance improvement:</i> The LG compiles, updates WSS	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	From the DWO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain quarterly WSS reports and check that the DWO collects and compiles quarterly information on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly reports

Performance area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment procedures	Means of verification
		information and supports LLGs to improve their performance <i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i>	storage and community involvement): Score 2 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 c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the current FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plan: Score 2 Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance.	sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage hygiene, and community involvement From the DWO MIS Check that: • Data on new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) is updated on quarterly basis and used for planning From the CAO: • Obtain the LLG water and environment performance assessment report and establish the 25% lowest performing LLGs From the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division: • Obtain copies of PIPs and reports for the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY PA and establish whether performance improvement plans were developed and PI actions have been implemented in the current FY • Sample in 3 LLGs to validate the performance improvement records	 • DWO MIS • LLG Performance assessment report • Copies of LLG PIPs • Performance Improvement reports • Sample LLGs
C) Human Resources Management and Development Maximum score: 10 points for this performance area	6	<i>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources:</i> The Local Government has budgeted for staff <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	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 b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the	From the LG Performance Contract: • Obtain and review the staff lists and validate that: ○ The DWO has budgeted for the critical staff in the District Water Office ○ The Environment & Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for critical staff in	• Performance Contract • Staff lists

Performance area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment procedures	Means of verification
			following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2	the Natural Resources department	
	7	<p><i>Performance Management:</i> 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>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>From the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain and review personnel files to determine whether District Water Office staff were appraised during the previous FY. <p>From the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain CNA reports and training reports and check that the DWO submitted staff capacity needs to the PHRO and DWO staff were trained as per district training plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff performance plans Personnel files Capacity Needs Assessment reports Training plans Training reports District training database
<p>D) Management, Monitoring, supervision of Services</p> <p>Maximum score: 20 points for this performance area</p>	8	<p><i>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery:</i> 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>a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <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>From the DWO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain the district average safe water coverage figures, AWP and budget and determine whether sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average have been prioritized in the allocation of funds <p>From the District Water Office:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain the district Quarterly software report and check that the DWO conducted sub-county advocacy meetings and among other aspects informed LLGs about their allocations per source Sample 3 LLGs and check that the allocations to the LLGs for the current FY are displayed on the noticeboards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safe water coverage data AWP for current FY Budget for current FY District and sub-county notice boards District quarterly software report Sample LLGs

Performance area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment procedures	Means of verification
	9	<p><i>Routine Oversight and Monitoring:</i> 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"> o If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 4 o If 80-99% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly: score 2 o If less than 80% of the WSS facilities monitored quarterly 80%: 0 	<p>From the DWO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain the number and list of water and sanitation projects in a LG • Review monitoring plans • Check the monitoring reports of each project and establish whether the LG monitored the projects (including E&S aspects) • <i>Note whether they followed up on recommended corrective actions.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of water and sanitation projects • Monitoring plans and reports for previous FY as per standard formats.
			<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>From the DWO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain the DWSCC minutes, DWO progress reports and check whether key issues from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWSCCC minutes • DWO progress reports • AWP
			<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>From the District and sub-county notice boards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check that allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average have been displayed at notice boards or websites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice boards • Websites
	10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If funds were allocated score 3 o If not score 0 	<p>From the DWO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain the AWP for previous FY and check that funds were allocated as per sector guidelines to facilitate community mobilization activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AWP
			<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>From the DWO and CDO:</p> <p>Obtain the annual software report for previous FY and check that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSCs were established and trained on their roles and on O&M of WSS facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Software reports • Sample WSCs

Performance area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment procedures	Means of verification
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sample 3 WSCs to check on recall of training content 	
E) Investment Management Maximum score: 28 points for this performance area	11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: Score 4 or else 0	From the DWO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain and review the assets register for WSS facilities and check that the WSS assets register is detailed and up to date. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assets register MIS
			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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Derived from the LGDP and approved sub-county plans. (ii) 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). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If desk appraisal was conducted and if more than 80% of the projects are derived from the LGDP: Score 4 If less Score 0 	From the Planner: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain and review the LGDP, AWP/budget for the current FY, WSS sector grant guidelines and approved sub-county plans and check that DWO conducted a desk appraisal for all WSS projects in the budget for the current FY and whether investments are derived from the LGDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AWP Local Government Development Plan District WSS grant/budget guidelines Approved sub-county plans
			c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2	From the DWO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain the community application files and check that beneficiary communities applied for WSS investments for the current FY 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community application files
			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	From the Planner: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain and review feasibility study report; water resources report and field appraisal report and establish whether field-based appraisals were conducted and check that: Sample 3 WSS projects to determine whether they are technically feasible, environmentally, and socially 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feasibility study Report Water resources report Field appraisal report

Performance area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment procedures	Means of verification
				acceptable and the designs have been customized in case of any technical issues	
			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>From the ENR office:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> check that screening was conducted for all WSS projects for the current FY, and ESIA/costed ESMPs prepared (where required) and whether the proposed mitigations measures were put in place <p>From the PDU:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain and review 3 sample contracts of ongoing WSS projects and establish whether they contain a clause on environmental and social protection requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Filled Environment and Social Screening forms ESIA/costed ESMPs Sample water projects
	12	<p><i>Procurement and Contract Management/execution:</i> The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved annual work plan, budget, and procurement plan: Score 2	<p>From the Planner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain and review the district annual work plan/budget and determine whether water supply infrastructure projects were incorporated in the LG approved annual work plan/ budget <p>From the Procurement Office:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain and review the procurement plan and check that water and sanitation infrastructure projects were incorporated in the procurement plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District Annual Work plan Budget Procurement plan
			b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the current FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:	<p>From the PDU:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain and review minutes of the contracts committee to determine whether water supply and public sanitation infrastructure projects for the current FY were approved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of Contracts Committee

Performance area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment procedures	Means of verification
				by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction	
			c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:	From the PDU: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain the procurement file and check that the LG established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of project Implementation team members
			d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2	From the DWO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain the standard technical designs From the PDU: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sample 3 WSS contracts and determine whether WSS infrastructure were constructed as per the technical design specifications Sample 3 WSS projects to validate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard technical designs Sample contracts Sample WSS projects
			e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2	From the DWO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain contract management plan, monthly supervision reports and determine whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The District Engineer, DWO, Environment and Community Development Officer participated in supervising WSS projects From the DWO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain minutes of site meetings and determine whether actions between the DWO and the contractor/consultant were implemented by the contractor Sample 3 WSS projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract Management Plan Sample WSS projects Supervision Reports Minutes of Site Meetings
			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	From the CFO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain and review a sample of contracts and determine whether payment requests were certified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Payment requests Sample contracts

Performance area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment procedures	Means of verification
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2 ○ If not score 0 	and recommended for payment as per contract and payment requests	
			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	From the PDU: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain and review procurement file to determine whether each contract has all relevant records as per the PPDA law 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement file
F) Environmental and Social Requirements Maximum score: 16 points for this performance area	13	Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework <i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i>	a. 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	From the District designated Grievance Coordinator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain the LG grievance redress framework and grievances log and determine whether the Grievances Redress Committee appropriately recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on all water and environment related grievances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LG grievances redress framework • Grievances log
	14	Safeguards for service delivery <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	a. 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	From the DWO & Environment Officer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain minutes of meetings with CDOs and determine whether water source and catchment protection and; natural resource management guidelines were disseminated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines for water source and catchment protection and natural resource management • Filled E&S screening forms • EIA reports/ESMPs • Sample contracts • Land agreements/titles and MOUs • Signed E&S Compliance Certification forms • Monthly monitoring reports
	15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0 b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 3, If not	From the Environment Officer and CDO check that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for WSS infrastructure projects constructed during the previous FY were prepared and implemented 	
				From the DWO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain the AWP, copies of land titles, agreements and MOUs to determine that all WSS projects 	

Performance area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment procedures	Means of verification
			score 0	<p>were implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sample 3 projects (if less all the available ones) 	
			c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 2, If not score 0	<p>From the CFO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain and review a sample of 3 interim and final payment certificates and check that The Environmental Officer and CDO completed and signed E&S Certification forms 	
			d. Evidence that the CDO and environment Officers undertakes monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 2, If not score 0	<p>From the ENR office and CDO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain ESMPs and monitoring reports and check that mitigation measures were implemented and monthly reports were compiled. 	

12 Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Assessment

1. Micro-scale irrigation performance assessment will only be conducted in districts selected to receive the micro-scale irrigation grant.
2. All indicators will be assessed starting in FY 2020/21. The indicators which are not applicable during the year of assessment will be scored 0. This is because:
 - a) It will provide a baseline and a basis for trend analysis
 - b) It will not disadvantage any LG as all will score 0 – level ground.
 - c) The districts are supposed to be performing the functions even without the micro-scale irrigation grant
3. The results for the assessment to be conducted in FY 2020/21 and FY 2021/22 will be used for monitoring and evaluation purposes and to develop performance improvement plans but not to impact on the allocation of the grants. This is because the districts will not have received and used the grants in FY 2019/20 (assessed in 2020/21); and the grants received in 2020/21 (assessed in 2021/22) are only for complementary services. Therefore, the results of the performance assessment to be conducted in FY 2022/23 will be the first to be used to impact on the allocation of grants for FY 2023/24. This is because the LGs would have received and used the capital development grant for FY 2021/22. The table below provides an overview of how the performance assessment and use of the results will be phased in relation to the flow of funds and implementation of activities in the 40 phase 1 districts. The same principles will apply when micro-scale irrigation grant is replicated countrywide.

No	Activity	2020/21				2021/22				2022/23			
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
1.	Flow of funds and implementation of activities	100% of grant for awareness raising				75% capital development (equipment procurement, installation and payments) ; and 25% complementary services				75% capital development (equipment procurement, installation and payments) ; and 25% complementary services)			
2.	LG Performance Assessment Exercise		XX				XX				XX		
3.	Use of results in development and implementation of PIPs			XX	XX	XX		XX	XX	XX		XX	XX
4.	Use of results to allocate part of the grants ¹⁵			N/A ¹⁶				NA ¹⁷				XX ¹⁸	

¹⁵ Note: Assessment in Y1 – mainly assesses performance in Y1-1; and impacts on allocation for Y1+1

¹⁶ No grant during Y1-1 (2019/20)

¹⁷ Grant in Y1-1 (2020/21) only focuses on awareness raising/complementary services

¹⁸ Assess use of grant in Y1-1 (2021/22) to impact on allocations in 2022/23

12.1 Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions

Performance Area	No.	Minimum Condition	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
A) Human Resource Management and Development	3.	The LG is compliant if it has recruited or requested for secondment of staff for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for micro-scale irrigation namely: a) The Senior Agriculture Engineer.	From the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division, obtain the appointment letters of the Senior Agricultural Engineer to establish that they are substantively recruited. In case the positions are not filled, get evidence from the Human Resource Management (HRM) Division that the LG requested for secondment from MAAIF.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appointment letters - Copy of letter from LG to MAAIF requesting for secondment of staff to District Production Office.
B) Environment and Social Requirements	4.	The LG is compliant if Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.	From the LG Environment officer, obtain the Environmental and Social Screening Form, ESMPs prepared (where applicable), for all micro-scale irrigation projects to verify whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E & S screening was carried out • ESMP prepared and costed (where required). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Filled Environmental and Social screening Forms • Costed ESMPs

12.2 Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures

Performance Area	No .	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
A. Local Government Service Delivery Results Maximum 20 points for this performance area	1.	<i>Outcome:</i> The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land Maximum score 4	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	From the District Production Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Data on irrigated land for the last two FYs to determine whether the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries	- Data on irrigated land for the last two FYs
			b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one: <ul style="list-style-type: none">By more than 5% score 2Between 1% and 4% score 1If no increase score 0	From the District Production Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Data on irrigated land for the last two FYs to calculate the increase in acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one	- Data on irrigated land for the last two FYs
	2.	<i>Service Delivery Performance:</i> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Above 70%; score 460 – 69%; score 2Below 60%; score 0	From the District Planner obtain: <ul style="list-style-type: none">the LLG performance report and calculate the average score of the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment	- Report on LLG performance assessment
	3.	<i>Investment Performance:</i> 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	From the District Production Office, obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The budget performance report to establish whether the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant was used on eligible activities	- Budget Performance Reports

Performance Area	No .	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<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>From the Chief Finance Officer obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payment vouchers for all equipment suppliers to establish whether the farmer Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well were attached before the LG made payments to the suppliers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Payment vouchers for all equipment suppliers
			<p>c) Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>From the District Production Office, obtain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (i) farm visit report; (ii) selected supplier quote; and (iii) the supplier contracts and calculate the variations in the contract price (contract variation orders) to determine whether they are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Farm visit report. - Supplier quote - Supplier contracts
			<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>From the District Production Office, obtain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (i) the supplier contracts; and (ii) budget performance report to determine whether micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed were installed during last FY 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supplier contracts. - Completion certificates; and - Budget performance report -
	4.	<p><i>Achievement of standards:</i> 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 where there is a wage bill provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If 100% score 2 - If 75 – 99% score 1 - If below 75% score 0 	<p>From the Human Resource Office obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The staffing structure for LLG extension workers (Agriculture, Veterinary, Fisheries, Entomology) - The LG PMG wage - The staff list - Calculate the %age of LLG extension workers that are filled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff structure - Staff List - Appointment letters from Records/Registry - Budget of the current FY showing the Wage bill
			<p>b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If 100% score 2 or else score 0 	<p>From the Agricultural Engineer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Obtain inventory of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied - Sample 5 completed micro-scale irrigation installations in different LLGs to ascertain whether they meet standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inventory of installed micro-scale irrigation equipment

Performance Area	No .	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			c) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional - If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	From the Agricultural Engineer: - Obtain the list of micro-scale irrigation equipment installed during the previous FY - Sample 5 installed irrigation facilities in different LLGs to check functionality	- Inventory of installed micro-scale irrigation equipment
B. Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement Maximum 10 points for this performance area	5.	<i>Accuracy of reported information:</i> The LG has reported accurate information Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	From the Human Resource Office obtain: - The staff list. - Sample 5 LLGs to establish that the extension workers are in place as indicated in the staff list	- Staff lists
			b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	From Agricultural Engineer obtain: - The inventory of installed micro-scale irrigation equipment. - Sample 5 and establish whether information submitted on installation and functionality is accurate	- Inventory of micro-scale irrigation equipment installed
	6.	<i>Reporting and Performance Improvement:</i> The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0	From the District Production Office, obtain and review. - Quarterly supervision and monitoring reports to determine whether they are compiled and cover sub-county irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment; complementary services and farmer applications	- Quarterly supervision and monitoring reports
			b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	From the District Production Office obtain and review: - MIS reports to determine whether up to-date LLG performance information is submitted	- MIS reports
			c) Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	From the District Production Office obtain and review: - Quarterly reports with information from the LLGs in the MIS	- Quarterly reports
			d) Evidence that the LG has: - Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	From the District Production Office obtain and review: - (i) the Approved Performance Improvement Plan; and (ii) PIP implementation reports to establish whether the LG developed and	- Approved Performance Improvement Plan. - PIP implementation reports

Performance Area	No .	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0 	implemented Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs	
C. Human Resource Management and Development Maximum 10 points for this performance area	7.	<i>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff:</i> The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0 Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0 	From the District Production Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the LG performance contract; and (ii) staff list to determine whether the LG Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines and deployed extension workers as per guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Contract of current FY Staff registers
			b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	From the SAS in a sample of at least 3 LLGs, obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the staff lists; (ii) attendance book; (iii) SAS supervision/ monitoring reports to determine that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current staff list Attendance books Supervision/ monitoring reports
			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	From the CAO's office obtain and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check circular from CAO to SAS showing details of Extension workers deployed in LLG In a sample of at least 3 LLGs check LLG notice board to establish whether the SAS posted the list of Extension workers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notice boards of LLGs Circular from CAO to LLGs
	8.	<i>Performance management:</i> The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0 	From the District HR department obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personal files for extension workers and sample at least 10 to determine whether they were appraised during the previous FY 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personal files Appraisal reports
			b) Evidence that:	From the District Production Office obtain and review:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training reports Training database

Performance Area	No .	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0 - Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (i) training reports; (ii) training database to establish that training activities were conducted and documented in the training database 	
D. Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services Maximum 22 points for this performance area	9.	<i>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery:</i> The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. Maximum score 10	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 – 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	From the District Planner, obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Performance Contract to determine whether the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services 	- Performance Contract
			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	From the District Planner, obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Performance Contract to determine whether the LG budget allocations made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines 	- Performance Contract of current FY

Performance Area	No .	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0		
			c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	From the District Planner, obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Performance Contract to determine whether the LG reflected co-funding in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines 	- Performance Contract
			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	From the District Planner, obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Budget Performance Report to determine whether the LG used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant 	- Budget Performance Report
			e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0	From the District Production Office obtain evidence on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dissemination of information on use of the farmer co-funding in DTPC, LLGs and to the farmers 	- Minutes from meetings between DPO and DTPC and LLGs - Copy of information shared
	10.	<i>Routine oversight and monitoring:</i> The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	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.) <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 	From the District Production Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The monthly reports for the previous FY to establish the number of micro-irrigation equipment that were monitored - Calculate the percentage monitored 	- Monitoring reports for previous FY as per standard formats
			b) Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing	From the District Production Office obtain and review:	- Field Monitoring and Supervision reports

Performance Area	No .	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reports on specific randomly sampled farmers to establish if LG oversaw the Approved Farmer training; also interview the farmers 	
			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	From the District Production Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The LG hands-on support reports to LLG extension workers (quarterly) - Review and check a sample of 3 LLG and interview extension workers to verify the hands-on support given. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supervision reports - Minutes of field meetings
			d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	From the District Production Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reports on farmer field schools to determine whether they are established and run as per guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reports on farmer field schools
	11.	<i>Mobilization of farmers:</i> The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	From the District Production Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Records showing farmers mobilized by gender and participated in irrigation activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attendance sheets - Field based photos
			b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	From the District Production Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reports to determine whether the District has conducted a training for Staff and political leaders at District and LLG: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training report
E. Investment Management	12.	<i>Planning and budgeting for investments:</i> The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines Maximum score 8	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	From the District Production Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The register of irrigation equipment supplied 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Register/Inventory of irrigation equipment
			b) Evidence that the LG keeps and up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 1 or else 0	From the District Production Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The database of applications for the current and previous FY and check the last date of update. - Sample applications to determine whether they are part of the database 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Database of applications - Copies of applications from LLGs - Submission letters

Performance Area	No .	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From the District Production Office obtain and review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Farm visit reports and signed commitment forms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Farm visit Reports - Agreement to Proceed for Quotation Forms
			<p>d) Evidence that all micro-scale irrigation systems were screened for environmental compliance and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for installation using E & S screening checklist: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From the Environmental Officer obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (i) Filled screening forms to ascertain whether screening was done and whether mitigation plans were developed; (ii) review site visit reports to check for compliance to the risk mitigation plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filled screening forms - Site visit reports
			<p>e) 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 1 or else 0</p>	<p>Check the District and at least 5 LLG notice boards to determine whether the LG publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - District and LLG notice boards
	13.	<p><i>Procurement, contract management/execution:</i> The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>From the Procurement and Disposal Unit obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Procurement Plan for the current FY to determine whether micro-scale irrigation equipment was incorporated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approved Procurement Plan
			<p>b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>From MAAIF obtain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A copy of the pre-qualified suppliers. <p>From Procurement and Disposal Unit obtain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requests for quotation for irrigation equipment suppliers to determine whether they were pre-qualified by MAAIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pre-qualified suppliers - Requested for quotation

Performance Area	No .	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	From the Procurement Unit obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minutes of the contracts committee to check whether selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria 	- Minutes of the Contracts Committee (CC)
			d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	From the Procurement Unit obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minutes of the contracts committee to determine whether micro-irrigation systems were approved by CC before commencement of installation. 	- Minutes of the Contracts Committee (CC)
			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	From the Procurement Unit obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - List of bidders - Sample 3 sites and review selected bidders' price to determine if it was the lowest and technically responsive 	- List of selected bidders - Compare with other bidders' prices
			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	From MAAIF obtain the standard technical designs issued to LGs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sample 3 sites, check and determine whether: the various aspects of the systems are as per designs (according to the applicable level of the construction at the time of the assessment) 	- standard technical designs - Site visit
			g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision by the relevant technical officers (District Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	From the District Production Office, obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LG supervision reports to establish that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision - Sample 3 sites and review site books to verify 	- Supervision reports - Site books
			h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0 - Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the 	- Sample 3 sites and review site books to verify if the LG production department oversaw the listed processes	- Supervision reports - Site books

Performance Area	No .	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0		
			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	From the Production Office, obtain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copies of payment requests from supplier/files, contracts and determine if payment was done within specified time frame 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sample contracts - Payment requests
			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	From the Production Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Procurement files for micro-scale irrigation projects for the previous FY to determine whether they are complete. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Procurement files for micro-scale irrigation projects
F. Environment and Social Safeguards Maximum 12 points for this performance area	14.	<i>Grievance redress:</i> The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	From the Production Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Check if GRM is displayed on the Production department noticeboard - Check also in the sub counties of the 5 sampled micro-irrigation projects whether it is displayed on their noticeboards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LG Production Dept noticeboard - LLG noticeboards
			b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recorded score 1 or else 0 - Investigated score 1 or else 0 - Responded to score 1 or else 0 - Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0 	From the Production Office obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Log of grievances and check whether they were investigated, recorded and responded to; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Records of grievances
	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	From the LG Production office find out whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Micro- scale irrigation guidelines (including E & S requirements) have been issued to the beneficiary small-holder farmers. -MoUs between LGs and beneficiary farmers include clauses to adhere with requirements for proper storage, use, transportation, and disposal of agro- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sector Guidelines on micro- scale irrigation • MoUs between LGs and farmers • Reports on farm visits

Performance Area	No .	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			disposal of chemical waste containers etc. score 2 or else 0	chemicals and if LGs monitor compliance with the E & S safeguard requirements	
			<p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Costed ESMP incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0 - 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 - 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 - 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 	<p>From the LG Environment officer, obtain the Environmental and Social Screening Form/ESMP (where applicable), for all micro irrigation projects to verify whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - E & S screening was carried out for, ESMP prepared and costed (where required). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and Social screening Forms • ESMPs (where required) • Monthly monitoring reports (includes E&S aspects) • Signed E & S compliance certificate

ANNEXES

Annex 1 Code of Ethics for the Assessment Teams

The assessment process and quality assurance under LG PA will be contracted to independent private firm(s). The contracted private firm(s) will have to adhere to the following standards/terms which should be part of the contract documents.

1. Fielding of competent team members:
 - Staff conducting the assessment should be those submitted for evaluation during the bidding process.
 - The staff should demonstrate that they have proven capacity and experience in the respective areas of expertise as presented in their respective CVs;
 - The staff should be neutral and without conflict of interest in terms of LG to be reviewed.
2. Team objectivity, neutrality, and integrity during the assessment process:
 - The team members should adhere to the assessment process, procedures and scoring as prescribed in the LG PA Manual.
 - The team members should not get involved in any sort of corrupt tendencies/practices.
 - The team member cannot receive any payments from the assessed LGs/or related bodies/stakeholders.
 - The team members should not have (or should declare) any sort of conflict of interest in the LGs being assessed, e.g. the team member should not have been involved in work or related support to the LG in case over the past 5 years;
 - Team members are obliged to report about any irregularities related to the assessments to the client.
3. Timely and quality production of the reports
 - The team members should produce the report as per the provided formats.
 - The team members should provide the report within the provided time.
 - The team members should provide comprehensive and accurate information

In case of failure to comply with the provisions of this code of conduct, the assessment team or any member thereon shall be subject to all/or some of the following disciplinary measures:

1. Additional work and reassessments: Teams may be required to conduct follow-up work on issues which are not sufficiently clear, or where there are cases of contradiction between the assessments and the quality assurance.
2. Deduction in the contract value for the assessments: In severe cases, where there are clear instances of wrong/flawed results, this may lead to deductions in the payments for the work conducted.
3. Blacklisting from future assessments: This will happen if there are strong reasons to believe that assessments lack quality, are flawed, or manipulated.



THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA
OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER
LOCAL GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT OF SERVICE DELIVERY PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT
EXIT DECLARATION FORM

This form is designed to capture key issues emerging during the Assessment of Local Governments. The key issues should be agreed upon by both the Assessment Team members and the Local Government Technical Planning Committee and fully endorsed by the Assessment Team Leader and the CAO/Town Clerk (or their representatives).

To be: (i) filled by the Assessment Team Leader; and (ii) signed by the CAO/Town Clerk or Representative of the District/Municipal Local Government on the one hand, and the Assessment Team Leader on the other hand.

Name of the Local Government

Dates of the LG Performance Assessment.....

1. Level of preparedness by the Local Government for the Performance Assessment.

(a) Availability of key LG officials or their assigned representatives-(Tick if met):

- i. Chief Administrative Officer
- ii. Education Officer
- iii. Health Officer
- iv. Water Officer
- v. District Production Officer
- vi. Human Resource Officer
- vii. Chief Finance Officer
- viii. Planner
- ix. Physical Planner
- x. Gender Focal Person
- xi. Environment Officer
- xii. Secretary District Service Commission
- xiii. Clerk to Council
- xiv. Procurement Officer
- xv. Internal Auditor

(b) Access to key documents (list).....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2. Main strengths identified by the Assessment Team:

.....
.....
.....
.....

3. Key gaps/challenges identified by the Assessment Team:

.....
.....
.....
.....

4. Specific areas of concern arising from the entire Annual Performance Assessment findings, whereby the D/MTPC is not in agreement (if any)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

5. General comments and observations by the CAO/Town Clerk about the LGPA process or team:

.....
.....
.....
.....

Endorsement by CAO/Town Clerk or their authorized representatives:

Signed Name.....

Date..... *(Insert official stamp of the LG).*

Endorsement by the LG Performance Assessment Team Leader:

Signed Name.....

Date.....