



## LGPA 2017/18

Accountability Requirements

Moroto District

(Vote Code: 538)

Assessment	Compliant	%
Yes	2	33%
No	4	67%

Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Compliant?
Assessment area: Annual performance contract			
<p>LG has submitted an annual performance contract of the forthcoming year by June 30 on the basis of the PFMAA and LG Budget guidelines for the coming financial year.</p>	xxx	<p>Not Compliant – No proof that Moroto LG submitted the APC FY 2017/18, let alone submit it timely (the OBT generation date was 11th/4/2017 and self-reported submission date was 12th April 2017 to the MoFPED but the assessor couldn't access the dated Receipt with Receipt No to verify the same).</p>	No
Assessment area: Supporting Documents for the Budget required as per the PFMA are submitted and available			
<p>LG has submitted a Budget that includes a Procurement Plan for the forthcoming FY (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>	xxxxx	<p>Not Compliant – While a Moroto LG Budget/ APC 2017/18 was seen at MoFPED (signed and stamped on the 14th/8/2017), there was no proof from the documentation at MoFPED that it was accompanied by a Procurement Plan. While a copy of Moroto LG Procurement Plan FY 2017/18 was seen at the district (signed by CAO and the Procurement Officer on the 10th/7/2017), the contents of the Moroto LG transmittal letter (11th/4/17) received by MoFPED on the 12/4/17 offered no indication as to the accompaniment of the APC 2017/18 with a procurement plan.</p>	No
Assessment area: Reporting: submission of annual and quarterly budget performance reports			

<p>LG has submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY on or before 31st July (as per LG Budget Preparation Guidelines for coming FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>Not Compliant – Moroto LG APR 2016/17 was submitted late to the MoFPED (i.e. on the 11th/8/2017), hence clearly well past the deadline (of 31st July 2017). According to the District Planner, the delays were attributable to MoFPED’s rather belated population of the PBS database with IPFs; the inevitable challenges involved in making a transition from OBT to PBS among other operations challenges (e.g. training coming at a short notice, persistent expired passwords, the system refusing entries and breaking down, etc.).</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY; PFMA Act, 2015)</p>	<p>xxxxxxx</p>	<p>Not Compliant – All 4 quarterly reports for the FY 2016/17 were duly submitted but Q4 submitted late (i.e. Q1 - 3rd/11/2016 but with missing Receipt No; Q2 – 2nd/3/2017 Receipt No: 0451; Q3 – 17th/5/2017 Receipt No: 0724; and Q4 – 11th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4545). NB: It must be noted that while we saw a dated, signed and stamped transmittal letter by Moroto District submitting the Q1 Report (the same letter received by MoFPED/PAF Secretariat and dated and stamped as such), what went unseen was a dated receipt and receipt number for the same with/or at MoFPED or Moroto District.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Assessment area: Audit</p>			
<p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General or Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by April 30 (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action (PFMA Act 2015; Local Governments Financial and Accounting Regulations 2007; The Local Governments Act, Cap 243).</p>	<p>xxxxxx</p>	<p>The LG provided information to PS/ST on the status of implementation of internal auditor General or Auditor General’s findings for the previous year 2015/16.</p> <p>The responses were dated 17th /3/2017 and submitted on 22nd /3/2017 which was within the required date of submission (deadline 30th/4/2017).</p> <p>The issues raised were 11 and they responded to all as evidenced in their submission report. (source of information was MOFPED)</p>	<p>Yes</p>

The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer

XXXXX

According to the Annual report of the Auditor General 2016/17, Moroto DLG obtained an unqualified audit opinion.

Yes



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Crosscutting Performance Measures

Moroto District

(Vote Code: 538)

Score 55/100 (55%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality; and (ii) all Town Councils in a District are approved by the respective Physical Planning Committees and are consistent with the approved Physical Plans</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure.</p>	<p>Evidence that a municipality/district has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 2.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All new infrastructure investments have approved plans which are consistent with the Physical Plans: score 2.</li> </ul>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of establishment and functionality of the Physical Planning Committee (PPC). While the Natural Resources Officers (in charge of Physical Planning) was sure that no such committee existed, the District Planner (a reported member of the PPC) argued that the PPC existed on paper with members appointed by CAO in the early 2000s. the planner neither specified the PPC's date of formation and/or members of the PPCs by CAO.</p> <p>There was no evidence of approved plans for new investments. According to official records got from MoLHUD, (Status of Physical Planning in Uganda 2017, the MoLHUD Physical Planning Department (2015) Moroto District was not listed among LGs that had available, running (not expired) and valid Structural and Detailed Plans. Visits to Moroto District confirmed the unavailability of the plans.</p>

The prioritized investment activities in the approved AWP for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan, are based on discussions in annual reviews and budget conferences and have project profiles

• Evidence that priorities in AWP for the current FY are based on the outcomes of budget conferences: score 2.

2

There is evidence that the AWP 2017/18 (page 51) was based on outcomes of the budget conference as seen in the contents of a draft Budget Conference Report (BCR). In future, a search for a robust one-on-one correspondence in the 2 official documents should be achieved without much laboring to seek evidence of the matching of priorities in the documents. The indicative evidence on offer appeared under details of departmental presentations in the main text of the BCR with some specifics as to the linkage to what appeared in the AWP 2017/18:

? Capital investment priorities e.g. construction of office blocks Acherer (page 18 in the AWP 2017/18) is seen as an outcome of the budget conference (page 10 of the BCR 2017/18).

? Capacity building priorities e.g. induction of new councilors on rules of procedures (page 8 in the AWP 2017/18) is seen as an outcome of the budget conference (page 13 of the BCR 2017/18).

? Recurrent expenditure priorities e.g. HR recruitment (page 8 in the AWP 2017/18) is seen as an outcome of the budget conference (page 13 of the BCR 2017/18).

• Evidence that the capital investments in the approved Annual work plan for the current FY are derived from the approved five-year development plan. If different, justification has to be provided and evidence that it was approved by Council. Score 2.

2

All capital investments in the AWP were drawn from the the 5-year District Development Plan (DDP) 2015/16-2019/20.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project profiles have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP as per LG Planning guideline: score 1.</li> </ul>	0	<p>There was no TPC minute seen discussing the DDP 2015/16-2019/20. For the FY 2016/17, the TPC met 7 out of the 12 mandatory times (i.e. on the 3rd/4/2017, 16th/3/2017, 16th/1/2017, 26th/10/2016, 27th/9/2016, 23rd/9/2016 and 13th/7/2016). However, only few TPC Minutes offered documented proof that the TPC meetings sat to discuss relevant issues such as statistical abstracts (27th/9/2016), gender assessment indicators (16th/3/2017) as well as profiles of completed projects (13th/7/2016), Therefore, the TPC deliberations appeared to be focused more on generics of LG functioning (e.g. budget estimates, quarterly reports, etc.) than on specifics important for informing planning. For the FY2016/17, NPA's (2017) Certificated of Compliance with Planning Guidelines awarded Moroto LG a score of 75% on the robustness of the planning process and an average score of 45.4% when all planning aspects were considered (see page 83).</p>
3	<p>Annual statistical abstract developed and applied</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual statistical abstract, with gender disaggregated data has been compiled and presented to the TPC to support budget allocation and decision-making- maximum 1 point.</li> </ul>	1	<p>The District Planner pointed to some evidence of availability of draft Statistical Abstracts 2016/17 at the time of the assessment (24th/1/2018). The abstracts captured some gender-based disaggregation of data (e.g. pages 15 and 31 presenting data on household size as well as secondary school teachers and students, respectively). Only few TPC minutes (e.g. that of 27th/9/2016 and 16th/3/2017 TPC meetings) used statistical abstract and gender related data respectively. As such, there appeared to be limited prospects of informing decision making. In a sense, proof of effective evidence utilisation of the statistical abstracts and gender related data in planning appeared somewhat weak considering that only 2 (out of 10 for the FY2016/17) TPC meeting appeared to consider such data in its deliberations.</p>



4	Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented by the LG in the previous FY were derived from the annual work plan and budget approved by the LG Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	The priorities are derived the AWP and budget 2016/17 for projects implemented and completed in FY 2016/17 – e.g. Renovation of CAOs Office (page 4 of AWP 2016/17), Construction/completion of a drug store (page 21 of AWP 2016/17) and Extension of the Planning Unit (page 36 of AWP 2016/17). Accordingly, documented evidence drawn from the APC/Budget 2016/17 suggested that not all projects implemented in the FY 2016/17 were drawn from AWP 2016/17.
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end for FY. o 100%: score 4 o 80-99%: score 2 o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul>	0	According to the Q4 Consolidated Report FY 2016/17) only some projects (79%) were completed. Hence, not all were completed in FY 2016/17 as per work plan. The uncompleted projects included acquisition of land titles (contrary to contractual provisions, the contracted surveyor required Moroto District to effect payment before releasing the land titles). The completed projects included those e.g. Renovation of CAOs Office (page 4 of AWP 2016/17), Construction/completion of a drug store (page 21 of AWP 2016/17) and Extension of the Planning Unit (page 36 of AWP 2016/17).
5	The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&M for all major infrastructure projects and assets during the previous FY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all investment projects in the previous FY were completed within approved budget – Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget: score 2</li> </ul>	2	Documented evidence seen that projects implemented and completed in FY 2016/17 were derived from the budget 2016/17 e.g. Renovation of CAOs Office (page 4 of AWP 2016/17), Construction/completion of a drug store (page 21 of AWP 2016/17) and Extension of the Planning Unit (page 36 of AWP 2016/17).
	Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	Moroto budgeted for O&M spending more than the budget (by about 120%) as seen from AFA 2016/17.

Assessment area: Human Resource Management

LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

- Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2

2

Evidence verified at the HRM office in Personnel files of HoDs indicates that all (100%) of the existing (8) HoDs (substantive and those appointed by assignment) were appraised in accordance with the standard MoPS guidelines . The Key areas of assessment included:

- Key outputs
- Finance and Human Resource Management
- Crosscutting initiatives and innovations
- Action Plans ( to address areas of improvement)

The Performance Agreements and Performance Reports for each HoD were on file dully endorsed by staff and the CAO. See below the dates of appraisal for each staff:

- Chief Finance Officer- Appraised on- 14/08/17
- District Education Officer- Appraised on- 14/08/17
- District Health Officer – Appraised on- 14/08/17
- District Engineer- Appraised on-16/05/16
- District Planner- Appraised on- 24/08/17
- District Comm. Dev Off- Appraised on - 14/07/17
- District Prodn& Mktg. Off- Appraised on- 14/8/17
- District Natural Res. Off- Appraised on - 14/08/17

• Evidence that the LG has filled all HoDs positions substantively: score 3

0

Moroto District has not yet filled all HoDs positions substantively as per personnel specifications.

Verified evidence included the approved staffing list for 2016/17 dated 15/06/17, approved staffing structure for 2016/17 dated 5/07/16 and a list of Heads of departments for Moroto district, all available in the HRM office.

While the MoPs provides for 9 Heads of Departments. Moroto district has so far substantively recruited for only 4 positions namely:

1. District Education Officer- File Ref No. MTO/6/003, appointed on 1/01/15, minute extract no. 23/MDC/2015CF
2. District Engineer- File Ref No. MTO/7A/004, appointed on 29/7/99, minute extract no.45 (i) 1999
3. District Planner- File Ref No. MTO/10/001, appointed on 21/07/03, minute extract no. 23/MDSC/10
4. District Prodn&Mktg Off- File Ref No. MTO/04/020

The 5 positions of: Chief Finance Officer District Health Officer, District Community Development Officer and District Natural Resources officer are held by officers who were appointed on *Assignment* by the CAO on 12/07/16 with their respective files referenced as CR/156/2. The Position of LED officer is still vacant.

Clearance was sought from MoPS by CAO (ref: CR/102 dated 4/09/2017) for the recruitment for the HoDs that are held by staff appointed on assignment. MoPs cleared the request (ref: ARC/293/5 dated 2/10/ 2017 and the recruitment process is in progress during the current year.

The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure

• Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2

2

All (100%) of the submissions made by CAO to the DSC were considered.

CAO made 4 submissions to the DSC on 23/11/16, evidenced by cover letter ref. no: 156/1, for the recruitment for 4 positions that were approved by MoPS on 4/11/16, ref. no: ARC/6/293/05 in response to CAO's request to recruit for 99 positions dated 29/08/16, ref no. CR/156. Only 4 positions were approved after MAAIF intervened and lobbied for the wage bill to be provided and also assisted with running the adverts for the 4 positions of; District Production and Marketing Officer, Principal Agricultural Officer, Principal Veterinary Officer and Principal Commercial Officer.

The recruitment process by the DSC was finalised on the 26/05/17 with an *Instrument of Appointment* forwarded to CAO as per minute extract 104/MDSC/2017 for *Appointment into Service* of the Principal Veterinary Officer and the Principal Agricultural Officer while minute extract 106/MDSC/2017 endorsed *Appointment on Promotion on Transfer of Service* for the Production and Marketing Officer. No suitable candidate was identified for the position of Principal Commercial Officer.

• Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1

1

No submissions were made by CAO to the DSC for consideration for confirmation of the 3 recruited staff. The staff were still on probation and hence not yet due for appraisal and consequent confirmation.

• Evidence that 100 percent of staff submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1

1

No cases requiring disciplinary action occurred during the FY under review; hence no submissions were made by CAO to the DSC

8	<p>Staff recruited and retiring access the salary and pension payroll respectively within two months</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>Three (3) staff were recruited in FY 2016/17 and all of them (100%) accessed the salary pay roll not later than two months after appointment. The staff were recruited on 26/05/17 and all of them appeared on the June 2017 salary pay roll. Verification of the June 2017 salary payment voucher dully approved by CAO, HRO and CFO identified the 3 staff with file ref. nos. and IPPS numbers as shown below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MTO/4/021----IPPS No: 1008260</li> <li>MTO/4/022----IPPS No: 1008123</li> <li>MTO/4/020----IPPS No: 829138</li> </ol>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that 100% of the staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>None (0%) of the retired 4 staff during the previous year accessed pension pay roll not later than two months after retirement. Staff with the following IPPS Nos. for Pension, although retired on different dates during the previous year, none had accessed the pension pay roll as at end December 2017.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>829112----Retired on 30/12/16</li> <li>829250----Retired on 10/10/16</li> <li>829128----Retired on 29/11/16</li> <li>865446----Retired on 4/01/17</li> </ol> <p>Reasons for failure to access the pension pay roll as advanced by the Principal Human Resource Officer include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delay by the retired staff to assemble and submit their essential documents to HRM office for further processing and submission to MoPS</li> <li>Delayed feedback from MoPS to HRM about identified anomalies in the documents submitted that require to be corrected.</li> <li>Delayed action by the retired staff to address the anomalies identified in their files.</li> </ul>

9	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If increase in OSR from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10% : score 4 points</li> <li>• If the increase is from 5 -10% : score 2 point</li> <li>• If the increase is less than 5% : score 0 points.</li> </ul>	0	<p>According to the financial statements of 2015/16 and 2016/17, Moroto District collected local revenue amounting to Ugx: 546,184,957 in FY 2015/2016 and Ugx: 389,181,613 in FY 2016/2017. The difference between what was collected in 2015/16 and 2016/17 was Ugx: 157,003,344, giving a decline of 29%.</p>
10	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realisation) is within +/- 10% : then 2 points. If more than +/- 10% : zero points.</li> </ul>	0	<p>The District collected local revenue amounting to Ugx: 389,181,613 in FY 2016/17 against a budget of Ugx: 688,089,780 in FY 2016/17. The difference between what was planned and actual was 298,908,167 ugx. Therefore, the shortfall was 43% of the total budget. (The figure indicated here is from the revised budget. Minutes of revising the budget dated 29/6/2017 were available and budget adjustments dated 10/7/2017 and signed by secretary for finance).</p>
11	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the District/Municipality has remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>As explained by the Chief financial officer and confirmed by Deputy CAO, there were no remittances to the lower local governments. This was contrary to section 85(4) of the LG Act CAP 243 which requires the higher local governments to remit 65% to lower local governments.</p> <p>The explanation by the chief finance officer was that proceeds from local revenue are meagre and cannot be shared with the sub counties. He also pointed out that royalties are now transferred directly to the sub counties not through the district as it used to be.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG is not using more than 20% of OSR on council activities: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>The actual total local revenue collected in FY 2015/16 was Ugx: 546,184,957. From payment vouchers for fuel Ugx 14,054,500, motor vehicle repairs Ugx 9,931,000, council/committees Ugx 58,061,000, medical/burials Ugx 3,780,000, travels Ugx 27,079,000, stationery Ugx 1,285,000 and welfare Ugx 510,000 totaling to 114,700,500 Ugx. (all the payment vouchers were cleared by the relevant authorities by signing and stamping). Therefore the LG used 21% of OSR on council activities which is more than the 20% mandated by law ( First schedule of the LG ACT CAP 243).</p>
--	--	---	---	---

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

12	<p>The LG has in place the capacity to manage the procurement function</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the District has the position of a Senior Procurement Officer and Procurement Officer (if Municipal: Procurement Officer and Assistant Procurement Officer) substantively filled: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LG does not have a Senior Procurement officer but has a Procurement officer as seen by appointment letter dated 22nd June 2015 signed by Mulondo Robert(CAO)</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The TEC produced and submitted reports to the contracts committee dated 3rd August 2016 signed by 3 members Adai Jimmy, Olinga John and Angella Justine</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The contracts committee considered recommendations of the FY 16/17(refer Minutes of Moroto District Local Government contracts committee for approval of evaluation committee report for tenders under open bidding)in a meeting Ref No Min 01/CC/2016/17 date of meeting was 19th August 2016.It was signed by the secretary, chairperson and member. They awarded 7 contracts under open bidding and 18 projects under selective bidding.</li> </ul>

13	<p>The LG has a comprehensive Procurement and Disposal Plan covering infrastructure activities in the approved AWP and is followed.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Evidence that the procurement and Disposal Plan for the current year covers all infrastructure projects in the approved annual work plan and budget and b) evidence that the LG has made procurements in previous FY as per plan (adherence to the procurement plan) for the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The procurement and disposal plan for the current FY was viewed. It was signed and stamped by the Procurement officer and CAO on the 10 July 2017.</li> <li>• There was evidence of submission of Procurement plan for FY 2016/2017 and contracts committee awarded under second quarter(Oct –Dec 2016/2017)to the Executive Director PPDA signed by CAO on 20th December 2016 and received by PPDA on 15 Feb 2017.</li> </ul>
14	<p>The LG has prepared bid documents, maintained contract registers and procurement activities files and adheres with established thresholds.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For current FY, evidence that the LG has prepared 80% of the bid documents for all investment/infrastructure by August 30: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG prepared bid documents for all infrastructural projects by 20th June 2016 under open domestic bidding signed and stamped by the secretary contracts committee and chairman on 15th July 2016 Bid adverts appeared in the press in the Daily Monitor on 15 July 2016.The 80% target was therefore reached</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The contracts register was seen on the computer and in hard copy and was updated showing current projects</li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2.</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the previous FY the LG adhered to procurement thresholds .Projects above 50m shs for open bidding and supplies above 30m shs. Min 54/CC/2016/2017 approval of procurement method under FY 16/17 for procurement method for selective bidding signed by chairperson Contracts committee.Min 40/CC/2015/2016 method of procurement approval threshold for open bidding for FY 2016/17 signed by chairman and members contracts committee.</li> </ul> <p>For open bidding construction of 2 classroom block at Kaloi,completion of district drug stores,extension and renovation of planning unit,renovation of 2 classroom block at Kakingol primary school and renovation of staff house at Nadunget HC III under selective bidding.</p>
15	<p>The LG has certified and provided detailed project information on all investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects implemented in the previous FY were appropriately certified – interim and completion certificates for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects for previous FY were appropriately certified through interim and completion certificates issued eg</li> </ul> <p>Completion certificate for construction of drug store at 92,766,450 shs signed by District Engineer on May 3rd 2017,interim payment certificate for construction of 5 Stance VIP Latrine at Kasimer Primary school signed by procurement officer and District Engineer on 10 March 2017.interim payment certificate for renovation of CAOs residence signed by district engineer and CAO on 12/01/2017.</p> <p>Certificate of practical completion for extension and renovation of planning unit at 103,444,150/= signed by district Engineer on April 12 2017.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all works projects for the current FY are clearly labelled (site boards) indicating: the name of the project, contract value, the contractor; source of funding and expected duration: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects visited for current FY are clearly labelled eg Rehabilitation of old engineering offices(project name ,client ,contractor and FY on siteboard were seen ),construction of cattle crush in Lokali (it had project name, client .funder, FY,Contractor and supervisor</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Financial management				

16	<p>The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>According to the print out from the IFMS system, the following bank accounts were reconciled up to 31/12/2017; Moroto District YLP project account, YLP recurrent account, Moroto district UWEP fund and Moroto District UNICEF account. All these accounts were prepared, reviewed and approved by the relevant authorities.</p>
17	<p>The LG made timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the LG makes timely payment of suppliers during the previous FY – no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2.</li> </ul>	0	<p>The CFO pointed out that Moroto District didn't maintain a claim and payment register during FY 2016/2017 to show overdue bills. However, sampled payment vouchers showed that some payments were not timely. e.g. request for payment by Pajoy general traders for renovation works of CAO's residence dated 12/01/2017, was cleared for payment on 18/1/2017 but paid on 30/05/2017 and request from Clabas Uganda Ltd for payment for extension and modification of planning unit ref Moro/535/1617/DDEG/Works/00007 dated 23/11/2016, was cleared for payment on 28/11/2016 and paid on 19/12/2016.</p>
18	<p>The LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA section 90 and LG procurement regulations</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has a substantive Senior Internal Auditor and produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 3.</li> </ul>	0	<p>According to the staff structure, Moroto District is supposed to have a Principal Internal Auditor and the Internal Auditor. Therefore, the LG has no Substantive Senior Internal Auditor. The LG advertised for the post of Principal internal Auditor in New vision dated 18/12/2017. However, the Acting Principal Internal Auditor produced all the quarterly audit reports for FY 2016/2017. First quarter Internal Audit report was dated 11/11/2016, second quarter dated 22/2/2017, third quarter dated 10/4/2017 and fourth quarter dated 10/8/2017.</p> <p>Dates of submission to MOFPED were; 11/11/2016, 22/3/2017, 12/4/2017 and 11/8/2017 respectively.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council and LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous financial year i.e. follow up on audit queries: score 2.</li> </ul>	2	<p>Information on the implementation status of the Internal audit findings for the previous financial year was included in all the four quarterly internal audit reports submitted on 8/11/2016, 22/2/2017, 10/4/2017 and 10/8/2017 respectively to Chairperson LGPAC, District Chairperson, CAO and RDC.</p> <p>Follow up was made on audit queries, review minutes from internal Audit meeting with Heads of departments dated 1/6/2017 reveal discussions on audit queries. Also attached were the lists of audit queries for quarter three and quarter two financial year 2016/17.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>Evidence from the letter delivery book, indicates that the Quarterly Internal Audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting officer, District chair person, RDC and LGPAC as follows: first quarter submitted on 8/11/2016, second quarter on 22/2/2017, third quarter on 10/4/2017 and fourth quarter on 10/8/2017. From the LGPAC reports dated 19th/2/2017-20/2/2017, 23th-25th May, 2017 and 24th, 27th,28th /11/2017 for FY 2016/17, the quarterly internal Audit reports were reviewed and followed up. The internal auditor met with heads of departments and discussed audit queries for third quarter on 1/6/2017.</p>
19	<p>The LG maintains a detailed and updated assets register</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>The available asset registers for vehicles, furniture, Donations from MAAIF and computer and computer accessories were not updated and not according to the format in the Finance and accounting manual.</p>

20	<p>The LG has obtained an unqualified or qualified Audit opinion</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Quality of Annual financial statement from previous FY: • unqualified audit opinion: score 4 • Qualified: score 2 • Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</p>	4	<p>From the annual report of the Auditor General FY 2016/2017, Moroto District obtained an unqualified audit opinion.</p>
Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability				
21	<p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues including TPC reports, monitoring reports, performance assessment results and LG PAC reports for last FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>There was documented evidence in the Moroto District Council Minutes that council met as per requirements 5 out of 6 times (i.e. on the 28th/4/2017, 28th/2/2017, 16th/12/2016, 28th/10/2016 and 23rd/9/2016). The council deliberated on relevant service-delivery issues (e.g. approval of budgets estimates and supplementary requests; approval of committee reports; discussion of reports by the LC V Chairperson, RDC, the committees and the executive; as well as other incidentals (e.g. constitution of committees, approval of new area land committees, adoption of the recommended staff establishment, etc). However, what appeared to be missing in council's discussions in the FY 2016/17 were deliberations on TPC reports, monitoring reports and performance assessment reports (departmental, mock/internal or sectoral performance assessments).</p>
22	<p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>• Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 2.</p>	0	<p>No documented evidence (apart from anecdotes and self-reported claims that ACAO through the sub-county chiefs) is officer assigned/designated to play the role of coordinating lower-level feedback on and responses to (grievances /complaints) in council.</p>

23	<p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG has published: • The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</p>	0	<p>No documented evidence of posting/publishing of payroll and pension schedule on LG notice boards (only self-reported anecdotes and assertions made that this was posted on CAO;s notice board and on checking what had been posted was payment vouchers not payroll and pension schedule. The District Planner confirmed that some district political leaders and technical officers were uneasy with such 'private' information being posted for 'public consumption').</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>No documented evidence seen of posting/publishing of procurement plans and awards of contracts and amounts on notice boards.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications, are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year (from budget requirements): score 1.</li> </ul>	0	<p>Not Applicable (N/A) – There was no LGPA in the FY under review. NB: Email dated 15th/1/2018 seen as documented evidence that the mock/internal LGPA results were posted or published.</p>
24	<p>The LGs communicates guidelines, circulars and policies to LLGs to provide feedback to the citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the HLG have communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>No documented evidence was made available for proof that central government agencies' (MoFPED, MoLG, OPM, etc) circulars, guidelines, policies and procedures (on DDEG, NAADS, NUSAF, etc) are disseminated mainly through stakeholder forums and radio programmes.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that LG during previous FY has 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.</li> </ul>	0	<p>No documented evidence for proof offered to confirm the practice of downward accountability through barazas, radio events, etc. Only anecdotes and self-reported claims of having supported barazas on education (sensitization the need to send children to school); six days of activism (involving all heads of departments) and UNICEF-supported community consultation.</p>
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				

25

The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.

• Evidence that the LG gender focal person has provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender into their activities score 2.

2

• The LG Gender focal person provided guidance and support to sector departments through Gender Analysis tools and Gender development work plans for sectors in Health, education, production, works and environment. Monitoring reports on Gender based Violence(GBV) support supervision addressed to CAO on 8 June 2017 signed by Gender Focal person., creating awareness on laws eg FGM act 2010,Gender working groups that meet (monthly, quarterly)Steering committees on gender formed and meetings held on 21/01/2016 at CAOs board room in attendance were 30 members(13 M,17F)

• Reports on Gender women council, HIV and culture for 1st quarter 2017 were also viewed.

• Evidence that gender focal point has planned activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and that more than 90% of previous year's budget for gender activities has been implemented: score 2.

0

• The Gender focal point has no direct budget .There are planned activities for current FY i.e. mentoring 12 male action groups in all subcounties,Hold Gender reference group meetings, monitor all sub county on Gender mainstreaming and HIV/AIDS awareness are some of the planned activities.

• Gender Focal point received 6,596,000 shs from LG planning unit for previous FY which is support to all 4 sub counties and 2 divisions however, actions plans are ongoing 60% works have been met.

LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

• Evidence that environmental screening or EIA where appropriate, are carried out for activities, projects and plans and mitigation measures are planned and budgeted for: score 2

2

• Environmental screening social form was viewed for:

2 stance latrine at Kameri primary school dated 19/07/2016 signed by the senior environment officer, screening forms for renovation of teachers house at Kaloi primary school, extension and renovation of planning unit block on 20/07/2017 signed by senior environment officer, sitting and drilling of boreholes lot 1(7),lot 2(8)boreholes on 20/07/2017 signed by senior environment officer, monitoring reports for 1st quarter dated 4th October 2016,compliance monitoring report dated 11th January were viewed.

Mitigation measures planned were all viewed for the above projects for screening.

• Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management plans in the contract bid documents: score 1

1

• The LG integrated environmental and social management plans in contract bids eg;

Construction of District drug store, environmental mitigation was allocated 1m shs, Construction of 5 stance VIP latrine allocated 15,000/=,sitting and drilling of boreholes 3.4m shs,renovation of classroom block at Kakingol primary school was allocated 100,000shs

• Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1

1

• There was proof of land ownership and land agreements for projects i.e.

Consent form for voluntary land contribution for Musus primary school signed by LC 1 and LC III of Katikekile Sub County on 13 Dec 2017,

consent form for voluntary land contribution for Nakonyen Dam.at Katikekile signed by the land owners and LC III Tapac sub county on 1st December 2017

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that all completed projects have Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Form completed and signed by Environmental Officer: score 2</li></ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The completed projects had environmental and social mitigation certificate forms for;  Construction of Nadunget Health Center III(certificate no 003) signed and stamped by Senior Environment officer on 9/11/2016, Two classroom block at Musingro Primary School signed by Senior Environment officer on 9/11/2016</li></ul>
--	--	---	---	---





## **LGPA 2017/18**

Educational Performance Measures

Moroto District

(Vote Code: 538)

Score 53/100 (53%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human Resource Management				
1	<p>The LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school)</p> <p>Maximum 8 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</li> <li>Evidence that the LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>Moroto DLG budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school . Verified evidence from the Moroto Local Government Performance Contract FY 2017/18</p> <p>Verified the evidence by the staff lists as of 01/11/17 (Term 3)/ (FY 2017/2018) of 528 schools in which all of them had more than 7 teachers and 1 head teacher.</p>
2	<p>LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision o If 100% score 6 o If 80 - 99% score 3 o If below 80% score 0</li> </ul>	0	<p>The DEO reported that he had filled all the teacher positions provided for in the wage bill although there was no evidence to ascertain his report</p>

3	<p>LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision: score 6</li> </ul>	0	<p>DEO reported that his office has substantively filled the 2 positions of Inspectors provided for in the approved staff structure but did not find any documentary evidence to ascertain the DEOs report</p>
4	<p>The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of Primary Teachers: score 2</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DEO reported that he had filled all the teacher positions provided for in the wage bill although there was no evidence to ascertain his report</li> </ul>
		<p>Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of School Inspectors: score 2</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DEO reported that his office has substantively filled the 2 positions of Inspectors provided for in the approved staff structure but did not find any documentary evidence to ascertain the DEOs report</li> </ul>
5	<p>The LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Education department appraised school inspectors during the previous FY • 100% school inspectors: score 3</p>	3	<p>There are 2 School Inspectors and 16 Head Teachers (heading 16 public schools) in Moroto district. The 2 Inspectors were duly appraised by the DEO as evidenced by duly completed PS Form 5 available on their personal files. The 2 School Inspectors are referenced by personal refs. nos. MTO/6/005 and MTO/6/252) . Inspector ref .no. MTO/6/005 was appraised on 07/7/2017 while inspector MTO/6/252 was appraised on 9/08/17.</p>

		Evidence that the LG Education department appraised head teachers during the previous FY. • 90% - 100%: score 3 • 70% - 89%: score 2 • Below 70%: score 0	0	There was no verifiable evidence (in form of appraisal reports for the 16 Head Teachers) in either the DEO's office or the HRM's office to confirm that the 16 Head Teachers were appraised. DEO claimed that the appraisal reports were stored in a nearby primary school (schools were on holiday) owing to the on-going renovations at the Education office. There was however, no prior effort to retrieve the files and have them available in readiness for the assessment exercise.
--	--	---	---	--

Assessment area: Monitoring and Inspection

6	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools: score 1</li> </ul>	1	<p>Moroto DEO communicated all several guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in 2017 to schools: Verified evidence from the following communications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter of invitation to the Head Teachers for the program for dissemination of National Integrated early childhood Development (NIECD) policy to Districts signed by the DEO on 9th May 2017.</li> <li>• Concept Note and program for the regional engagement of Cultural and Religious Leaders on the Gender and Equity issues in the Karamoja Region received from P/S MOES by the DEO on 19th July 2017 and forwarded to all Head Teachers on 20th July 2017.</li> <li>• Circular of 24/01/17 by the P/S MOES regarding Menstrual Hygiene Management in Schools forwarded by the DEO to all Head Teachers on 25/01/17.</li> </ul>
---	--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level, including on school feeding: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Verified evidence from the following communications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter of invitation to the Head Teachers for the program for dissemination of National Integrated early childhood Development (NIECD) policy to Districts signed the DEO on 9th May 2017.</li> <li>• Concept Note and program to all head teachers for the regional engagement of Cultural and Religious Leaders on the Gender and Equity issues in the Karamoja Region received from P/S MOES by the DEO 19th July 2017 and forwarded to all Head Teachers on 20th July 2017.</li> <li>• Circular of 24/01/17 by the P/S MOES regarding Menstrual Hygiene Management in Schools forwarded by the DEO to all Head Teachers on 25/01/17.</li> </ul>
7	<p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all private and public primary schools</p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all private and public primary schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100% - score 12</li> <li>o 90 to 99% - score 10</li> <li>o 80 to 89% - score 8</li> <li>o 70 to 79% - score 6</li> <li>o 60 to 69% - score 3</li> <li>o 50 to 59% score 1</li> <li>o Below 50% score 0.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	12	<p>Verified the evidence from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter of submission of accountability of schools inspection report for quarter 1 2017/18 signed by the CAO on 19/12/17.</li> </ul>

<p>LG Education department has discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the Education department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>Verified evidence from Minutes of the Naitakwae P/S SMC meeting of 7/12/17 which discussed among other things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>? Increased need for involving parents in school activities</li> <li>? Cause of increased school drop-out rate</li> </ul>
<p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Verified the evidence from the following acknowledgement notes from the Directorate of Education Standards ( DES) signed by the Senior Inspector of Schools on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20/01/18 for receipt of the Moroto Report and accountability for the 1st quarter 2017/18.</li> <li>• 12/10/17 for receipt of 3rd quarter of 2106/17</li> <li>• 14/07/17 for receipt of inspection report of 4th quarter 2016/17.</li> <li>• 16/01/17 for receipt of inspection report of Jan to Dec. 2016</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>Verified evidence from warning letters by the DEO to the following teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achieng Rose (III/2006/3868) dated 12/10/17 for absconding duty from Topac Primary Schools</li> <li>• Sermon letter signed by the DEO on 5/05/17 Egujuwai Patrick (Reg. No. III/2009/4845) of Kakinyol Primary School to report to the DEOS on 10/7/17.</li> </ul>

9	The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and OBT: score 5</li> </ul>	0	The list of Government aided primary schools' data submitted by the DEO is not consistent as evidenced from data obtained from the two sources of PBS and EMIS  EMIS..... 26 schools  PBS .....24 schools
	Maximum 10 for this performance measure	Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: • Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and OBT: score 5	0	The P/ Schools' enrolment data for 2017/18 is not consistent as evidenced from the P/S enrolment data obtained from the two sources of OBT and EMIS  OBT..... 8767 Pupils  EMIS .....9784 Pupils

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc... during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	The Production, Marketing, Social Services and Natural Resources Management Committee (PSSNRMC) is the standing committee responsible for education on top of other social sectors. For the FY 2016/17, it sat on the 22nd/6/2017, 4th/10/2017, 20th/4/2017, 18th/2/2017, 18th/11/2016 and 21st/10/2016. As such, there was evidence from the committee minutes to confirm that it met and discussed education service delivery issues, including departmental quarterly updates on priorities and reports as well as sector-specific review of budgets, quarterly reports, proposals / recommendations and performance (see page 4 of the 22nd/6/2017 committee meeting minutes). However, there was no evidence in the minutes highlighting discussion of results from inspection and monitoring in the education sector, including LG PAC reports.
	Maximum 4 for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	Some minutes of council's deliberations (28th/4/2017, 28th/2/2017, 16th/12/2016, 28th/10/2016 and 23rd/9/2016) indicated that representatives of the PSSNRMC presented education sector issues to council that required council's approval (see page 19 and min.24/DLC/16 of district council meeting dated the 16th/12/2016).

11	<p>Primary schools in a LG have functional SMCs</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to DEO) • 100% schools: score 5 • 80 to 99% schools: score 3 • Below 80% schools: score 0</p>	5	<p>Verified evidence from the minutes of the meetings that were conducted on the following dates at Moroto KDA primary school visited during the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 06/06/17 to approve the School budget of the 3rd quarter of 2016/17.</li> <li>• 14/03/17 to discuss school finance</li> <li>• 25/09/17 beginning of term</li> </ul>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>	0	<p>No evidence of any publications regarding schools receiving UPE funds were seen at the district head quarters.</p>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				
13	<p>The LG Education department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>Moroto DEO's office did not submit its procurement requests because under the IFMS system all Capital Development Funds are transferred directly to the respective sub/counties through the Discriminatory Development Grant (DDEG) under the District Planning Unit.</p>



14	<p>The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	3	<p>From the documents availed, only documents for one supplier qualified to be assessed i.e. Glotech consults Int. LTD payment for supply of office laptops to education department request dated 7/2/2017, certified and approved for payment on 15/2/2017, verified on 17/3/2017 and paid on 5/6/2017. Certification and initiation for payment was on time. Other payment vouchers and request had no contracts, certification and were mainly for trainings and workshops but were paid on time.</p>
----	---	---	---	--

Assessment area: Financial management and reporting

15	<p>The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>According to the LG Planner's records and evidence from the Q4 Consolidated APR for the FY 2016/17, while the education department submitted inputs to the planning unit for all 4 quarters for FY 2016/17 (i.e. Q1 - 3rd/11/2016 but with missing Receipt No; Q2 – 2nd/3/2017 Receipt No: 0451; Q3 – 17th/5/2017 Receipt No: 0724; and Q4 – 11th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4545), the submissions were sometimes slow, hence the late submission of the Q4 APR (meant to be submitted before 31st/7/2017).</p>
----	--	--	---	---

16	<p>LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</li> <li>If sector has no audit query score 4</li> <li>If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points</li> <li>If all queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	2	<p>The education sector provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of audit findings for the previous financial year. Responses to audit queries can be viewed in the quarterly audit reports 2016/17. For example query on shoddy works at Kaloi P/S classroom construction and a lot of defects in door locks for VIP latrine at Kasimeri P/S. Management response was that the defect was corrected and LGPAC recommended that the contractors should be blacklisted and never be awarded contracts in the District. The education sector had 1 audit finding in fourth quarter of Nadunget seed school which had queries with micro procurements, non adherence to completion dates for construction, and inadequacy book keeping among others. Management requested sub accountants to assist heads in preparation and maintenance of books of accounts. Source of information is quarterly audit reports 2016/17.</p>
----	---	--	---	---

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

17	<p>LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 5 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/men teacher should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc...: Score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>The DEO reported that there were a number of dissemination workshops regarding gender hygiene reproductive health that were conducted during 2017 but did not see any documentary evidence to verify the DEO's report.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<p>The DEO reported that there were a number of dissemination workshops regarding gender hygiene reproductive health that were conducted during 2017 but did not see any documentary evidence to verify the DEO's report.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<p>The DEO reported the Women in Moroto District are not very active socially so it was very difficult to get them to the SMCs. This is claim was evidenced from the sample of primary schools visited during the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moroto KDA Primary School 2/9</li> <li>• Naitakwae PS 4/13</li> </ul> <p>:</p>
18	<p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environment education etc..): score 3:</li> </ul>	3	<p>Verified evidence from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Circular of 16/01/17 inviting students to attend an HIV workshop entitled 'Choose Life-Home Based Care' signed by coordinator of Home Based Care program after which the students formed the Child Rights Club.</li> </ul>



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Health Performance Measures

Moroto District

(Vote Code: 538)

Score 68/100 (68%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Human resource planning and management				
1	<p>LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY • More than 80% filled: score 6 • 60 – 80% - score 3 • Less than 60% filled: score 0</p>	0	<p>56% of the approved positions for primary health care workers for the current FY are filled with a wage bill. The approved staffing structure for the 2017/2017 with staffing levels is available at the office of the human resources for verification of this information. The district has advertised for two more positions (DHO and ADHO maternal and child health) to improve staffing. This advert run in the new vision of 18/12/2017 and closed 12/01/2018. Addition of two staff will not improve staffing levels significantly to affect the scores.</p>
2	<p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 4</p>	4	<p>A comprehensive recruitment plan signed on 28/08/2016 has been submitted to the HRM for the current FY covering vacant positions of which two have already been advertised through the new vision on 18/12/2018. A copy of the recruitment plan signed by the CAO is available at the office of the HR.</p>
3	<p>The LG Health department has ensured that performance appraisal for health facility in charge is conducted</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the health facility in-charge have been appraised during the previous FY: o 100%: score 8 o 70 – 99%: score 4 o Below 70%: score 0</p>	8	<p>There are no Health Centres IV and District Hospitals in Moroto district hence; there were no appropriate health facility in- charges to be appraised by the DHO.</p> <p>Moroto Hospital serves as a Regional Referral Hospital and the Medical superintendent is appraised by the Hospital Director, while Nadunget HC III currently serves as the HC IV and MoH is in the process of upgrading it to HC IV level.</p>

4	<p>The Local Government Health department has equitably deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>	4	<p>Health workers in Moroto have been deployed equitably in line with the staff on the deployment list. This was verified at Nadunget and Rupa health centers through matching the available staff at the facility with the deployment list at the office of the DHO.</p>
---	--	--	---	---

Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision

5	<p>The DHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>The district only received infection control and prevention guidelines (2013) in the FY 2016/2017. Copies of these guidelines were further disseminated to all the in charges during quality improvement meeting. A distribution list on 9/05/2017 is on file at the office of the DHO for verification.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>These were communicated to health facility in charges during a quality improvement meeting held on 9/05/2017. Min 3 of this meeting (communication from the DHO) serves as a confirmation to this communication.</p>
6	<p>The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that DHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals: score 3</p>	3	<p>This indicator is not applicable to Moroto district since it has no HC IV. The proposed HC IV (Nadunget HC III) is not officially gazetted to assume this status. After the regional referral hospital the highest level of health facility is at level III.</p>

		Evidence that DHT has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY: • If 100% supervised: score 3 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 1 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0	1	The DHT supervised 76% of health facilities. Quarterly support supervision reports are available at the office of the DHO for the 2016/2017 FY. The 4th quarter report shows that this activity was done during the period May 27 to June 7 2017 although dates for supervision activities in other quarters was missing on the reports.
7	The Health Sub-district(s) have effectively provided support supervision to lower level health units  Maximum 6 points for this performance measure	Evidence that health facilities have been supervised by HSD and reports produced: • If 100% supervised score 6 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 4 • 60 - 79% of the health facilities: score 2 • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0	6	There is no HSD in Moroto district, since no health facility is at HC IV level which by current MOH health system is mandated to supervise the lower level health facilities.
8	The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed up  Maximum 10 points for this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> <li>• Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>	4  6	<p>These reports were discussed. Each of the 4 quarterly reports presented issues per health facility and recommended actions to minimize the gaps. Copies of these reports are on file at the office of the DHO.</p> <p>Actions from support supervision findings were discussed. This can be verified from minutes of the DHT meeting on 24/03/2017. In the minutes of this meeting, (communication from the DHO), findings of support supervision during the January to March period showed that a partograph as a labor monitoring tool in the district was only used on 14% of mothers in labor which contributed to obstetric emergencies. In this meeting, it was recommended that this should be increased to 85% to reduce obstetric complication through use of this tool to monitor labor closely for timely decisions.</p>

9	<p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for health facility lists as per formats provided by MoH</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o List of health facilities which are consistent with both HMIS reports and OBT: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	0	<p>Despite all the effort, it was not possible to access the PBS/OBT for Moroto to make comparisons of health facilities between HMIS and the OBT to determine consistency.</p>
---	--	---	---	---

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability

10	<p>The LG committee responsible for health met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the council committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>The Production, Marketing, Social Services and Natural Resources Management Committee (PSSNRMC) is the standing committee responsible for health on top of other social sectors. For the FY 2016/17, it sat on the 22nd/6/2017, 4th/10/2017, 20th/4/2017, 18th/2/2017, 18th/11/2016 and 21st/10/2016. Therefore, there was evidence from the committee minutes to confirm that it met and discussed health service delivery issues including departmental quarterly updates on priorities and reports as well as sector-specific review of budgets, quarterly reports, proposals/recommendations and performance (see page 2-4 of the 22nd/6/2017 committee meeting minutes). There was no evidence in minutes highlighting discussion of results from supervision and monitoring in the health sector, including LG PAC reports.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>Some minutes of council's deliberations (28th/4/2017, 28th/2/2017, 16th/12/2016, 28th/10/2016 and 23rd/9/2016) indicated that representatives of the PSSNRMC presented health sector issues to council that required council's approval (see page 20 and min.24/DLC/16 of district council meeting dated the 16th/12/2016).</p>

11	<p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 5 points</p>	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 5</li> <li>• If 80-99% : score 3</li> <li>• If 70-79%: : score 1</li> <li>• If less than 70%: score 0</li> </ul>	1	<p>All the 18 health facilities in the district had established HUMCs. All HUMCs have membership following the guidelines of the MOH (7 members for the HCIII, 5 members for the HC II). Of the sampled facilities 75% demonstrated functionality of HUMCs with minutes of quarterly review meetings for the q quarters of 2016/2017.</p>
12	<p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>PHC releases for quarter quarter 2 of the 2017/2018 FY were posted at the LG notes board on the office of the CFO. Budget performance was also shown on this list by way of funds disbursed and the variance compared to the total budget for each facility.</p>

Assessment area: Procurement and contract management

13	<p>The LG Health department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30 for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<p>According to the annual work plan, no procurement's for the health sector were included, hence no procurement request was submitted to PDU.</p>
		<p>Evidence that LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2</p>	2	<p>Form PP5 was not submitted since no procurement was planned for the Health department for the current FY.</p>



14	<p>The LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG Health department has supported all health facilities to submit health supplies procurement plan to NMS on time:</li> <li>• 100% - score 8</li> <li>• 70-99% – score 4</li> <li>• Below 70% - score 0</li> </ul>	8	<p>The office of the DHO supported health facilities to submit the procurement plan for health supplies to NMS timely. This can be verified by the 6 cycles of drug orders submitted on the following dates: For Nadunget HCIII. receipts of these medicines were available with the following dates, 1. 27/07/2017, 2. 16/09/2016, 3. 10/11/2016, 4. 23/01/2017 5. 23/03/2017 6. 29/05/2017. For Rupa HC III 1.2/08/2016. 2. 16/09/2016, 3. 10/11/2016, 4. 23/01/2017, 5. 24/05/2017. The LG verified and stamped on all the receipts of medicines for the cycles during the FY 2016/2017</p>
15	<p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 2 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 2 points</li> </ul>	2	<p>From the documents availed, only documents for one supplier qualified to be assessed i.e. Glotech consults Int. LTD payment for supply of office laptops to Health department request dated 7/2/2017, certified and approved for payment on 15/2/2017, verified and recommended on 17/3/2017 and paid on 5/6/2017. Certification and initiation for payment was on time. Other payment vouchers and request had no contracts, certification and were mainly for trainings and workshops.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				
16	<p>The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul>	0	<p>According to the LG Planner's records and evidence from the Q4 Consolidated APR for the FY 2016/17, while the health department submitted inputs to the planning unit for all 4 quarters for FY 2016/17 (i.e. Q1 - 3rd/11/2016 but with missing Receipt No; Q2 – 2nd/3/2017 Receipt No: 0451; Q3 – 17th/5/2017 Receipt No: 0724; and Q4 – 11th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4545), the submissions were sometimes slow, hence the late submission of the Q4 APR (meant to be submitted before 31st/7/2017).</p>

17	<p>LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year • If sector has no audit query score 4 • If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 2 points • If all queries are not responded to score 0</p>	2	<p>There is evidence that the health sector provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of audit findings for the previous financial year in the quarterly audit reports and LGPAC reports dated 24th-25th May, 2017. For example Nakiloro Health centre, Kosiroi H/C had audit queries with positing cash books and reconciling them( according to LGFARs 2007 sec 62 (3) talks about maintaining a cash book and reconciling them monthly to the bank statement. Management response was that sub accountants should assist health in charges in preparation and maintenance of books of Accounts. Also there was evidence that the audit query raised in third quarter of missing cash book and no access to books of account for Loputuk H/C, by quarter four audit report the health centre had a cash book and reconciled up to date. LoputukH/c, had found the cash book and it was also posted and reconciled up to date. Rupa Health Centre had also received the books that were not accessible to the audit team in the previous visit. It was also posted and reconciled to date. Accountabilities had also been retired.</p>
----	---	--	---	--

Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards

18	<p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>	<p>• Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines: score 2</p>	2	<p>All the HUMCs meet the gender composition requirement of at least 30% of the committee members being females. The list of committee members for each facility can be verified at both the office of the DHO and the health facilities themselves.</p>
		<p>• Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2</p>	0	<p>The LG had not issued any such guidelines in the district. It was however not possible to establish at the DHOs office if these guidelines had been received by Moroto district from the MOH.</p>

19	<p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence that the LGs has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal : score 2 points.</li></ul>	0	<p>These guidelines were not available at the DHOs office and it was not clear if they had been provided since the current acting DHO had been in office for only one year.</p>
----	---	---	---	---



## **LGPA 2017/18**

Water & Environment Performance Measures

Moroto District

(Vote Code: 538)

Score 61/100 (61%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: Planning, budgeting and execution				
1	<p>The DWO has targeted allocations to sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average.</p> <p>Maximum score 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY: score 10</li> </ul>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Safe Water Coverage data for Moroto District LG show that the district has safe water access of 67%. Hence, only Nadunget S/C had Safe Water Coverage of 43.9% below the district average.</li> <li>From the annual workplan for 2017/18 submitted on 27th June 2017, Moroto DLG planned for drilling and siting of 15 boreholes in Nadunget S/C, Rupa S/C, Katikekile S/C &amp; Tapac S/C.</li> <li>In Nadunget alone which was below the district coverage, 5 boreholes were planned in the following villages i.e Natapar Akwangan/Kwamon, Lokeriaut/Lobobore Iolepo Site 1, Kalogilikol/Lobei site, Namatwai/Karenga and Nakamistae/Nabusligoi.</li> </ul>
2	<p>The LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties (i.e. sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average)</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY: score 15</li> </ul>	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the annual Progress report for FY 2016/17(quarter 4) dated 17th July 2017 and received by MoWE on 19nd July 2017, it was revealed that DWO had implemented budgeted water projects in Nadunget S/C.</li> <li>Physical visit of the assessor on Thursday 25th January 2018 also confirmed as sampled at Namatwai/Karenga borehole.</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Monitoring and Supervision				

3	<p>The LG Water department carries out monthly monitoring and supervision of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the LG Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually. • If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15 • 80 - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10 • 70 - 79%: score 7 • 60 - 69% monitored: score 5 • 50 - 59%: score 3 • Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored - score 0</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no monitoring report from Moroto DWO seen by the assessor.</li> </ul>
4	<p>The LG Water department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data lists of water facilities as per formats provided by MoWE</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and OBT: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Performance Contract for Moroto DLG shows that Nadunget S/C had safe Water access of 43.9% below Moroto district average coverage of 67.</li> <li>• This was contrary to the MIS report that showed that Moroto DLG had safe water coverage of 81% and that 2 Sub-Counties figures were below the district average (i.e Tapac S/C-61% and Nadunget S/C-75%).</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Procurement and contract management				
5	<p>The LG Water department has submitted procurement requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>	<p>Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement requests to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement requests from DWO were seen by the assessor that cover all investment items for the drilling of five boreholes. The request was initiated by the DWO on 15th October 2017. The total cost was Ugshs 115,000,000.</li> <li>• The procurement request was however initiated and submitted late on 15th October 2017 after 30th April 2017 as per the manual guideline.</li> </ul>

6	<p>The DWO has appointed Contract Manager and has effectively managed the WSS contracts</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the DWO prepared a contract management plan and conducted monthly site visits for the different WSS infrastructure projects as per the contract management plan: score 2</li> <li>• If water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> <li>• If contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> <li>• If DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>	<p>0</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no contract management plan by the DWO seen during the assessment.</li> <li>• The DWO indicated that the designs for deep boreholes did not change. It is only in installation where installation pipes vary as well as the yield of the borehole. Through field visits on 3 sampled boreholes, the designs were found similar with what is mentioned in the Bills of Quantities.</li> <li>• Completion report for siting, drilling and installation of six hand pump boreholes in Moroto district for FY 2016/17 were seen. This completion report was prepared by Galaxy Agritech(U) Ltd, the contractor under contract reference no.Moro 538/1617/DDEG/Wrks/00004 and it was appended on the request for payment letter dated 02nd March 2017.</li> <li>• The DWO has certified all the water projects for FY 2016/17 as evidenced by the payment certificates issued by Moroto DLG;</li> <li>• Payment certificate was made for Galaxy Agritech(U) Ltd on 12th September 2017.</li> <li>• Another Payment certificate was prepared for Icon Projects Ltd on 17th September 2017.</li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the DWOs timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points</li> </ul>	3	<p>The DWOs timely certified and recommended suppliers for payment as evidenced from payment to Moroto MC works and technical services for servicing vehicle LG0006080 request dated 13/4/2017, certification and recommendation on 13/4/2017, verified on 19/4/2017 and payment on 3/5/2017. Also payment to Marlboro Motors for repair of the same Vehicle request dated 23/1/2017, certification by water officer on 27/1/2017, recommended and paid on 15/2/2017.</p>
Assessment area: Financial management and reporting				

8	<p>The LG Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation: score 5</li> </ul>	5	<p>According to the LG Planner's records and evidence from the Q4 Consolidated APR for the FY 2016/17, while the water department submitted inputs to the planning unit for all 4 quarters for FY 2016/17 (i.e. Q1 - 3rd/11/2016 but with missing Receipt No; Q2 – 2nd/3/2017 Receipt No: 0451; Q3 – 17th/5/2017 Receipt No: 0724; and Q4 – 11th/8/2017 Receipt No: 4545), the submissions were sometimes slow, hence the late submission of the Q4 APR (meant to be submitted before 31st/7/2017).</p>
9	<p>LG Water Department has acted on Internal Audit recommendation (if any)</p> <p>Maximum 5 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year</li> <li>If sector has no audit query score 5</li> <li>If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year: score 3</li> <li>If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul>	3	<p>There was evidence that the water sector provided information to internal audit on the implementation of audit findings for the previous financial year. Funds advanced to Ayamo Judith on 28/10/2016 of Ugx 14,500,000 meant for rehabilitation of boreholes not accounted for. She accounted by attaching a report and payment voucher. Also funds paid to Olaka Geoffrey on 6/10/2016 worth 200,000 Ugx meant for toiletries of the chairman had no request and not accounted for. Vouchers and reports with details of expenditure were verified by internal auditor and query was dropped. The water department had no audit queries in the fourth quarter. (Source of information was Quarterly internal audit reports and LGPAC reports).</p>

Assessment area: Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability



10	<p>The LG committee responsible for water met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council</p> <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the council committee responsible for water met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports and submissions from the District Water and Sanitation Coordination Committee (DWSCC) etc. during the previous FY: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>The Finance, Administration and Technical Services Committee (FATSC) is the standing committee responsible for water on top of other hardware-related sectors. For the FY 2016/17, it sat on 21st/6/2017, 21st/4/2017, 17th/2/2017, 17th/11/2016 and 20th/10/2016. As such, there was evidence both from the committee meetings and from the district council minutes that confirmed that it met and discussed water service delivery issues, including departmental quarterly updates on priorities and reports as well as sector-specific review of performance, budgets, quarterly reports, proposals and recommendations (see page 4-5 and 11 of 20th/10/2016 committee meeting). Even so, there was no evidence in minutes highlighting discussion of results from inspections, monitoring and LG PAC reports on the water sector).</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<p>Some minutes of council's deliberations indicated that representatives of the FATSC presented water sector issues to council that required council's approval (see page 10 and min.18/DLC/16 of district council meeting dated the 28th/10/2016).</p>
11	<p>The LG Water department has shared information widely to the public to enhance transparency</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The AWP, budget and the Water Development grant releases and expenditures have been displayed on the district notice boards as per the PPDA Act and discussed at advocacy meetings: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Assessor saw on Moroto DLG noticeboard MoFPED and other Government releases for FY 2017/18 published by CAO dated 25th January 2018.</li> <li>It showed that the release for Rural Water and Sanitation Development Grant was 95,656,488 in Quarter 1 and 71,742,366 in Quarter 2.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All WSS projects are clearly labelled indicating the name of the project, date of construction, the contractor and source of funding: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the field visits on Thursday 25th January 2018, the assessor visited 3 boreholes and found out that they were clearly labelled that is;</li> <li>Karenga village of Nadunget S/C, Lobur-Ngikwamong village of Nadunget S/C and Tikokin village of Tapac S/C.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on tenders and contract awards was seen on Moroto LG noticeboard as indicated;</li> <li>Best Evaluated bidder: Reddy's Boreholes &amp; Engineering Services Ltd</li> <li>Project: Drilling and siting of five boreholes</li> <li>Total Contract Sum: Ugshs 110,875,750 with VAT inclusive.</li> <li>Notice Date: 20th October 2017</li> </ul>
12	<p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If communities apply for water/public sanitation facilities as per the sector critical requirements (including community contributions) for the current FY: score 1</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two application letters for water facilities were seen by the assessor i.e from the office of Kambizi village applying for a borehole dated 03rd November 2017. Also a request for 2 boreholes in Loolung mining area of Rupa S/C were seen dated 30th August 2017.</li> <li>There was however no evidence of communities paying application fees of Ugshs 200,000.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of water supply facilities with WSCs that are functioning evidenced by collection of O&amp;M funds and carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, for the current FY: score 2</li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although 15 lists of Water User Committees (WUCs) were seen as having been trained by the DWO between 20th-28th February 2017, there was no physical report seen confirming that they were fully functioning including having a report on O &amp; M funds being collected.</li> <li>Even during fieldwork, the assessor could not see evidence of WUCs collecting O &amp; M funds.</li> </ul>
Assessment area: Social and environmental safeguards				

13	<p>The LG Water department has devised strategies for environmental conservation and management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that environmental screening (as per templates) for all projects and EIAs (where required) conducted for all WSS projects and reports are in place: score 2</li> <li>• Evidence that there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1</li> <li>• Evidence that construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>The DWO indicated that he never had any reports concerning environmental screening of boreholes for FY 2016/17 and FY 2017/18. He confessed that the DWO usually implements WSS projects without involving Environment and Natural Resources (ENR) office.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DWO indicated that there has never been cases of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY 2016/17.</li> <li>• Construction contracts never had a clause on environmental protection for instance; a contract No.Moro538/1718/Wrks/DDEG/00002 for siting and drilling of 5 boreholes awarded to Reddy's Boreholes and Technical Services Ltd on 14th November 2017.</li> </ul>
14	<p>The LG Water department has promoted gender equity in WSC composition.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If at least 50% WSCs are women as per the sector critical requirements: score 3</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessor looked at 15 lists of Water User Committees (WUCs) that were trained in the sub-counties of Nadunget, Tapac, Rupa and Katikekile between 20th-28th February 2017.</li> <li>• It was found out that 8 out of 15 WUCs ( 53.3%) for boreholes had atleast 50% of their members as women in line with the sector critical requirements. These included;</li> <li>• Naputh ligo(M=4, F=5), Lobobore Atolepo(M=5,F=4), Lobur Angikwamong(M=4,F=5), Kodonyo III(M=4,F=5), Kalemungole/Kosiroi HCII(M=3,F=6), Lokituret Lobobororio(M=6,F=3),Nakurobuin Naminam(M=5,F=4), Nakujan Kengole Wath Lokalimon(M=4,F=5),Nacuka Karenga(M=5,F=4), Kalogilikol (M=5,F=4), Napiero Lia(M=5,F=4), Nangeleya Akwapuwa(M=5,F=4),Poro/Nakonyen(M=4,F=5), Ariamabu Musas(M=4,F=5),Nabwal ke Ecale/Nakonyen(M=4,F=5).</li> </ul>

15	<p>Gender- and special-needs sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/RGCs.</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If public sanitation facilities have adequate access and separate stances for men, women and PWDs: score 3</li> </ul>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the previous FY 2016/17 and the current FY 2017/18, no public sanitation facilities have been budgeted and constructed. Moroto District LG has been conducting sensitization by encouraging communities to construct their own latrines through Community Led Total Sanitation Strategy (CLTS) approach.</li> <li>• The Assessor saw in the 4th Quarter progress report of Moroto district for FY 2016/17 that CLTS strategy was employed in which 25 villages with 36 manyattas in Rupa, Nadunget and Katikekile sub counties were sensitized on sanitation and hygiene.</li> </ul>
----	--	--	---	--