



## Local Government Performance Assessment

Moroto District

(Vote Code: 538)

| Assessment                        | Scores |
|-----------------------------------|--------|
| Accountability Requirements       | 17%    |
| Crosscutting Performance Measures | 58%    |
| Educational Performance Measures  | 48%    |
| Health Performance Measures       | 68%    |
| Water Performance Measures        | 77%    |

| Summary of requirements   | Definition of compliance   | Compliance justification  | Compliant? |
|---|--|---|------------|
| 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> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From MoFPED's inventory/schedule of LG submissions of performance contracts, check dates of submission and issuance of receipts and:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If LG submitted before or by due date, then state 'compliant'</li> <li>o If LG had not submitted or submitted later than the due date, state 'non-compliant'</li> </ul> </li> <li>• From the Uganda budget website: <a href="http://www.budget.go.ug">www.budget.go.ug</a>, check and compare recorded date therein with date of LG submission to confirm.</li> </ul> | <p>Moroto District Local Government submitted the Final Performance Contract on 9th August 2018 and approved on the same date as per the submission schedule of MoFPED, which was after the deadline of 1st August 2018.</p> <p>Note: The PFMAA LG Budget guidelines require the submission to be by 30th June. However, this date was revised to 1st August 2018 as per the request from MoFPED.</p> | No         |
| 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 by 30th June (LG PPDA Regulations, 2006).</p>                                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From MoFPED’s inventory of LG budget submissions, check whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The LG budget is accompanied by a Procurement Plan or not. If a LG submission includes a Procurement Plan, the LG is compliant; otherwise it is not compliant.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>                                       | <p>Moroto District Local Government submitted a Budget for FY 2018/2019; including a Procurement Plan for FY 2018/2019 on the 9th August 2018 as per the submission schedule of MoFPED. The District Council approved the Budget under Min. 04/DLC/05/’18 during the Council meeting held on 22nd May 2018.</p> <p>The submission of the Budget for FY 2018/2019; including a Procurement Plan for FY 2018/2019 was done after the deadline of 1st August 2018 as required.</p> <p>Note: The PFMAA LG Budget Guidelines require the submission to be by 30th June. However, this date was revised to 1st August 2018 as per the request from MoFPED.</p> | No |
| 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>From MoFPED’s official record/inventory of LG submission of annual performance report submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the annual performance report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted report to MoFPED in time, then it is compliant</li> <li>• If LG submitted late or did not submit, then it is not compliant</li> </ul> | <p>The Annual Budget Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 was submitted on 5th September 2018 (as per computer-generated date on the Q4 report submitted to MoFPED). Moroto DLG was missing on the MoFPED Submission Schedule.</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 31st July 2018</p>  | No |

|   |  |  |           |
|---|--|--|-----------|
| <p>LG has submitted the quarterly budget performance report for all the four quarters of the previous FY by end of the FY; PFMA Act, 2015).</p> | <p>From MoFPED's official record/ inventory of LG submission of quarterly reports submitted to MoFPED, check the date MoFPED received the quarterly performance reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted all four reports to MoFPED of the previous FY by July 31, then it is compliant (timely submission of each quarterly report, is not an accountability requirement, but by end of the FY, all quarterly reports should be available).</li> <li>• If LG submitted late or did not submit at all, then it is not compliant.</li> </ul> | <p>All the four Quarterly Budget Performance Reports for Moroto DLG for FY 2017/2018 were submitted to MoFPED as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarter One Report was submitted on 14th December 2017 to MoFPED (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED).</li> <li>• Quarter Two Report was submitted on 14th March 2018 to MoFPED and approved on 15th March 2018 (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED).</li> <li>• Quarter Three Report was submitted on 3rd July 2018 to MoFPED and thereafter approved on the same date (as per Submission Schedule of MoFPED).</li> <li>• Quarter Four Report was submitted on 5th September 2018 to MoFPED (as per computer-generated date on the Q4 report submitted to MoFPED). Moroto DLG was missing on the MoFPED Submission Schedule.</li> </ul> <p>The reports for the first three quarters were submitted by the end of the FY; PFMA Act, 2015 – Section 21 (3). However, the Quarter Four Report was submitted on 3rd September 2018, which was after the end of FY 2017/2018.</p> | <p>No</p> |
| <p>Audit</p>  |  |  |           |

|   |   |   |     |
|---|---|---|-----|
| <p>The LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and the Auditor General's findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and the Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to take action in lines with applicable laws.</p> | <p>From MoFPED's Inventory/record of LG submissions of statements entitled "Actions to Address Internal Auditor General's findings",</p> <p>Check:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If LG submitted a 'Response' (and provide details), then it is compliant</li> <li>• If LG did not submit a 'response', then it is non-compliant</li> <li>• If there is a response for all –LG is compliant</li> <li>• If there are partial or not all issues responded to – LG is not compliant.</li> </ul> | <p>The Accounting Officer submitted to the PS/ST information regarding the status of implementation of all the 4 queries raised by the Internal Auditor General in FY 2016/2017 on 23rd/4/2018 Ref: CR/155/1 later than the recommended date of 28th February 2018 contrary to provisions of the PFMA 2015 section 11 2g.</p> <p>These findings were:<br/> Expenditure in excess of warrants totaling to Shs. 4,404,754,147, Unaccounted for funds totaling to Shs. 332,205,435, Doubtful expenditure is totaling to Shs. 260,434,897 and Loss of funds totaling to Shs. 80,177,813.</p> <p>In addition, the Accounting Officer submitted to PS/ST information regarding the status of implementation of 5 queries raised by the OAG for FY 2016/2017 on 27th/3/2018 Ref: CR/252/2 later than the recommended date of 28th February 2018 contrary to the provisions of the PFMA 2015 section 11 2g.</p> <p>These findings were: Failure to implement the budget as approved by Parliament, Under collection of local revenue, Understaffing, Failure to implement Board of Survey recommendations and Routine maintenance of Roads under Force Account.</p> | No  |
| <p>The audit opinion of LG Financial Statement (issued in January) is not adverse or disclaimer.</p>  |   | <p>Moroto DLG obtained Unqualified Audit Opinion for FY 2017/18</p>   | Yes |

| Summary of requirements  | Definition of compliance  | Compliance justification   | Score |
|--|---|--|-------|
| Planning, budgeting and execution  |   |  |       |
| <p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) 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 district/ municipality has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A functional Physical Planning Committee in place that considers new investments on time: score 1.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The members of the District Physical Planning Committee – Moroto, were appointed by the CAO as per letter Ref: CR/156//3 dated 13th September 2018.</li> <li>• Moroto DLG had not recruited a Physical Planner; but was utilizing the one recruited by Moroto MC.</li> <li>• The newly appointed committee had held one meeting (as ascertained from the minutes of the meeting held on 18th September 2018).</li> <li>• There was no Records Book where submitted plans were to be entered by the Physical Planner.</li> </ul> | 0     |
| <p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) 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> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that district/ MLG has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD score 1.</li> </ul>                            | <p>Moroto District had not submitted to MoLHUD the minutes of the only meeting held.</p>   | 0     |

|  |  |  |          |
|--|--|--|----------|
| <p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) 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> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All infrastructure investments are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul> | <p>Moroto DLG did not have a Physical Development Plan for the whole district due to lack of resources. Therefore, it was not possible to ascertain the consistency of the infrastructure investments with the Physical Development Plan.</p>  | <p>0</p> |
| <p>All new infrastructure projects in: (i) a municipality / (ii) 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> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action area plan prepared for the previous FY: score 1 or else 0</li> </ul>   | <p>There were no Action area plans prepared by Moroto DLG during FY 2017/2018 due to lack of qualified personnel in the area physical planning. The District LG had just started utilising the services of the Municipal Physical Planner who was five months old in office at the time of assessment.</p> | <p>0</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

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.

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

The priorities in the Moroto DLG AWP for FY 2018/2019 were based on the outcomes of budget conference that was held on 26th October 2017.

For instance, under:

• Health: 'Installation of solar system' (Page 59 of AWP for FY 2018/2019) and Report for Budget Conference - Presentation of Health Department: 'Installation of a sustainable power source to run the district cold chain system' - Page 9.

• Natural Resources: 'Construction of a Green House in Rupa Sub-county' (Page 80 of AWP for FY 2018/2019) and Budget Conference Report - Presentation of Natural Resources Department: 'Demonstration Woodlots in Rupa Primary School, Kasimeri PS, and Nawanatau PS' - Page 11.



|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <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</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 differences appear, a justification has to be provided and evidence provided that it was approved by the Council. Score 1.</li> </ul> | <p>The capital investments in the approved Annual work Plan for the FY 2018/2019 were derived from the approved Moroto Five Year District Development Plan (2015/16 – 2019/20).</p> <p>For example, under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health: ‘Installation of solar system’ (Page 59 of AWP for FY 2018/2019) and ‘Installing solar cold chain systems (at Kosiroi, Tapac, Lopelipel, and District Health Office)’ in the DDP (Chapter 5: 5-Year District Implementation Plan – Annualized Work Plan – Page 120).</li> <li>• Natural Resources: ‘Construction of a Green House in Rupa Sub-county’ (Page 80 of AWP for FY 2018/2019) and ‘Establishing of Tree Nurseries’ in the DDP (Chapter 5: 5-Year District Implementation Plan – Annualized Work Plan – Page 118).</li> </ul> |  |
|--|---|--|--|

|  |   |  |          |
|--|---|--|----------|
| <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</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure.</p> | <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 2.</li> </ul>   | <p>The project profiles were said to have been discussed during one of the DTPC meetings.</p> <p>However, the minutes were not availed to the assessment team.</p>   | <p>0</p> |
| <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 score 1.</li> </ul> | <p>The Annual Statistical Abstract was compiled and presented to the DTPC to support budget allocation and decision-making. The DPTC was held on 23rd October 2017 (under Min. 06/DTPC/OCT/17: Dissemination of District Statistical Abstract 2017).</p> | <p>1</p> |

|   |   |  |          |
|---|---|--|----------|
| <p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p> | <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>  | <p>The infrastructure projects implemented during FY 2017/2018 (as indicated in the Local Government Quarterly Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 (Vote 538 – Quarter 4), were derived from the Annual Work Plan and Budget Estimates for FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>For example, under:</p> <p>Education: 'Construction of DEO Office Block at District HQs '(LG Quarter 4 Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 – Vote 538 Moroto - Page 67), and 'Construction of DEO Office block at district headquarters' (Moroto DLG AWP and Budget – Page 54).</p> <p>Roads and Engineering: '2 Irish Bridge in Naoi - Lokisilei Road constructed '(LG Quarter 3 Performance Report for FY 2017/2018 – Vote 538 Moroto - Page 69), and 'Construction of 2 Irish Bridge in Naoi - Lokisilei Road' (Moroto DLG AWP and Budget – Page 56).</p> | <p>2</p> |
| <p>Investment activities in the previous FY were implemented as per AWP.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure.</p> | <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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100%: score 4</li> <li>o 80-99%: score 2</li> <li>o Below 80%: 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>The Moroto DLG Contracts Register availed at the time of assessment lacked vital information on the completion status of each project by the 30th June 2018.</p> <p>Therefore, it was not possible to ascertain the completion status of investment projects implemented in FY 2017/2018 as per work plan.</p>  | <p>0</p> |

|   |   |   |          |
|---|---|---|----------|
| <p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p> | <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> | <p>The Contracts Register availed at the time of assessment lacked vital information on the actual expenditure on each project by the 30th June 2018.</p> <p>Therefore, it was not possible to ascertain completion of investment projects implemented in FY 2017/2018 within approved budget -. Max. 15% plus or minus of original budget.</p>   | <p>0</p> |
| <p>The LG has executed the budget for construction of investment projects and O&amp;M for all major infrastructure projects during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has budgeted and spent at least 80% of the O&amp;M budget for infrastructure in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>                       | <p>Moroto DLG budgeted UGX 80,694,000 on O&amp;M during FY 2017/2018 and spent UGX 90,633,947.</p> <p>This was 112.3% of the budget for O&amp;M as per Draft Final Accounts for the Year Ended 30th June 2018 (NOT page numbered BUT coded - GL Account Nos. 228002 &amp; GL Account Name: Maintenance – Vehicles; GL Account Nos. 228003 &amp; GL Account Name: Maintenance – Machinery; GL Account Nos. 228004 &amp; GL Account Name: Maintenance – Other).and Moroto DLG Budget, Vote 538.</p> | <p>2</p> |
| <p>Human Resource Management</p>  |   |   |          |

LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments

Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.

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

There were 10 HoD at U1 salary scale in the approved establishment / organisation structure. Four (4) were substantively appointed as per their appointment letters;

1. D/CAO – LG/P. 10706 dated 15th September 2017
2. DEO – CR/156/2 dated 28th January 2018
3. D/PO – CR/156/2 dated 26th May 2017
4. D/Commercial Officer - CR/156/2 dated 31st May 2018

Six (6) were performing duties of HoD as follows;

5. Duties of the CFO were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Finance Officer (U3) as per the appointment letter CR/156/2 dated 28th January 2015
6. Duties of the D/Planner were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Principal Planner (U2) as per the appointment letter CR/156/2 dated 14h June 2010
7. Duties of the District Engineer were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Principal Executive Engineer U2-S as per the appointment letter CR/156/2 dated 7th October 2005
8. The duties of the D/CDO were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Community Development Officer (U3) as per the appointment letter CR/152/1 dated 28th January 2015
9. The duties of the D/NRO were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Senior Environment Officer (U3) as per the appointment letter CR/D/156/2 dated 14th June 2010
10. The duties of the DHO were performed by an officer whose substantive appointment was Principal Environmental Health Officer (U2-S) as per the appointment letter CR//212 dated 10h May 2017

|   |   |   |          |
|---|---|---|----------|
| <p>LG has substantively recruited and appraised all Heads of Departments</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure.</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that HoDs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul> | <p>There was evidence that all HoD were appraised on the following dates as per appraisal reports seen:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. D/CAO – 8th August 2018</li> <li>2. CFO – 10th July 2018</li> <li>3. D/Planner – 2nd August 2018</li> <li>4. D/Engineer – 31st August 2018</li> <li>5. DEO – 2nd August 2018</li> <li>6. D/CDO – 2nd August 2018</li> <li>7. D/NRO – 14th September 2018</li> <li>8. D/PO – 3rd August 2018</li> <li>9. D/Commercial Officer – 3rd August 2018</li> <li>10. DHO – 10th July 2018</li> </ol>   | <p>2</p> |
| <p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of staff submitted for recruitment have been considered: score 2</li> </ul>                    | <p>Twelve (12) positions were submitted to the DSC for recruitment of new employees as per the submission letter CR/156/1 dated 30th October 2017, as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CFO (U1-E)</li> <li>2. DHO (U1-S)</li> <li>3. D/CDO (U1-E)</li> <li>4. D/NRO (U1-S)</li> <li>5. D/Commercial Officer (U1-E)</li> <li>6. Principal Maternal Health Officer (U2)</li> <li>7. Principal Internal Auditor (U2)</li> <li>8. Senior Education Officer (U3)</li> <li>9. Veterinary Officer (U4-S)</li> <li>10. Asst. Agricultural Officer (U5 S)</li> <li>11. Asst. Animal Husbandry Officer (U5-S)</li> <li>12. Engineering Assistant, Mechanical U7)</li> </ol> <p>There was evidence that they were all considered during the DSC meetings held between 14th and 18th May 2018 as per the minute number 8/DSC/2018</p> | <p>2</p> |

|   |   |   |          |
|---|---|---|----------|
| <p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for confirmation have been considered: score 1</li> </ul>         | <p>Eighty seven (87) names of employees from four departments were submitted to the DSC for confirmation of their appointment as per the submission letters CR/1021 dated 15th May 2018. As follows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Education Department.        79</li> <li>2. Administration Department    1</li> <li>3. Production Department        1</li> <li>4. Health Department            6</li> </ol> <p>There was evidence that they were considered by the DSC during its meeting held from 14th to 18th May 2018.</p> <p>Letter D.DSC/251/1 dated 28th May 2018, extracted minutes of the 2nd meeting of Moroto DSC.</p> | <p>1</p> |
| <p>The LG DSC has considered all staff that have been submitted for recruitment, confirmation and disciplinary actions during the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 100 % of positions submitted for disciplinary actions have been considered: score 1</li> </ul> | <p>There were no submissions for disciplinary action cases</p>  | <p>1</p> |

|   |   |  |          |
|---|---|--|----------|
| <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>    | <p>Four (4) new employees were appointed and recruited into the district service during the months of May and June 2018. They were,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Naligoi Emmanuel, Veterinary Officer</li> <li>2. Egesa Wabuli David, Principal Internal Auditor</li> <li>3. Adongar Erepentus Rex, Engineering Assistant (Mechanical)</li> <li>4. Achira Lawrence, District Commercial Officer</li> </ol> <p>They all assumed duty during the month of August as per their respective Posting Instruction Letters dated 1st August 2018.</p> <p>There was evidence that they accessed the payroll during the month of September 2018. Their payroll number on the district IPPS payroll were as follow;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Naligoi Emmanuel – 1030409</li> <li>2. Egesa Wabuli - 745222</li> <li>3. Adongar Erepentus Rex - 1030400</li> </ol> <p>Achira Lawrence - 1030407</p> | <p>3</p> |
| <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 that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: score 2</li> </ul> | <p>Two employees retired from the district service during the FY 2017/18.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Asst. Engineering Officer</li> <li>2. Head Teacher, Rainbow Primary School</li> </ol> <p>There was no evidence that they accessed the retirement payroll</p>   | <p>0</p> |
| <p>Revenue Mobilization</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)

Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure.

- If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets) from previous FY but one to previous FY is more than 10 %: score 4.

- If the increase is from 5%

-10 %: score 2.

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

OSR collected in FY 2016/2017 (excluding sale of assets) was Shs. 389,181,613 whereas OSR collected in FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 522,227,290 which resulted into an increase of Shs. 133,045,596.

Source: Final Accounts FY

2016/2017-page No.16 and Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018- page No. 29.

The percentage increase was 34.2%

Workings:

$133,045,596/389,181,613 \times 100 = 34.2\%$

This increase which was in line with the provision of PFMA 2015 Section 45 (3) was attributed to the following factors:

- Increase in collection from Royalties which was Shs. 170,512,826 in FY 2017/2018 compared to Shs.150,133,660 in FY 2016/2017.

- More realistic budgeting in FY 2017/2018 Compared to FY 2016/2017.

|   |   |   |          |
|---|---|---|----------|
| <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 score 2. If more than +/- 10 %: Score 0.</li> </ul> | <p>Original budget for local revenue in FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 1,064,873,915 against which Shs. 522,227,209 was collected representing a budget out-turn of 49%.</p> <p>Source: Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018- page No.12.</p> <p>Therefore the LG budget realization/ratio was 51% below the planned local revenue for FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>Workings:</p> $522,227,209/1,064,873,915 \times 100 = 49\%$ <p>Therefore, the Budget realization/ratio was:</p> $100\% - 49\% = 51\%$ <p>This budget realization which contravened the LGFAR 2007 section 32 was attributed to the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local rent from the District rentable premises went down by Shs. 20,000,000 in FY 2017/2018. Planned for Shs. 86,470,000 but collected Shs. 66,470,000.</li> <li>Big rental arrears from organisations renting the District premises like Radio Karamoja Shs. 30m, Alerimok CDO Shs. 18m,URA Shs, 18m despite Council's effort to enforce timely payment.</li> </ul> | <p>0</p> |
|---|---|---|----------|

|   |   |  |          |
|---|---|--|----------|
| <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> | <p>The District Council collected Shs. 44,145,699 in FY 2017/2018 in respect of Local Service Tax.</p> <p>Source: Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018 page- 29.</p> <p>However, the LG retained all the LST and there was no evidence of transfer to LLGs contrary to LGA Cap 243 as amended, Regulation 85 (4).</p> <p>Failure to effect the transfers to LLGs was attributed to LLGs' failure to submit their respective staffing levels to the District to enable equitable sharing as per the recommended formula before end of FY 2017/2018 as evidenced by the following correspondences by CAO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-response to CAO's letter dated 19th/4/2018 Ref: CR/104/1 addressed to SAS of Rupa, Nadunget, Tapac and Katikekile sub-counties requesting them to submit lists of all staff at their respective LLGs to enable the District to compute their portion of LST share for eventual transfer to their collection accounts.</li> <li>• Non-response to CAO's reminder to the above 4 mentioned LLGs dated 14th//2018 Ref: CR/104/1 about submission of their respective staff lists to enable transfer of their LST share to their collection accounts.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, the District could not effect the LST sharing due to non-response from the 4 LLGs to submit their respective staff lists as at 30th/6/2018.</p> | <p>0</p> |
|---|---|--|----------|

|   |   |   |          |
|---|---|---|----------|
| <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 total Council expenditures on allowances and emoluments- (including from all sources) is not higher than 20% of the OSR collected in the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul>                         | <p>There was evidence that the total Council expenditure on allowances and emoluments was not higher than 20% as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Actual local revenue collected in FY 2016/2017 was Shs. 389,181,613 of which 20% equivalent to Shs. 77,836,323 was supposed to be the maximum expenditure for Council emoluments and allowances in FY 2017/2018.</li> </ul> <p>Source: Final Accounts for FY 2016/2017-page No.16.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The actual expenditure on Council emoluments and allowances in FY 2017/2018 was Shs. 63,816,000 representing only 16% within the recommended maximum of 20% as per 1st Schedule Regulation 4 of the LGA Cap 243 as amended.</li> </ul> <p>Source: Draft Final Accounts for FY 2017/2018-page No. (Annexes to Financial Statements FY 2017/2018: Trial Balance).</p> <p>Workings: <math>63,816,000/389,181,613 \times 100 = 16\%</math></p> | <p>2</p> |
| <p>Procurement and contract management</p>  |   |   |          |
| <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> | <p>The district had no Senior Procurement Officer. Duties were performed by a Procurement Officer as per his appointment letter CR/156/2 dated 22nd June 2015</p>   | <p>0</p> |

|   |   |   |          |
|---|---|---|----------|
| <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 TEC produced and submitted reports to the Contracts Committee for the previous FY: score 1</li> </ul>  | <p>The LG TEC evaluated procurement items under both open and selective bidding on 11th October 2017 and submitted the report to the LG Contracts Committee. The evaluated projects included among others;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of Education office block at district headquarters</li> <li>• Renovation of the old engineering block.</li> <li>• Construction of a two unit staff house at Acherer primary school</li> <li>• Construction of a market shade at Acholiin</li> <li>• Construction of a 3 stances pit latrine at Acholiin market.</li> </ul> | <p>1</p> |
| <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 Contracts Committee considered recommendations of the TEC and provide justifications for any deviations from those recommendations: score 1</li> </ul> | <p>The LG Contracts Committee held a meeting on 19th October and under minute number 21/CC/2017/18 awarded contracts for following projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of Education office block at district headquarters</li> <li>2. Renovation of the old engineering block.</li> <li>3. Construction of a two unit staff house at Acherer primary school</li> <li>4. Construction of a market shade at Acholiin</li> <li>5. Construction of a 3 stances pit latrine at Acholiin market</li> </ol>   | <p>1</p> |

|  |  |   |          |
|--|--|---|----------|
| <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> | <p>The District procurement and Disposal plan for 2019/18 covered all the infrastructure projects as in the approved district annual work plan that included projects like;</p> <p>Rehabilitation of staff house at kakingoi primary school, construction of staff house at Kalemongole HCII, Construction of staff house at Acherer HCII, Renovation of Kakingoi maternity unit, Drilling of 7 boreholes, construction of teachers house at Lia primary school</p> <p>The LG made procurements in 2017/18 FY in adherence to the procurement plan.</p> | <p>2</p> |
| <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>  | <p>The LG had prepared all the bid documents for infrastructure/investment projects for 2018/2019 FY by August 2018 and were able to issue a bid notice for items under open domestic bidding on 10th September in the New vision newspaper of 10th September 2018 on page 67</p>   | <p>2</p> |

|  |  |   |          |
|--|--|---|----------|
| <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 Previous FY, evidence that the LG has an updated contract register and has complete procurement activity files for all procurements: score 2</li> </ul> | <p>The LG did not have an updated Contract register for 2017/18 FY. The provided register was for 2016/17 FY</p>  | <p>0</p> |
| <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 previous FY, evidence that the LG has adhered with procurement thresholds (sample 5 projects): score 2.</li> </ul>                                      | <p>The LG adhered with procurement thresholds for the projects implemented in 2017/18 FY. This was evidenced through the following awarded projects;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moro538/1718/WRKS/DDEG/0001 Construction of Education office block at district headquarters worth 124,025,000 (open bidding).</li> <li>• Moro538/1718/WRKS/DDEG/00003 Renovation of the old engineering block worth 59,779,000 (open bidding).</li> <li>• Moro538/1718/WRKS/DDEG/00017 Construction of a two unit staff house at Acherer primary school worth 35,213,323 (selective bidding)</li> <li>• Moro538/1718/WRKS/DDEG/00013 Construction of a market shade at Acholiin worth 26,055,750 (selective bidding)</li> <li>• Moro538/1718/WRKS/DDEG/00014 Construction of a 3 stances pit latrine at Acholiin market worth 12,731,250 (selective bidding)</li> </ul> | <p>2</p> |

|  |  |  |          |
|--|--|--|----------|
| <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</li> </ul> <p>for all projects based on technical supervision: score 2</p>           | <p>The works projects implemented in 2017/18 were issued with certificates of completion and interim certificates evidenced by attachments on the procurement files. For example Construction of Education office block at district headquarters was issued an interim certificate dated 20/12/17</p> <p>Renovation of the old engineering block was issued a certificate dated 19/6/18</p> <p>Construction of a two unit staff house at Acherer primary school was issued completion certificate dated 30/7/2018</p> <p>Construction of a market shade at Acholiin was issued certificate of completion dated 30/7/2018</p> <p>Construction of a 3 stances pit latrine at Acholiin market. Issued certificate of completion dated 30/7/2018</p> | <p>2</p> |
| <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 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> | <p>There were no projects under implementation in 2018/2019.</p>   | <p>0</p> |
| <p>Financial management</p>  |  |  |          |



The LG makes monthly and up to-date bank reconciliations

Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.

- Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the time of the assessment: score 4

The LG had been rolled on IFMS and it operated 6 Cash books/ Bank Accounts namely: General Fund A/c, UNICEF A/c, UWEP Fund A/c, YLP A/c, RPLRP A/c, and Global Fund A/c.

All the monthly bank reconciliations for July 2017 – June 2018 FY 2017/2018 were duly prepared by the respective Sector Accountants, Reviewed by the District Accountant and Approved by the Head of Finance.

General Fund A/c: Bank Reconciliation for June 2018 was made on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per Bank Statement was Shs. 296,478,117 and Balance as per Cash Book was Shs. 106,478,117

UNICEF A/c: Bank Reconciliation for June 2018 was made on 30th/6/2018.

Balance as per Bank Statement was Shs. 107,053,294 and Balance as per Cash Book was Shs. 107,053,294

UWEP A/c: Bank Reconciliation for June 2018 was made on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per Bank Statement was Shs.133, 421,092 and Balance as per Cash Book was Shs. 133, 421,092.

YLP Project A/c Bank Reconciliation for June 2018 was made on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per Bank Statement was Shs. 150,044,843 and Balance as per Cash book was Shs. 143, 699,843.

RPLRP A/c Bank Reconciliation for June 2018 was made on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per bank Statement was Shs. 26,947,023 and Balance as per Cash book was Shs. 26,947,023.

Global Fund A/c Bank Reconciliation was made on 30th/6/2018. Balance as per Bank Statement was Shs. 13,374,207 and Balance as per Cash book was Shs. 13,374,000.

However, the monthly bank reconciliations for July and August 2018 had not been made as at the time of assessment due the following IFMS Challenges beyond the making of the LG:

- Change from Tier 2 to Tier 1 by MoFPED
- Delays by MoFPED to upload the budget into IFMS thus no transactions on the system in July and August 2018.

|  |  |   |          |
|--|--|---|----------|
| <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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– no overdue bills (e.g. procurement bills) of over 2 months: score 2.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>There was evidence that the LG made timely payment of suppliers in FY 2017/2018 as indicated in the sampled payments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M/s Reddy's Bore hole &amp; Technical Services Ltd request for payment of Shs. 110,875,750 on 15th/1/2018 for Siting and Drilling of (5) Bore holes under DWD in Moroto District was recommended for payment on 14th/2/2018 and paid on 6th/3/2018 vide PV-WK0067 within 50 days.</li> <li>• M/s Water Brick (U) Ltd) request for payment of Shs. 55,575,000 dated 27th/4/2018 for construction &amp; Rehabilitation of Education block at the District HQs was recommended for payment on 3rd/5/2018 and paid on 13th/6/2018 vide PV-ED0008 within 47 days.</li> <li>• M/s Jam Double M Investments Ltd request for payment of Shs. 4,230,000 dated 8th/8/2017 for supply of tyres for LG0006-080 was recommended for payment on 8th/8/2017 and paid on 3rd/10/2017 vide PV-WK00051 within 56 days.</li> </ul> | <p>2</p> |
| <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: 1 point.</li> <li>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</li> </ul>                       | <p>The LG had a Principal Internal Auditor substantively appointed by the District Service Commission on 1st/8/2018 under Min. 30 MDSC/2018.</p>  | <p>1</p> |

|  |  |   |          |
|--|--|---|----------|
| <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>• LG has produced all quarterly internal audit reports for the previous FY: score 2.</li> </ul>   | <p>All the 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018 were produced as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1 dated 2.<br/>4th/10/2017 (unreferenced)</li> <li>• Q2 dated 24th/1/2018 (unreferenced)</li> <li>• Q3 dated 24th/4/2018 Ref: CR/IA/03/18</li> <li>• Q4 dated 24th/7/2018 (unreferenced).</li> </ul> <p>All were addressed to the Accounting Officer and copied to the District Chairperson and amongst others except the 1st quarterly internal audit report which was addressed to the District Chairperson.</p>   | <p>2</p> |
| <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> | <p>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 from all quarterly audit reports: score 2.</p> | <p>There was no evidence that the LGPAC had reviewed the 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018. This was attributed to the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The former LGPAC term of office expired in January 2018.</li> <li>• The new members of LGPAC were nominated and approved in a District Council meeting held on 22nd /5/2018 under Min. 05/DLC/05/'18</li> <li>• The new LGPAC had not been sworn in and inducted as at the time of this assessment.</li> </ul> <p>Since LGPAC did not review the 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018, the Accounting Officer had no basis to take action on queries raised thereof hence was not able to communicate to Council and LGPAC accordingly.</p> | <p>0</p> |

|  |   |  |          |
|--|---|--|----------|
| <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 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> | <p>There was evidence that all the 4 quarterly internal audit reports for FY 2017/2018 were submitted to the Accounting Officer and LGPAC as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1 dated 24th/10/2017 (unreferenced) copied to CAO and LGPAC.</li> <li>• Q2 dated 24th/1/2018 (unreferenced) addressed to CAO and copied to LGPAC.</li> <li>• Q3 dated 24th/4/2018 addressed to CAO and copied to LGPAC.</li> <li>• Q4 dated 24th/7/2018 addressed to CAO and copied to LGPAC.</li> </ul> <p>However, there was no evidence of review and follow-up by the LGPAC as required. This failure was attributed to delays to constitute a new LGPAC as the term of office for the old one had expired in January 2018. The new LGPAC had been approved by Council and was waiting to be sworn in and inducted to start council business as at the time of assessment.</p> | <p>0</p> |
| <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>        | <p>The LG maintained all the 3 sections of the assets register i.e. Register of Fixed Assets – General, Register of Fixed Assets – Motor Vehicle &amp; Heavy Plants and Register of Fixed Assets – Land &amp; Buildings.</p> <p>However, the LG had not up-dated the assets register at time of the assessment due to the change from the old format to the recommended format as per the Local Government Financial and Accounting Manual 2007 pages 167 &amp; 168.</p> <p>The new assets register which matched with the recommended format were procured belatedly on 22nd/6/2018 vide PV-FN00245.</p>  | <p>0</p> |

|   |   |  |          |
|---|---|--|----------|
| <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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unqualified audit opinion: score 4</li> <li>• Qualified: score 2</li> <li>• Adverse/disclaimer: score 0</li> </ul>                          | <p>Moroto DLG obtained Unqualified Audit Opinion for FY 2017/18</p>  | <p>4</p> |
| <p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>   |   |  |          |
| <p>The LG Council meets and discusses service delivery related issues</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul> | <p>Moroto District Council met and discussed service delivery related issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Min. 04/DLC/05/'18 – Committees' Reports to Council for Adoption; and Min. 06/DLC/05/'18 – Approval of Budget Estimates for FY 2018/2019 (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 22nd May 2018).</li> <li>• Min. 06/DLC/'18 – Presentation and Approval of Annual Work Plan, Procurement Plan, Capacity Building Plan 2018/2019; and Min. 07/DLC/'18 – Laying and Receipt of Budget Estimates (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 27th April 2018).</li> <li>• Min. 04/DLC/18 – Presentation and Approval of Annual Work Plan, Procurement Plan, Capacity Building Plan 2018/2019 (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 28th February 2018).</li> <li>• Min. 20/DLC/'17– Committees' Reports to Council for Adoption (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 21st December 2017).</li> </ul> | <p>2</p> |
| <p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that LG has designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and responded to feedback and complaints: score 1.</li> </ul>   | <p>The CAO / Moroto assigned Mr. Longes Donato (Information Officer) additional responsibility as 'Public Relations / Liaison Officer' (as per letter Ref: CR/103/-dated 3rd July 2017). Among his key roles was to "Receive complaints from the general public and provide appropriate feedback as a mechanism of accountability, rights, and obligations to all clients".</p>  | <p>1</p> |

|   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>The LG has responded to the feedback/complaints provided by citizens</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which should be displayed at LG offices and made publically available: score 1</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district introduced suggestion boxes which were fixed on the Administrative Block as well as the CAO's Block at Moroto District Headquarters. However, there was no book for recording these complaints.</li> <li>• Parish Chiefs were assigned the responsibility to collect complaints from the communities, and thereafter forward them the information Officer at Moroto District headquarters.</li> </ul> | 0 |
| <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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LG Payroll and Pensioner Schedule on public notice boards and other means: score 2</li> </ul>  | <p>The Moroto District Payroll and Pensioner Schedule for July and August 2018 were displayed on public notice board in the Administration block at Moroto District headquarters. The indicated dates of display were 13th September 2018 (for payroll) and 1st October 2018 (for Pensioners Schedule).</p>   | 2 |
| <p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and amounts are published: score 1.</li> </ul>   | <p>The information for FY 2018/2019 displayed on the notice board at Moroto District headquarters was in respect to "Bid Notice Under Open Domestic Bidding – Procurement Reference: Moro/1819/Wrks-Supls-Srvcs-00002"</p> <p>The procurement plan was not displayed on the Procurement Notice Board or any other Notice Board at Moroto District Headquarters.</p>   | 0 |
| <p>The LG shares information with citizens (Transparency)</p> <p>Total maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</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> | <p>The district published the annual performance assessment results (for FY 2016/2017) and implications as evidenced by the communication from CAO / Moroto DLG to all HoD, and SAS (Ref: CR/210/1 dated 30th June 2018) regarding "National Assessment Results for Financial Year 2017/2018". The key message was dissemination of the assessment results.</p>   | 1 |

|  |   |   |          |
|--|---|---|----------|
| <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>   | <p>The district communicated and explained guidelines, circulars and policies issued by the national level to LLGs during FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter from CAO to all SAS (Ref: CR/210/1 dated 4th October 2017) concerning “Guidelines on Utilisation of DDEG”.</li> <li>• Letter from CAO to all SAS and Parish Chiefs (Ref: CR/210/1 dated 20th February 2018) concerning “Upgrading of Positions of Parish Chiefs and Town Agents”.</li> <li>• Letter from CAO to all SAS (Ref: CR/210/1 dated 3rd January 2018) in respect to “Disaster Risk Financing Sub-Components – NUSAF 3”</li> </ul>  | <p>1</p> |
| <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 LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: score 1.</li> </ul> | <p>The district conducted discussions with the public to provide feedback on status of activity implementation and other topical issues using the weekly free airtime offered by the three FM Radio Stations based in Moroto (i.e. Radio Maria, Ateker FM, and All Karamoja FM).</p> <p>This was verified at one of the mentioned radio stations – All Karamoja FM – where the records indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On 25th May 2018, there was a talk show – Back to School Campaign. The district officials who participated were: Mr. Napaja Andrew (District Chairperson), Mr. Situma Aron (DCAO), and Mr. Aleper Joseph (District Inspector of Schools),</li> <li>• On 18th June 2018, there was talk show – Introduction of the ROTA Vaccine, and the Functionality of Water User Committees in Moroto DLG. The district officials who participated were: Mr. Situma Aron (DCAO), and Mr. Andrew Lues (Ag. DHO).</li> </ul> | <p>1</p> |
| <p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>   |   |   |          |

|   |  |  |          |
|---|--|--|----------|
| <p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG gender focal person and CDO have provided guidance and support to sector departments to mainstream gender, vulnerability and inclusion into their activities score 2.</li> </ul>   | <p>The district Gender Focal Person provided guidance and support to sector departments on how to mainstream gender in their activities through a number of activities like conducting training seminars on gender budgeting for district sector heads and sub county CDO and Senior Assistant secretaries evidenced by mentoring reports for district sector heads dated 7/6/18. The Gender focal person also disseminated gender indicators to district sector heads and LLG evidenced by activity report dated 10th May 2018. The focal person also conducted gender based violence support supervision and monitoring at sub counties evidenced by report dated 6/6/18</p>   | <p>2</p> |
| <p>The LG has mainstreamed gender into their activities and planned activities to strengthen women's roles</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the gender focal point and CDO have planned for minimum 2 activities for current FY to strengthen women's roles and address vulnerability</li> </ul> <p>and social inclusions and that more than 90 % of previous year's budget for gender activities/ vulnerability/ social inclusion has been implement-ted: score 2.</p> | <p>The gender focal person and CDO had planned a number of activities according to the 2018/19 work plan to mainstream gender and they include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mentoring district stakeholders on mainstreaming gender in budgets and work plans.</li> <li>2. Supporting women groups with funds from Uganda women entrepreneurship programme (UWEP).</li> <li>3. Conducting quarterly meetings for women council executives</li> </ol> <p>The budget for gender mainstreaming activities in 2017/18 FY was 18,000,000 but only 6,000,000 were availed due to budget shortage. The received funds were fully utilised as evidenced by payment voucher number PV-S01599 worth 6,000,000 advance for gender mainstreaming activities, dated</p> | <p>2</p> |



|   |  |  |          |
|---|--|--|----------|
| <p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 1</li> </ul> | <p>Environmental screening was done for all the five sampled projects. Construction of Education office block at district headquarters was screened on 23/11/17, construction of cattle market at Looreng screened on 21/11/17, Construction of a two unit staff house at Acherer primary school screened on 23/11/17,</p> <p>Construction of a market shade at Acholiin screened on 23/11/17 and Construction of a 3 stances pit latrine at Acholiin market screened on 23/11/17.</p> | <p>1</p> |
| <p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG integrates environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents: score 1</li> </ul>   | <p>There was evidence that the LG integrated environmental and social management and health and safety plans in the contract bid documents and the BOQs for the 4 sampled projects , had budgets for environmental mitigation for example construction of staff house at Acherer had a budget of 500,000 (pg. 3 of 7 BOQ), Looreng cattle market had a budget of 500,000 (BOQ pg. 1 of 4), VIP latrine at Looreng market had 400,000 and construction of Musas market had 300,000.</p> | <p>1</p> |

|   |   |  |          |
|---|---|--|----------|
| <p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership (e.g. a land title, agreement etc.): score 1</li> </ul>                             | <p>The projects sampled were implemented on district government owned land evidenced by land title for Block (Road)1 plot 58 for Acherer for Acherer primary school where staff house was constructed, sale of and purchase of land agreement between Rupa sub county and Lorem Apatakan entered into on 15/2/2016 for one and half acres land at Lorukumo where Looreng market was constructed. The education office was constructed at the district headquarters and the renovated engineering building was at the district headquarter.</p> | <p>1</p> |
| <p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <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 and CDO: score 1</li> </ul> | <p>The Environmental and Social Mitigation Certification Forms were completed for sampled completed projects as follows; construction of cattle market at Looreng certificate number 002 issued on 23/3/18, Construction of a two unit staff house at Acherer primary school certificate number 007 issued on 23/3/18, Construction of a market shade at Acholiin certificate number 003 issued on 23/3/18 and Construction of a 3 stances pit latrine at Acholiin market certificate number 006 issued on 23/3/18</p>                         | <p>1</p> |

|   |   |   |          |
|---|---|---|----------|
| <p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the contract payment certificated includes prior environmental and social clearance (new one): Score 1</li> </ul>  | <p>The contract payments for sampled projects were effected without seeking for any environmental and social clearance as a requirement.</p>  | <p>0</p> |
| <p>LG has established and maintains a functional system and staff for environmental and social impact assessment and land acquisition</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that environmental officer and CDO monthly report, includes a) completed checklists, b) deviations observed with pictures, c) corrective actions taken. Score: 1</li> </ul> | <p>The Environmental officer did not write monthly monitoring reports but the quarterly report dated 7/04/2018 indicated that projects under implementation were monitored though there were neither completed checklists nor deviations observed recorded in the report.</p> | <p>0</p> |

| Summary of requirements   | Definition of compliance  | Compliance justification   | Score |
|---|---|--|-------|
| Human resource planning and management  |   |  |       |
| <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> </ul> | <p>The LG Department of Education had 25 (16 government and 9 community) Primary schools with 394 teachers. The total enrolment was 9,800 pupils.</p> <p>There was evidence that for FY 2018/19, under Vote 538, the LG budgeted shs 3,670,217,000 for Wages for teachers.</p>   | 4     |
| <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 deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY: score 4</li> </ul>  | <p>The Staff list obtained indicated that each of the schools had at least 7 teachers per school and 1 Head Teacher for all the 25 schools including community schools.</p> <p>Schools with the highest number of teachers had up to 43 teacher (Kasimeri P/S).The school with the least number of teachers had 12 teachers (Musas P/S).</p> <p>-Layaraboth P/S, with 4 teachers was up to P 4.</p> <p>-Loletekia P/S with 3 teachers was up to P 3.</p> <p>-Kidepo Pupu P/S, Nachele P/S &amp; Lopelipel P/S with less than 7 teachers was up to P 3 and P 4 respectively.</p> <p>Overall, all the school met the minimum requirement on at least 7 teachers per school and 1 head teacher.</p> | 4     |

|  |  |   |          |
|--|--|---|----------|
| <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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100%: score 6</li> <li>o If 80 - 99%: score 3</li> <li>o If below 80%: score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>The LG filled 394 positions of primary school teachers. With a ceiling of 386 teachers, the LG filled 102 % of the posts for primary school teachers.</p> <p>According to the DEO the staff filling was done before the LG was split to create Napak district.</p>   | <p>6</p> |
| <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>   | <p>The LG Department of Education had filled both positions of Senior Inspector of Schools and inspector of schools as per the staff recruitment plan for FY 2017/18.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr. Aleper Joseph was senior inspector of schools. Appointed on 31/5/2018.</li> <li>• Ms. Lokeris Hellen was inspector of schools. Appointed on 1/1/2015.</li> </ul> | <p>6</p> |
| <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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary Teachers: score 2</li> </ul>   | <p>The LG submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for 6 Primary teachers for the FY 2018/19 on replacement basis. The submission was done on 10/5/2018 to HRM.</p>  | <p>2</p> |

|   |  |  |          |
|---|--|--|----------|
| <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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Inspectors: score 2</li> </ul>                                      | <p>The LG had fully recruited and filled the positions of inspectors of school as per the staff structure. The department had a structure of 7 staff. 5 out of 7 positions were filled including inspector and senior inspector of schools.</p>  | <p>2</p> |
| <p>Monitoring and Inspection</p>  |  |  |          |
| <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 has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% school inspectors: score 3</li> </ul> | <p>The district had two (2) Inspectors of Schools.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Senior Inspector of Schools, appointment letter CR/156/2 dated 31st May 2018</li> <li>2. Inspector of Schools appointment letter CR/156/2 dated 28st January 2015</li> </ol> <p>There was evidence that they were both appraised on 28th June 2018 and 30th June 2018, respectively as per their appraisal reports seen</p> | <p>3</p> |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <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>Evidence that the LG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p>    | <p>The district had sixteen (16) primary schools and therefore 16 Head Teachers as per the district staff list.</p>  |
| <p>Maximum 6 for this performance measure</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary school head teachers o 90 - 100%: score 3</li> <li>o 70% and 89%: score 2</li> <li>o Below 70%: score 0</li> </ul> | <p>There was evidence that fourteen (14) Head teachers were appraised as per the appraisal reports seen, representing 88% compliance</p>   |
|   |   | <p>The fourteen (14) Head Teachers of the following Primary Schools were appraised on the dates outlined:</p>  |
|   |   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lopotuk PS – 9th March 2018</li> <li>2. Atedeoi PS – 31st January 2018</li> <li>3. Nadunget PS – 13th March 2018</li> <li>4. Acherer PS – 5th December 2017</li> <li>5. Lolet-ekia PS – 9th February 2018</li> <li>6. Kaloi PS – 26th February 2018</li> <li>7. Moroto Rainbow PS – 22nd Dec. 2017</li> <li>8. Moroto Army PS – 22nd February 2018</li> <li>9. Kakingol PS – 31st December 2017</li> <li>10. Musas PS – 23rd February 2018</li> <li>11. Nawanatau PS – 12th April 2018</li> <li>12. Musupo PS – 31st December 2017</li> <li>13. Lia PS – 31st December 2017</li> <li>14. Moroto KDA PS – 20th December 2017</li> </ol> |

|  |  |   |          |
|--|--|---|----------|
| <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>   | <p>In the financial year 2017/2018 there was no evidence that the LG received any circulars, guidelines and or policy. The DEOs' Office had no copies of any circular/guidelines and or policy at the time of assessment.</p> <p>The LG received a circular no. 1 of 2017 ref. EPD/139/298/314/01 dated 24/4/2017 on Mass registration of learners in schools. But this was outside the period being assessed.</p> <p>There was no evidence at the DEOs' office and at the sampled schools that circulars and guidelines were communicated in the previous financial year 2017/18</p> | <p>0</p> |
| <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 held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 2</li> </ul> | <p>There was no evidence that the LG department of Education held meetings with Head Teachers to explain and sensitize them on the guidelines and circulars issued by the national level.</p>   | <p>0</p> |



|   |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| <p>The LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered primary schools<sup>2</sup></p> <p>Maximum 12 for this performance measure</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced:</li> <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> | <p>There was evidence that the LG department of Education inspected school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Term III inspection was done and report dated 27/10/17. 17 out of 25 schools were inspected according to the report.</li> <li>• Term II inspection was done and report written on 14/7/17. The inspection period was April-June 2017. 11 schools were inspected as per the inspection report</li> <li>• Term I inspection was done and reported on 15/6/2018. The inspection period was Feb-April 2018. 13 schools out of 25 were inspected.</li> </ul> <p>On average, 13.6 schools (<math>11+17+13=41/3=13.6/\text{approx.} = 14/25 = 56\% = 1</math>) were inspected.</p> | 1 |
| <p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</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>  | <p>There was no evidence in form of minutes of meeting to indicate that the department discussed the school inspection reports.</p> <p>The DEO submitted reports of some of the actions taken against teachers with indiscipline cases, cases of abscondment at Kaloi and Tapac P/S respectively, but these cases did not arise from the school inspection reports the assessment team reviewed.</p>   | 0 |

|   |  |  |          |
|---|--|--|----------|
| <p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <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>      | <p>There was evidence that the LG Department of Education submitted School inspection report to DES for terms I on 3/7/2018, II on 28/8/2017 and III on 27/10/17 but as part of the accountability for the inspection grant.</p> <p>The matrix of submission obtained from DES however did not indicate that the reports were submitted. And there was no acknowledgement letter report submission.</p> <p>In most of the districts, there is confusion between the acknowledgement of inspection grants and inspection report. DES needs to clarify whether reports submitted as part of accountability for inspection grants also counts for the actual school inspection report submission.</p> | <p>2</p> |
| <p>LG Education department has discussed the results/ reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed- up: score 4.</li> </ul>  | <p>The LG department of Education did not discuss the school inspection reports and thus there was no evidence that recommendation of the reports were followed-up.</p>  | <p>0</p> |
| <p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>There was no evidence that the school list and the PBS generated lists were consistent and accurate as there was no PBS list provided at the LG for comparison at the time of the assessment. There was no evidence that the school list and the PBS generated lists were consistent and accurate as there was no PBS list provided at the LG for comparison at the time of the assessment.</p>   | <p>0</p> |

|   |   |  |          |
|---|---|--|----------|
| <p>The LG Education department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MoES</p> <p>Maximum 10 for this performance measure</p> | <p>Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/consistent data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>  | <p>Enrolment data from the 25 schools were not compared with the PBS list because the latter was not provided to the assessment team for review.</p>   | <p>0</p> |
| <p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>   |   |  |          |
| <p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented 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 education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul> | <p>The Production, Social Services, and Natural Resources Management Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018 as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 26th June 2018 (under Min. 03/PSC/06/18 – Sector Performance Review).</li> <li>• Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 17th May 2018 (under Min. 03/PSC/05/18 – Budget Scrutiny and Review).</li> <li>• Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 18th April 2018 (under Min. 03/PSC/04/18 – Presentation of Sector Work Plans).</li> </ul> | <p>2</p> |
| <p>The LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and pre- sented 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 education sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>   | <p>The Production, Social Services, and Natural Resources Management Committee presented issues that required approval to Council during FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Report of Production, Social Services, and Natural Resources Management to Council Meeting on February 20, 2018’</li> <li>• ‘Production, Social Services, and Natural Resources Management Committee’s Findings and Recommendations on Budget Estimates for FY 2018/2019 Following Its Sitting on 18th May 2018’.</li> </ul>                                     | <p>2</p> |

|  |  |  |          |
|--|--|--|----------|
| <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/ MEO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% schools: score 5</li> <li>• 80 to 99% schools: score 3</li> <li>• Below 80 % schools: score 0</li> </ul> | <p>There was evidence that SMCs' in sampled schools were functional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kidepo Pupu P/S held a meeting on 25/11/2017. Agenda (f) was communication from SMC chair.</li> <li>• Loyaraboth P/S held a meeting on 21/08/2017. Agenda 4&amp;5 were remarks from SMC chairperson and reactions.</li> <li>• Nawanatan P/S SMC met on 1/8/2017 to review the budget.</li> <li>• Tapac P/S SMC also met on 1/8/2017 to present and approve the school budget.</li> </ul> | <p>5</p> |
| <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</li> </ul> <p>e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 3</p>   | <p>There was no evidence on the notice board at the LG and in the files at the DEOs' office that the list of schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants was made public.</p>  | <p>0</p> |
| <p>Procurement and contract management</p>   |  |  |          |
| <p>The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to the Procurement Unit 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 input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30: score 4</li> </ul>  | <p>The procurement input dated 9/8/2018 for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A twin staff house construction at Lia and Acherere P/S.</li> <li>• Renovation of teachers house at Lopelpel &amp; Kakingol P/S</li> </ul>   | <p>4</p> |
| <p>Financial management and reporting</p>  |  |  |          |

|  |  |  |          |
|--|--|--|----------|
| <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.</li> </ul>  | <p>The LG Education department had untimely certified and recommended suppliers for payments later than 60 days as per the sampled payments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M/s Water Brick (U) Ltd request for payment of Shs. 21,322,560 (undated) for construction &amp; Rehabilitation of Education Block at the District HQs was certified under Interim Certificate No. 1 dated 20th/12/2017, recommended for payment on 21st/12/2017 and paid on 16th/4/2018 vide PV-ED0008 within 116 days.</li> <li>• M/s Malboro Motors request for payment of Shs. 1,149,000 dated 14th/2/2018 for Motor Vehicle repair (LG 0008-080) was recommended for payment on 1st /3/2018 and paid on 10th/5/2018 vide PV-ED00005 within 85 days.</li> </ul> | <p>0</p> |
| <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 15th of July for consolidation: score 4</li> </ul> | <p>The Education department submitted the annual performance report for the FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner on 25th August 2018 (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation’ dated 25th August 2018 alerting the Planner / Moroto DLG about the submission by the Department)</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 15th July 2018.</p>  | <p>0</p> |

|  |  |  |          |
|--|--|--|----------|
| <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>o If sector has no audit query</li> <li>score 4</li> <li>o 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</li> <li>o If all queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul> | <p>The LG Education department had 2 internal audit queries in FY 2017/2018 but which had not been cleared as at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>These queries were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Books of accounts for Nadunget P/S, Kasimeri P/S, Kakingor P/S and Loyarboth P/S were not posted to date.</li> <li>• Books of accounts for Rupar P/S were not availed for audit.</li> </ul> | <p>0</p> |
| <p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>   |  |  |          |
| <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 teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills, etc.: Score 2</li> </ul>   | <p>There was no evidence that the LG department of Education in consultation with the gender focal person disseminated guidelines on how senior women and men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys.</p>  | <p>0</p> |
| <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 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>  | <p>The was no evidence that the LG in collaboration with gender department issued and explained guidelines on sanitation for girls and PWD in P/S. The department did not give this activity the attention it deserved.</p>  | <p>0</p> |

|  |   |  |          |
|--|---|--|----------|
| <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 School Management Committee meets the guideline on gender composition: score 1</li> </ul>  | <p>There was evidence that SMCs' met the gender requirement.</p> <p>The 5 sampled schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acherere P/S had 4 female members out of 12</li> <li>• Nadunget P/S had 6 female members out of 13</li> <li>• Moroto Rainbow P/S had 3 female members out of 9</li> <li>• Rupa P/S had 5 female members out of 12</li> <li>• Kalo P/S had 4 female members out of /13</li> </ul> | <p>1</p> |
| <p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</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 1:</li> </ul> | <p>There was no evidence at the DEOs' office that the education department in collaboration with environment officer issued guidelines on environment management in schools.</p>   | <p>0</p> |
| <p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all school infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 1</li> </ul>   | <p>There was evidence of project screening for a 2 unit staff house block at Acherere P/S dated 23/11/2017.</p>  | <p>1</p> |

|  |   |  |          |
|--|---|--|----------|
| <p>LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 1</li> </ul> | <p>There was evidence that education project at Acherere P/S was visited and site visit report written on 7/4/2018</p> | <p>1</p> |
|--|---|--|----------|



| Summary of requirements   | Definition of compliance  | Compliance justification   | Score |
|---|---|--|-------|
| Human resource planning and management  |   |  |       |
| <p>LG has substantively recruited primary health care workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage</p> <p>Maximum 8 points for this performance measure</p>                           | <p>Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health care with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than 80% filled: score 8</li> <li>• 60 – 80% - score 4</li> <li>• Less than 60% filled: score 0</li> </ul> | <p>There was evidence that the LG Health department had filled the structure for health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage FY 2018/2019 as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Out of 165 health staff establishment for Moroto LG as per records obtained from the Ag. DHO's office, 100 had been filled representing 60.6% whereas 65 were not filled representing 39.4%.</li> </ul>                       | 8     |
| <p>The LG Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department</p> <p>Maximum 6 points for this performance measure</p> | <p>Evidence that Health department has submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/re- quest to HRM for the current FY, covering the vacant positions of primary health care workers: score 6</p>  | <p>There was evidence that the Health department had submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan to HRM for FY 2018/2019 covering the vacant positions of primary health workers as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ag. DHO's letter entitled "Submission of Recruitment Plan for Health Workers for FY 2018/2019" dated 12th/2/2018 Ref: HEA addressed to the CAO indicating 17 posts to be advertised.</li> </ul> | 6     |

The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital In-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted

Maximum 8 points for this performance measure

Evidence that the all health facilities in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY:

- o 100%: score 8
- o 70 – 99%: score 4
- o Below 70%: score 0

The district had ten (10) health facilities and therefore 10 Officers in Charge of health facilities as follows;

Health Center IIIs 5

Health Center IIs 5

There was evidence that all 10 Officers in Charge of Health Centers were appraised as per the appraisal reports seen, representing 100% compliance

The 10 appraisal reports of Officers in Charge were checked to establish the dates of their appraisals as follows;

1. Medical Officer, Nadunget HC III – 14th August 2018
2. Assistant Nursing Officer, Kakingol HC III – 14th September 2018
3. Senior Clinical Officer, Rupa HC III
4. Senior Clinical Officer, Acherer HC III – 14th August 22018
5. Assistant Nursing Officer, Kasiroi HC III – 14th August 2018
6. Assistant Nursing Officer, Nakiloro HC II – 4th August 2018
7. Assistant Nursing Officer, Kadonyo HC II – 14th July 2018
8. Enrolled Nurse, Lopelipel HC II – 14th August 2018
9. Enrolled Nurse, Kalemungole HC II – 14th August 2018
10. Enrolled Nurse, Lotiri HC II – 14th August 2018

The Local Government Health department has deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the budget in the current FY.

Maximum 4 points for this performance measure

- Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY, and if not provided justification for deviations: score 4

There was evidence that the LG Health department had deployed health workers in line with the list submitted with the budget for FY 2018/2019 as indicated in the 5 sampled health facilities below:

- Nadunget HCIII: Approved 42 and filled 31.
- St. Pius Kidepo HCIII: Approved 19 and filled 7.
- Rupa HCII: Approved 9 and filled 8.
- Loputuk HC III: Approved 19 and filled 3.
- Lotirir HCII: Approved 9 and filled 4.

Monitoring and Supervision

The DHO/MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities

Maximum 6 for this performance measure

- Evidence that the DHO/MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to health facilities: score 3

There was evidence that the DHO had communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in FY 2017/2018 to all health facilities.

From the DHO's office the distribution record indicated that the in-charges of the 5 sampled health facilities of:

1. Nadugent HCII
2. Rupa HCII
3. Loputik HCIII
4. St. Puis Kidepo HCII
5. Lotirir HCII

Received copies of the 5 prioritized guidelines and signed for them. These guidelines were:

- Nutrition Training Guidelines -- 2015 issued on 7th/5/2018.
- T.B Guidelines – 2015 issued on 30th/4/2018.
- HUMC Guidelines for HCII & HCIII – 2012 issued 17th/3/2018
- Training Manual of Rota Virus issued on 7th/6/2018.
- Clinical Guidelines -2016 issued on 7th/6/2018.

|  |   |   |          |
|--|---|---|----------|
| <p>The DHO/MHO 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/MHO 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> | <p>There was evidence that the DHO held meetings with health in charges and explained among others the guidelines, policies and circulars issued by the national level as indicated below based on the above sampled health facilities:</p> <p>The evidence was proved both in the supervisory reports and the specific supervisory log books at the health facilities as indicated below:</p> <p>Q1 meeting held on 3rd/8/2017</p> <p>Q2 meeting held on 5th/12/2017</p> <p>Q3 meeting held on 26th/2/2018</p> <p>Q4 meeting held on 17th/6/2018</p> | <p>3</p> |
| <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/MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3</p>  | <p>There was no evidence that the DHT had supervised 100% of HCIV and District Hospital because there was neither HCIV nor District Hospital, but there was Moroto Regional Referral Hospital.</p> <p>However, the DHT supervised PNFs of Lotirir HCII, Tapac HCII and St. Pius Kidepo HCIII.</p>   | <p>0</p> |

|  |  |   |          |
|--|--|---|----------|
| <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/MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If 100% supervised: score 3</li> <li>• 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2</li> <li>• 60% - 79% of the health facilities: score 1</li> <li>• Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0</li> </ul> | <p>The DHT had ensured that HSD had supervised lower level health facilities within FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p> <p>NOTE: Total number of health facilities was 18.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q1: 15th -20th/7/2017. Total number of health facilities supervised was 17 representing 94%.</li> <li>• Q2: 5th -12th/12/2017. Total number of facilities supervised was 13 representing 72%.</li> <li>• Q3: 15th -22nd/2/2018. Total number of facilities supervised was 18 representing 100%.</li> <li>• Q4: 18th -27th/6/2018. Total number of facilities supervised was 18 representing 100%.</li> </ul> <p>On average health facilities were 92% supervised.</p>  | <p>2</p> |
| <p>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</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous FY: score 4</li> </ul>  | <p>There was evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports had been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions in FY 2017/2018 as indicated below:</p> <p>1. Q1: Lotirir HCII</p> <p>Issues discussed on 26th/9/2017:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly meetings were not conducted.</li> <li>• CMEs schedules were neither planned nor displayed.</li> </ul> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The in charge should schedule, display and conduct CMEs.</li> <li>• Services offered by the facility should also be displayed.</li> </ul> <p>2. Q2: St. Pius Kidepo HCIII</p> <p>Issues discussed on 12th/1/2018:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incineration system and use was poor.</li> </ul> <p>Recommendation:</p> | <p>4</p> |

- The DHO should ensure that the incinerator was functional.

### 3. Q3: Nadugent HCIII

Issues discussed on 26th/3/2018:

- Out reaches were not conducted as scheduled.
- Staff data base was not in place.

Recommendation:

- The in charge should ensure that outreaches were carried out.

### 4. Q4: Loputik HCIII

Issues discussed on 3rd/8/2018:

- No placenta pit.

Recommendation:

- The DHO should ensure that there was a functional placenta pit at the health facility.

|  |  |  |          |
|--|--|--|----------|
| <p>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</p> <p>Maximum 10 points for this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the recommendations are followed – up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6</li> </ul>   | <p>There was evidence that the recommendations were followed up and specific activities undertaken for correction as indicated below;</p> <p>1. Q1: at Lotirir HCII</p> <p>Corrective action taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health education was conducted and all the services offered by the facility like Ante-Natal Services were displayed on the notice board.</li> </ul> <p>2. Q2: at St. Pius HCIII</p> <p>Corrective action taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The incinerator was made functional by the DHO.</li> </ul> <p>3. Q3: at Nadunget HCIII</p> <p>Corrective action taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outreaches were found to be in progress.</li> </ul> <p>4. Q4: at Loputik HCIII</p> <p>Corrective action taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate health talks regarding correct baby feeding were conducted.</li> </ul> | <p>6</p> |
| <p>The LG Health department has submitted accurate/consistent reports/data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding 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 receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS: score 10</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>There was no evidence that the LG had submitted accurate/consistent data for all the 18 health facility lists which received PHC funding with both HMIS reports and PBS. The Ag. DHO did not avail this documentary evidence at the time of assessment.</p> <p>There was no evidence in any of the 5 sampled lower health facilities of Lotirir HCII, Nadunget HCIII, Rupa HCII, Loputik HC III, and St. Pius Kidepo HCIII which included 3 PNFP health facilities.</p>   | <p>0</p> |
| <p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>  |  |  |          |



|   |  |  |          |
|---|--|--|----------|
| <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 LG 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> | <p>The Production, Social Services, and Natural Resources Management Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018 as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 26th June 2018 (under Min. 03/PSC/06/18 – Sector Performance Review).</li> <li>Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 17th May 2018 (under Min. 03/PSC/05/18 – Budget Scrutiny and Review).</li> <li>Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 18th April 2018 (under Min. 03/PSC/04/18 – Presentation of Sector Work Plans).</li> </ul> | <p>2</p> |
| <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 health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 2</li> </ul>   | <p>The Production, Social Services, and Natural Resources Management Committee presented issues that required approval to Council during FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Report of Production, Social Services, and Natural Resources Management to Council Meeting on February 20, 2018'</li> <li>'Production, Social Services, and Natural Resources Management Committee's Findings and Recommendations on Budget Estimates for FY 2018/2019 Following Its Sitting on 18th May 2018'.</li> </ul>                                   | <p>2</p> |

|  |   |  |          |
|--|---|--|----------|
| <p>The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning</p> <p>Maximum 6 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 6</li> <li>• If 80-99 %: score 4</li> <li>• If 70-79: %: score 2</li> <li>• If less than 70%: score 0</li> </ul> | <p>There was evidence that health facilities had functional HUMCs established, meetings held and discussion of budget and resource issues on quarterly basis as per the 5 sampled health facilities indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lotirir HCII had 7 members of HUMC and held their meeting on 11th/4/2018. They discussed lack of placenta pit, lighting system and weighing machine for babies.</li> <li>• Nadunget HCIII had 7 members of HUMC and held their meeting on 2nd/3/2018. They discussed the OPD floor which needed renovation and IEC materials which were not displayed.</li> <li>• St. Pius Kidepo HCIII had 9 members of HUMC and held their meeting on 2nd/6/2018. They discussed incomplete record keeping by the Bio-Statistician.</li> <li>• Rupa HCII had only 7 members of HUMC and held their meeting on 9th/8/2018. They discussed lack of Maternal Monitoring cards in Labour Ward.</li> <li>• Loputik HCIII had 7 members of and held their meeting on 19th/15/2017. They discussed delayed supply of essential drugs by Joint Medical Stores when ordered.</li> </ul> | <p>6</p> |
| <p>The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants</p> <p>Maximum 4 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 4</li> </ul>  | <p>There was no evidence in all the 5 sampled health facilities that the LG had publicized all the facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants through posting on their respective public notice boards. The Ag. DHO did not avail documentary evidence at the time of assessment.</p>  | <p>0</p> |
| <p>Procurement and contract management</p>   |   |  |          |

|  |  |   |          |
|--|--|---|----------|
| <p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and 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 input to procurement plan 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> | <p>The LG Health department submitted input to procurement plan to the PDU on 10th April 2018. The following investment items were included;</p> <p>Construction of staff house at Acherer HCII, Construction of staff house at Kalemungole HCII, Construction of placenta pit at Nakiloro HCII</p> | <p>2</p> |
| <p>The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and 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 LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 2.</li> </ul>   | <p>The LG Health department had not yet submitted form PP1 to the PDU by the time of assessment and it was already 2nd quarter. The department was late to submit but were planning to complete the forms.</p>  | <p>0</p> |

|   |   |  |          |
|---|---|--|----------|
| <p>The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 4 for this performance measure</p>                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the DHO/MHO (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers timely for payment: score 4.</li> </ul>  | <p>The LG Health department did not certify and recommend suppliers for payment on a timely basis as in all the following cases sampled payments were made later than the recommended 60 days:</p> <p>M/s Natimo Enterprises request for payment of Shs. 2,700,000 dated 26th/10/2017 for cleaning and slashing compound for October-December 2017 was recommended for payment on 18th/12/2017 and paid on 23rd/1/2018 vide PV-HE00200 within 89 days.</p> <p>M/s Bayimu Engineering Co. Ltd request for payment of Shs. 4,638,323 for 10% Retention for completion of District Drug Store was recommended for payment on 18th/4/2018 and paid on 7th//2018 vide PV-HE000040 within 85 days.</p> <p>M/s Elgon Springs (U) Ltd request for payment of Shs. 1,500,000 dated 21st/6/2017 for supply of fuel for fridges was recommended on 21st/6/2017 and paid on 7th/12/2017 within 169 days.</p> | <p>0</p> |
| <p>Financial management and reporting</p>   |   |  |          |
| <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> | <p>The Health department submitted the annual performance report for the FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner on 4th September 2018 (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation' dated 4th September 2018 alerting the Planner / Moroto DLG about the submission by the Department)</p> <p>The submission was made after the deadline of 15th July 2018.</p>   | <p>0</p> |

|   |   |   |          |
|---|---|---|----------|
| <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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> | <p>The LG Health department had 4 internal audit queries in FY 2017/2018 but which had not been cleared at the time of the assessment. The cause for this failure was not given to the assessment team.</p> <p>These queries were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Books of accounts in Loputuk HCII, Rupa HCII &amp; Lopelpel HCII were not availed for audit.</li> <li>• Kalemongole HCII had a grounded motor bike.</li> <li>• Kodonyo HCII newly constructed staff house had cracked before expiry of the defects liability period.</li> <li>• Lotirir HCII did not have a cash book.</li> </ul> | <p>0</p> |
| <p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>  |   |   |          |

Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.

Maximum 4 points

- Evidence that Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30

% women: score 2

There was evidence that the HUMCs met the gender composition as per guidelines as seen in the 5 sampled lower health facilities except for Nadunget HCIII:

- Lotirir HCII HUMC had 7 members of whom 4 were men and 3 were female representing 43%
- St. Pius Kidepo HCIII HUMC had 9 members of whom 6 were male and 3 were female representing 33%.
- Rupa HCII HUMC had 5 members of whom 5 were male and 2 were female representing 40%
- Nadunget HCIII HUMC had 7 members of whom 3 were male and 2 were female representing 29%
- Loputik HCIII had 7 members of whom 4 were male and 3 were female representing 43%.

Note: Out of the 5 sampled health facilities only Nadunget did not achieve the 30% gender composition requirement.

Source: Lists of HUMC & members.

|   |  |   |          |
|---|--|---|----------|
| <p>Compliance with gender composition of HUMC and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p>                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities including separating facilities for men and women: score 2.</li> </ul>  | <p>There was evidence that LG had issued guidelines on how to manage health facilities including separating facilities for men and women as was observed in all the 5 sampled health facilities. These guidelines included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Posters on use of the color coded bins - 2014.</li> <li>Posters on proper use of pit latrines with covers - 2014</li> <li>Siting of where to construct pit latrines – 2012.</li> <li>Guidelines on use of pit latrines by PWDs – 2016.</li> <li>Bathe shelter with proper drainage and soak pit – 2012.</li> </ul> | <p>2</p> |
| <p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: Score 2</li> </ul> | <p>There were no Health facility infrastructure projects implemented and therefore no environmental screening was done</p>  | <p>2</p> |
| <p>LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with</p> <p>Maximum 4 points for this performance measure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with: Score 2</li> </ul>  | <p>No site visits were conducted by the environmental officer as there were no sites to visit</p>   | <p>2</p> |

|   |  |   |          |
|---|--|---|----------|
| <p>The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management</p> <p>Maximum 4 points</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc.) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal: score 4.</li> </ul> | <p>There was evidence that the LG had issued guidelines on medical waste management, including guidelines for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidelines on medical waste management were issued to lower health units 17th/3/2018 during the supervision visits by DHT.</li> <li>• Guidelines on domestic waste management issued on 30th/4/2018</li> <li>• Guidelines on use of color coded bins were displayed on the 5 sampled health facilities issued on 7th/5/2018</li> <li>• Siting of pit latrines 7th/5/2018</li> <li>• Guidelines on use of incinerator for burning highly infectious medical waste were issued to lower health units on 10th /12/2017.</li> <li>• Safety boxes for used needles issued on 10th/12/2017.</li> </ul> | <p>4</p> |
|---|--|---|----------|



| Summary of requirements   | Definition of compliance   | Compliance justification  | Score |
|---|--|---|-------|
| Planning, budgeting and execution   |  |   |       |
| <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 district Water department has targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the budget for the current FY:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below average coverage: score 10</li> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 7</li> <li>o If 60-79: Score 4</li> <li>o If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>Two sub-counties of Nandugut 74% and Tapac 62% were found to have a safe water coverage below the district average which currently stands at 80% as per the District Atlas Report of the Ministry of Water and Environment and AWP and budget 2018/19.</p> <p>From review of AWP and budget 2018/19, it was found out that the Water department had planned for 7 new boreholes each costing Ushs 24,500,000 and 17 cattle troughs each costing Ushs 300,000,000 and rehabilitation of 5 boreholes each at a cost of Ushs 1,939,497.</p> <p>However there were no particular allocations to the sub counties in the AWP and budget for FY 2018/19. According to the District Water Officer, the allocations to sub-counties were done in the advocacy meetings which had not been held at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>Therefore the Assessment team could not verify how much have been budgeted for the sub counties below district average.</p> | 0     |

|   |  |  |           |
|---|--|--|-----------|
| <p>The district 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 district Water department has implemented budgeted water projects in the targeted sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 100 % of the water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: <p>Score 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o If 80-99%: Score 10</li> <li>o If 60-79: Score 5</li> <li>o If below 60 %: Score 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>The review of the AWP and budget for FY 2017/18 submitted by the District Water Department and MIS reports from MoWE revealed that Nanduguet and Tapac sub counties were below district safe water coverage. A total of 5 new Boreholes and 10 rehabilitations were planned for in the FY 2017/18. Of the 5new boreholes, 1 borehole and 2 boreholes were allocated to Nanduguet and Tapac sub counties respectively which were below district coverage.</p> <p>The review of Annual progress reports submitted to MoWE for instance Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 report dated 24th April 2018 and 3rd August 2018 respectively and site visits made to sampled projects confirmed that all projects in Nanduguet and Tapac sub counties were implemented. The sample projects visited by the Assessment team included; Naput BH (Rupa S/C), Loolung BH (Rupa S/C), Lomoruarengak BH (Tapac S/C), Morulem BH (Tapac S/C) and one rehabilitation borehole at Pupu Village (Rupa S/C).</p> | <p>15</p> |
|---|--|--|-----------|

**Monitoring and Supervision**

|  |   |   |           |
|--|---|---|-----------|
| <p>The district Water department carries out monthly monitoring of project investments in the sector</p> <p>Maximum 15 points for this performance measure</p> | <p>Evidence that the district Water department has monitored each of WSS facilities at least annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more than 95% of the WSS facilities monitored: score 15</li> <li>• 80% - 95% of the WSS facilities - monitored: score 10</li> <li>• 70 - 79%: score 7</li> <li>• 60% - 69% monitored: score 5</li> <li>• 50% - 59%: score 3</li> <li>• Less than 50% of WSS facilities monitored: score 0</li> </ul> | <p>The District Water Office Provided Form 1 which was used for monitoring all water sources in the district. The forms indicated that all water sources in the district had been monitored. In addition, Form 4 attached to Fourth quarter report submitted on 03rd August 2018 confirmed that all new water sources had been monitored.</p> | <p>15</p> |
|--|---|---|-----------|

|  |  |   |          |
|--|--|---|----------|
| <p>The district 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 district has submitted accurate/consistent data for the current FY: Score 5</li> <li>List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul> | <p>The data contained in the District Annual Work Plan was similar to the information obtained from the Ministry of Water and Environment</p>   | <p>5</p> |
| <p>The district 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>List of water facility which are consistent in both sector MIS reports and PBS: score 5</li> </ul>  | <p>The water facilities listed in the MIS report provided by the MoWE reflected 5 New Deep boreholes and 10 borehole. This was consistent with the list in the AWP, PBS and Performance contract 2018/19.</p>                             | <p>5</p> |
| <p>Procurement and contract management</p>   |  |   |          |
| <p>The district Water department has submitted input for district's procurement plan, 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 input for the district procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time (by April 30): score 4</p>                                   | <p>The procurement plan for all the investment items approved which included Drilling and sitting of 7 Boreholes and Construction of 17 Cattle troughs was submitted to the PDU together with the final work plan on 10th April 2018.</p> | <p>4</p> |

|   |  |   |          |
|---|--|---|----------|
| <p>The district 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 contract manager 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> </ul> | <p>The CAO had appointed Mr. Olaka Geoffrey as the contract manager for WSS projects in the district in an appointment letter dated 10th July 2018.</p> <p>A contract management plan which involved monitoring and supervision plan was included in the AWP 2018/19. Monthly site visits were conducted and site issues reported in the site supervision and progress reports.</p> <p>For instance the DWO presented to the assessment team minutes for the site meeting held on 5th Dec 2017 for the Siting and drilling of 5 boreholes in which site issues were discussed on site.</p> <p>BoQ for drilling of 5 boreholes as part of the contract document for the contract Moro 538/1718/Wrks/DWD/00002 were reviewed by the assessment team and found that the projects were constructed as per design.</p> | <p>2</p> |
| <p>The district 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 water and sanitation facilities constructed as per design(s): score 2</li> </ul>   | <p>There were no Drawings in the contract documents and DWO did not provide any drawing to the Assessment team. However, the following completed facilities were sampled and inspected. They were all found to be functioning and well maintained,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Naput BH (Rupa S/C)</li> <li>Loolung BH (Rupa S/C)</li> <li>Lomoruarengak BH (Tapac S/C),</li> <li>Morulem BH (Tapac S/C) and</li> <li>One rehabilitation borehole at Pupu Village (Rupa S/C).</li> </ul> <p>The assessment team could not verify whether the facilities were constructed as per design due to lack of drawings for reference.</p>  | <p>0</p> |

|   |   |  |          |
|---|---|--|----------|
| <p>The district 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 contractor handed over all completed WSS facilities: score 2</li> </ul>   | <p>The contractors handed over the completed WSS facilities and completion report dated January 2018 for the drilling and siting of 5 boreholes by Reddy's Boreholes and Technical Services Ltd was found at DWO file and completion certificate dated 30th January 2018 was also issued.</p>  | <p>2</p> |
| <p>The district 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 DWO appropriately certified all WSS projects and prepared and filed completion reports: score 2</li> </ul>              | <p>DWO appropriately certified all the WSS projects as evidenced by;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completion Certificate dated 30th January 2018 for the Drilling and siting of 5 boreholes in selected villages was issued to Reddy's Boreholes and Technical services Ltd and was presented to the assessment team for review.</li> <li>Interim certificates were prepared by DWO for payment. For instance Reddy's Boreholes and Technical Services Ltd requested for payment of Ush 110,875,750 on 15th January 2018 for Siting and drilling of 5 boreholes and DWO certified the payment on under certificate No 1 on 13th February 2018 and paid on 6th March 2018.</li> </ol> | <p>2</p> |
| <p>The district Water department has certified and initiated payment for works and supplies on time</p> <p>Maximum 3 for this performance measure</p> | <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> | <p>The District Water department did not timely certify and initiate payment for works and supplies as evidenced by the following sampled projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M/s Elgon Springs (U) Ltd request payment of Shs. 2,454,700 dated on 12th/12/2017 for fuel for Water department was recommended for payment on 6th/2/2018 and paid on 21st/3/2018 vide PV-WK00075 within 96 days.</li> <li>M/s Elgon Springs (U) Ltd request payment of Shs. 2,500,000 dated on 1st /8/2017 for fuel for Office operations was recommended for payment on 1st/8/2017 and paid on 3rd/10/2017 vide PV-WK00056 within 62 days.</li> </ul>   | <p>0</p> |
| <p>Financial management and reporting</p>   |   |  |          |

|  |   |   |          |
|--|---|---|----------|
| <p>The district Water department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Plan- ning 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>   | <p>The Water department submitted the annual performance report for the FY 2017/2018 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner on 23rd August 2018 (as per Email from the PBS – Re: Reg. Head of Department Validation' dated 23rd August 2018 alerting the Planner / Moroto DLG about the submission by the Department)</p> <p>The submission was however made after the deadline of 15th July 2018.</p> | <p>0</p> |
| <p>The District 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> </ul> </li> <li>If queries are not responded to score 0</li> </ul> | <p>The District Water department had no internal audit query in FY 2017/2018</p>  | <p>5</p> |
| <p>Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability</p>  |   |   |          |

|  |  |   |          |
|--|--|---|----------|
| <p>The district 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> | <p>The Finance, Administration, and Technical Services Committee met and discussed service delivery issues during FY 2017/2018 as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 19th April 2018 (under Min. 03/FATS/18 – Presentation of Sector Work Plans).</li> <li>Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 18th May 2018 (under Min. 03/FATS/05/18 – Budget Scrutiny and Review for FY 22018/2019).</li> </ul>   | <p>3</p> |
| <p>The district 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 water sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council: score 3</li> </ul>  | <p>There were no reports availed to show that the Finance, Administration, and Technical Services Committee presented issues that required approval to Council during FY 2017/2018.</p> <p>However, the minutes of the District Council indicated that the committee had presented issues to councils as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Min. 04/DLC/05/'18 – Committees' Reports to Council for Adoption (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 22nd May 2018).</li> <li>Min. 20/DLC/'17– Committees' Reports to Council for Adoption (Minutes of District Council meeting held on 21st December 2017).</li> </ul> | <p>3</p> |
| <p>The district 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>   | <p>Water development Grant releases for FY 2017/18 amounting to Ushs 167,398,854 with corresponding budget FY2017/18 amounting to Ushs 286,969,463 were displayed on the Notice board at District Water Department.</p>   | <p>2</p> |

|   |  |   |          |
|---|--|---|----------|
| <p>The district 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>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>                        | <p>All the WSS projects visited were clearly labelled indicating name of contractor, Name of project, date of construction and source of funding.</p> <p>The visited facilities were Naput BH (Rupa S/C), Loolung BH (Rupa S/C), Lomoruarengak BH (Tapac S/C), Morulem BH (Tapac S/C) and one rehabilitation borehole at Pupu Village (Rupa S/C).</p>   | <p>2</p> |
| <p>The district 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>Information on tenders and contract awards (indicating contractor name /contract and contract sum) displayed on the District notice boards: score 2</li> </ul>                  | <p>The information on tenders and contract awards had been removed from the District Notice board by the time of the assessment, however copies of the same that had been displayed on notice board had been kept in a file at PDU office and were presented to the assessment team. For instance a file copy at PDU office for the tender information for drilling and sitting of 5 boreholes indicated Best evaluated bidder as Reddy's Boreholes and Engineering services ltd, Contact amount Ushs 115,000,000, and was displayed on 20th October 2017 and removed on 3rd November 2017.</p> | <p>2</p> |
| <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> | <p>Application letters for WSS facilities from communities together with the minutes of the meetings held by communities were submitted to the District Water Office as per sector critical requirements for action and were properly filed. For instance application request for a borehole dated 25th January 2018 from Atirwae village</p>   | <p>1</p> |



|  |  |   |          |
|--|--|---|----------|
| <p>Participation of communities in WSS programmes</p> <p>Maximum 3 points for this performance measure</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water and Sanitation Committees that are functioning evidenced by either: i) collection of O&amp;M funds, ii) carrying out preventive maintenance and minor repairs, iii) facility fenced/protected, or iv) they have an M&amp;E plan for the previous FY: score 2</li> </ul> <p>Note: One of parameters above is sufficient for the score.</p> | <p>On file, there were copies of receipts of contributions by the WSCs from Morulem and Lomoruarengak villages to the drilling and rehabilitation of boreholes; for instance receipt No: 507 for contribution of Ush400, 000 towards drilling of 2 boreholes. The facilities visited were functioning and well maintained, properly fenced for protection.</p>  | <p>2</p> |
| <p>Social and environmental safeguards</p>   |  |   |          |
| <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> </ul>   | <p>The Environment screening reports for all WSS projects implemented were duly filled and available on file. The environmental screening report date 21st November 2017 was presented to the assessment team for review and all projects were found to have been screened.</p>   | <p>2</p> |
| <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 there has been follow up support provided in case of unacceptable environmental concerns in the past FY: score 1</li> </ul>   | <p>Environmental Certificate No: 004 dated 23rd March 2018 for drilling of 5 boreholes for contract Ref no: Moro538/1718/Wrks/DDEG/00002 was presented to the Assessment team for review.</p> <p>The certificate clearly indicated the Negative Environmental and Social impacts (as Clearing of grass at localized areas), Mitigation measures (as Planting of trees around for shade when in use) and implementation progress (as completed and handed over).</p> | <p>1</p> |

|  |   |  |          |
|--|---|--|----------|
| <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 construction and supervision contracts have clause on environmental protection: score 1</li> </ul>   | <p>Item 18 of BOQ in the construction of Market at Kosiroi contract covers environmental management, Contract No: Moro 538/1718/Wrks/DDEG/00004).</p> <p>Item 23 of BOQ in the completion of a two staff house block at Acherer Primary school contract covers environmental mitigation, Contract No: Moro 538/1718/Wrks/DDEG/00017).</p> <p>Item 23 of BOQ in the Renovation of old engineering block contract covers environmental mitigation, Contract No: Moro 538/1718/Wrks/DDEG/00003).</p>  | <p>1</p> |
| <p>The district 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 and at least one occupying a key position (chairperson, secretary or Treasurer) as per the sector critical requirements: score 3</li> </ul> | <p>The lists of members of WSCs were provided in the software progress reports of the District Water Office. All committees had women, with majority having over 50% members being women and with women occupying key positions. This was corroborated on the sampled facilities visited. For instance from the sampled projects, Morulem Borehole (Tapac S/C), Lomoruarengak borehole (Tapac S/C), Loolung Borehole (Rupa S/C), and Naput borehole (Rupa S/C0; out of 9 WSC members, 5 were found to be women occupying at least two key positions of Vice chairman, Secretary, Treasurer and care taker.</p> | <p>3</p> |
| <p>Gender and special needs-sensitive sanitation facilities in public places/</p> <p>RGCs provided by the Water Department.</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>  | <p>The DWO revealed to the assessment team that due to limited funds, the Water department did not plan of any Sanitation facilities. The Department had prioritized on Water supply projects.</p> <p>Therefore there was no sanitation facility that was available for sampling to verify gender and special needs sensitivity in public sanitation facilities.</p>   | <p>0</p> |