



LGMSD 2022/23

Moroto District

(Vote Code: 538)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	76%
Education Minimum Conditions	30%
Health Minimum Conditions	40%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	70%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	30%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	70%
Educational Performance Measures	64%
Health Performance Measures	61%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	73%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	49%

**Crosscutting
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Service Delivery Outcomes of DDEG investments</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG funding are functional and utilized as per the purpose of the project(s): • If so: Score 4 or else 0 	<p>The evidence provided indicated the district only had one project implemented using DDEG funding and it was completed and being utilized follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a Classroom block at Acherer Primary School Ushs 67,682,000 (Budget page 32 and Q4 report(page 19). 	4
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>The average score in the overall LLG performance assessment increased from previous assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5%, score 3 • 1 to 5% increase, score 2 • If no increase, score 0 <p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 3 for any increase.</p>	<p>The average score for the current year's results was 77%.</p> <p>The average score for previous financials was 69%</p> <p>Percentage change was 7%</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DDEG funded investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per performance contract (with AWP) by end of the FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% the projects were completed : Score 3 • If 80-99%: Score 2 • If below 80%: 0 	<p>The DDEG-funded investment project implemented in the previous FY was completed and fully utilized as per the Annual budget performance report and it was ;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a Classroom block at Acherer Primary School Ushs 67,682,000 (Budget page 32 and Q4 report the project was 100% completed(page 19). 	3

3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines: Score 2 or else score 0.	There was evidence that the LG budgeted Ugx 67,682,000 and spent all the DDEG in the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines as indicated below; 1. Construction of a Classroom block at Acherer Primary School Ushs 67,682,000 (the Approved budget on page 32 and from annual budget performance report the project was 100% completed(page 19).	2
3	Investment Performance Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	b. If the variations in the contract price for sample of DDEG funded infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/-20% of the LG Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0	Only one project was implemented using DDEG funding. It was -1.01% and within the +/-20% variation and therefore complied. The project was for construction of 2-classroom block at Acherer primary school Procurement ref: Moro538/2022-2023/wrks/DDEG/00002 Estimate cost: Ugx 78,000,000/= Contract cost ; Ugx 78,790,960/= Variation cost: Ugx -790,960/= %age variation (-790,960/78,000,000) x 100% =-1.01%	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	Accuracy of reported information Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate, score 2 or else score 0	From the 3 LLGs visited (Nadunget, Rupa and Katikekile Sub County), there was evidence from the staff lists at the LLGs and the attendance registers that information from the LG on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards is accurate. For instance in Nadunget Sub county, the following staff were deployed; 1. Naru Gertrude- Senior Assistant Secretary 2. Olinga John -Agricultural Officer 3. Okello Pius- Veterinary Officer 4. Anyakun Addah- Community Development Officer 5. Cici Alice- Accounts Assistant 6. Twala Zackary- Assistant Community Development Officer 7. Akol Raphael- Parish Chief 8. Pulkol Hellen-Parish Chief 9. Dengel David Lokule- Parish Chief 10. Aguma Peter Okeng- Parish Chief 11. Adome Samson-Parish Chief 12. Lotee Phillip- In-charge Nadunget HC 13. Ogole Mark- Health Assistant 14. Korobe Joseph Osag- Head Teacher	2
---	--	--	---	---

4	<p>Accuracy of reported information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that infrastructure constructed using the DDEG is in place as per reports produced by the LG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % in place: Score 2, else score 0. <p>Note: if there are no reports produced to review: Score 0</p>	<p>Only one project was implemented using DDEG funding during FY 2022/2023, which was the construction of a 2-classroom block at Acherer Primary School. There was a completion report- the ABPR as of the 30th June 2023 as well as the Engineer's report completion report dated 5th July 2023.</p>	2
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>If there is no difference in the assessment results of the LG and national assessment in all LLGs</p> <p>score 4 or else 0</p> <p>NB: The Source is the OPAMS Data Generated by OPM.</p>	<p>The findings from LG and IVA were as follows;</p> <p>Nadunget Sub County LG assessment results was 69% while IVA findings was 81%, a variance of 12%. Nadunget Town Council findings were 67% for LG findings and 76% for IVA- a variance of 9%. Similarly, Katikekile Sub County LG findings was 88% while IVA was 93%, a variance of 5% and last but not least, Rupa Sub CountyLG findings was 87% while IVA was 80%= variance of 7%</p> <p>Based on Nadunget findings, the LG scores zero.</p>	0
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. The District/ Municipality has developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG developed performance improvement plans for at least 30% of the lowest performing LLGs for the current FY, based on the previous assessment results.</p>	0
5	<p>N23_Reporting and Performance Improvement</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. The District/ Municipality has implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG implemented the PIP for the 30 % lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY.</p>	0

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. The recruitment plan was dated 22nd September 2022 and submitted to MoPs on 26th September 2023.</p>	2
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI):</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District had conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI). For instance in the first quarter July to September 2023 the best performers were Aleper Agnes Office assistant and Nakiru Lucia, Office Assistant at 97% while the worst performers were Kinyosi Micheal Senior Land Management Officer and Lolem Maggie, District Community Development Officer with 0%.</p>	2
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features:</p> <p>HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous</p> <p>FY: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>7 out of 9 HODs had been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lotyang John, District Natural Resources Officer, was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the CAO Chelimo Alex 2. Achia Lawrence, District Commercial Officer was appraised 30th June 2023 by the CAO Chelimo Alex 3. Opio Paula, District Planner was appraised 30th June 2023 by the CAO Chelimo Alex 4. Egesa Wabudi David, CFO was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the CAO Chelimo Alex 5. Lemkol James, DHO was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the CAO Chelimo Alex 6. Orup Ceasor, District Engineer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the CAO Chelimo Alex 7. Inangolet Francis Olaki, DPMO was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the CAO Chelimo Alex 	0
			<p>The HR department did not present the appraisals for DEO and DCDO at the time of assessment.</p>	

7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>ii. (in addition to “a” above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines. For instance on 7th February 2023 the rewards and sanctions committee sat and sanctioned Atukei Dinah Atukei and Okoth Kenneth for over staying their study leave. Their Salaries were withheld. The committee was comprised of Eko Edward, PAS- Chairperson, Lemukol James- Member, Oputa James Member, Akkelo Annet Sarah Secretary, Naru Gertrude- member, and Alinga John Bosco-member.</p>	1
7	<p>Performance management</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional.</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional. On 6th July 2023 the committee sat and handled a number of staff grievances including a complaint by Napeyok Rosemary-enrolled Nurse at Lopeliple HC II that the incharge was segregating. The committee resolved that the officer was undisciplined and insubordinate and she was cautioned. The committee was comprised of Longes Donato-Chairperson, Akello Anet Sarah-Secretary, Inangolet Francis-member, Lemukol James-member, Ojao Markson Akol- member, Ewangu Samuel-member.</p>	1

8	<p>Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>The LG recruited 22 Education Assistants in the previous FY. 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment. For instance;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apio Hellen, District Education Officer was appointed on 25th January 2023 and accessed the payroll on April 2023. 2. Chemutai Shanura District Education Officer was appointed on 25th January 2023 and accessed the payroll on April 2023. 3. Ajilong Christine Education Assistant was posted on 23rd January 2023 and accessed the payroll on April 2023. 4. Asege Norah Education Assistant was posted on 30th January 2023 and accessed the payroll on April 2023. 5. Chebet Shakila Education Assistant was posted on 30th January 2023 and accessed the payroll on April 2023. 6. Oyata Malisa Education Assistant was posted on 30th January 2023 and accessed the payroll on April 2023. 7. Aguti Serida Education Assistant was posted on 30th January 2023 and accessed the payroll on April 2023. 8. Amiriot Rebecca Education Assistant was posted on 30th January 2023 and accessed the payroll on April 2023. 9. Okello Geoffrey District Education Officer was appointed on 25th January 2023 and accessed the payroll on April 2023. 10. Ongor Stephen Education Assistant was posted on 30th January 2023 and accessed the payroll on April 2023 	1
9	<p>Pension Payroll management</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0</p>	<p>a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement:</p> <p>Score 1.</p>	<p>The LG had 5 staff that retired the previous FY. They accessed the payroll as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aleper Joseph Senior Inspector of Schools retired on 31st December 2022 and accessed the pension payroll in January 2023. 2. Chamcham Obadia Head Teacher Naitakwae PS retired on 2nd March 2023 and accessed the pension payroll in April 2023 3. Lopeyok Joseph Deputy Head Teacher Moroto Rainbow PS retired on 8 April 2023 and accessed the payroll in May 2023 4. Nake Hellen Senior Education Assistant retired on 1st January 2023 and accessed the payroll in February 2023 5. Atiang Eunice Damalie Head Teacher of Lochirapake PS retired on 30th May 2023 and accessed the payroll in June 2023 	1

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence from the release letters indicated that the transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget amount Ugx 143,432,000 in previous FY as per the releases below;</p> <p>Nadunget S/C received Ushs 34,798,213</p> <p>Loptuk S/C received Ushs 5,597,000</p> <p>Rupa S/C received Ushs 33,352,000</p> <p>Lotisan S/C received Ushs 5,597,000</p> <p>Tapac S/C received Ushs 32,340,000</p> <p>Katikekile S/C received Ushs 22,656,000</p> <p>Nadunget T/C received Ushs 9,090,794</p> <p>The total transfers to all the LLGs in the LG added up to Ushs 143,428,756 which was the Actual amount released by MoFPED for the FY 2022/2023. The above transfers were made in two installments dated:</p> <p>In quarter 1: The LG did not receive DDEG.</p> <p>In quarter 2 was paid on 17th October 2022.</p> <p>In quarter 3 was paid on 19th January 2023.</p> <p>In quarter 4: The LG did not receive DDEG.</p>	2
10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG did timely warranting/ verification of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget:Note: Timely warranting for a LG means: 5 working days from the date of upload of releases by MoFPED). Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG did not do timely warrant direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance with the requirements of the budget as follows:</p> <p>Quarter 1: LG did not receive DDEG.</p> <p>Quarter 2: Release was on 3rd October 2022, warranted on 17th October 2022, warrant was 14 days late; and</p> <p>Quarter 3: Release was on 02nd January 2023, warranted on 09th January 2023 which was within the time limit day.</p> <p>Quarter 4: LG did not receive DDEG.</p>	0

10	<p>N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG invoiced and communicated all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the funds release in each quarter:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence provided indicated that the invoicing and communicating of all DDEG transfers for the previous FY to LLGs was done. However, it was not within 5 working days from the date of funds release in each quarter;</p> <p>Quarter 1 LG did not receive DDEG funds.</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds were released on 17th October 2022 and the communication was made on 17th October 2022 which was within 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds were released on 02nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 19th January 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4 LG did not receive the DDEG funds.</p>	0
11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence the district supervised and mentored all LLGs in the District at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines as per the monitoring reports</p> <p>The LG mentored the LLGs in all the quarters.</p> <p>The supervision and mentoring were done in each quarter as per the reports:</p> <p>The LG provided evidence of quarterly reports for the supervision and mentoring of LLGs in the District FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The quarter 1 report was conducted from 5th October 2022 to 6th October 2022</p> <p>The quarter 2 report was conducted from 4th January 2023 to 6th January 2023.</p> <p>The quarter 3 report was conducted from 17th April 2023 to 18th April 2023.</p> <p>The quarter 4 report was conducted from 27th June 2023 to 29th June 2023.</p>	2

11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the results/reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC, used by the District/ Municipality to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG availed reports which showed that results and reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed in the TPC by the District to make recommendations for corrective actions and follow-up. These were signed by the Chairperson Eko Edward and were as below;</p> <p>The minutes were as follows;</p> <p>Q 1-Discussed on 12th September 2022- TPC-MIN.04/DTPC/SEPT/22.</p> <p>Q 2-Discussed on 19th January 2023 - TPC- Min MIN.03/DTPC/JAN/23.</p> <p>Q 3-Discussed on 19th May 2023 -TPC MIN.04/DTPC/May/23.</p> <p>Q 4-Discussed on 28th June 2023 -TPC- MIN 07/DTPC/MDLG/2023.</p>
----	---	---	---

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality maintains an up-dated assets register covering details on buildings, vehicle, etc. as per format in the accounting manual:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>Note: the assets covered must include, but not limited to: land, buildings, vehicles and infrastructure. If those core assets are missing score 0</p>	<p>The district had in place a computerized Assets Register in FY 2022/2023 through the IFMS system. The update of the Assets Register was up to 30th June, 2023. The register categorized land and buildings, furniture and fixtures, motor vehicles, computers and office equipment and all assets of Moroto district local government.</p>
----	---	---	---

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The district had in place a Board of Survey Report for the FY 2021-2022, produced and fully signed on 30th August 2022. The report carried recommendations to management which included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Engraving of all DLG assets. 2- Disposal of obsolete assets. 3- Attaching the values to assets <p>No evidence was presented at the time of assessment to show that the LG used the report to make assets management decisions like disposal and engraving etc.</p> <p>It was noted by the Senior Account that recommendations were not acted upon since there was a conflict of interest and the members failed to resolve the issues.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>The LG had a functional Physical Planning Committee appointed by the CAO as evidenced by the appointment letter Ref CR/156/1 dated 18th April 2023.</p> <p>The committee held all the quarterly meetings as per the minutes of the meetings availed to the Assessment team;</p> <p>Quarter 1 meeting was held on 27th September 2022.</p> <p>Quarter 2 meeting was held on 09th December 2022</p> <p>Quarter 3 meeting was held on 31st January 2023</p> <p>Quarter 4 meeting was held on 17th May 2023.</p> <p>The above minutes were submitted to the MoLHUD as follows</p> <p>Quarter 1 was submitted on 24th October 2022, Quarter 2 minutes were submitted on 21st December 2022, Quarter 3 was submitted on 03rd February 2023, and Quarter 4 minutes were submitted to Ministry on 19th May 2023.</p>	2

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. For DDEG financed projects;</p> <p>Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a desk appraisal for all projects in the budget - to establish whether the prioritized investments are: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDP III); (ii) eligible for expenditure as per sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. DDEG). If desk appraisal is conducted and if all projects are derived from the LGDP:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted a desk appraisal on the project implemented as per the report availed at the time of assessment. For the DDEG project was desk appraised on 17th July 2022 checking whether the proposed projects were in the LGDP, AWP and availability of funds in the Approved budget</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a Class room block at Acherer Primary School Ushs 67,682,000. 	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>For DDEG financed projects:</p> <p>e. Evidence that LG conducted field appraisal to check for (i) technical feasibility, (ii) Environmental and social acceptability and (iii) customized design for investment projects of the previous FY:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG conducted field appraisal for the projects implemented as per the report availed at the time of assessment. It was evidenced that the appraisal checked technical feasibility,</p> <p>(ii) Environmental and social (iii) customized design for investment projects The project field appraisal was conducted on 25th July 2022 for the DDEG projects that were implemented in the previous FY 2022/23 as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of a Classroom block at Acherer Primary School Ushs 67,682,000. <p>The project was appraised by the District Planner, DCDO, and other technical team. The project was recommended for funding to improve the service delivery at the district Headquarters.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that project profiles with costing have been developed and discussed by TPC for all investments in the AWP for the current FY, as per LG Planning guideline and DDEG guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>There was evidence that project profiles with costing were developed by HODs from different departments and discussed under TPC meeting held on 29th August 2022 under Min 06/DTPC/08/2022 Presentation of Project Profile with presentation derived from Annual Work plans and Draft Budget Estimates for the FY 2023/24.</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG has screened for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures where required before being approved for construction using checklists:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG screened 17 projects for environmental and social risks/impact and put mitigation measures, however, only one project was subjected to a monitoring checklist that is the upgrade of Kalemungole HCII to III with a checklist prepared on 4th May, 2023.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that all infrastructure projects for the current FY to be implemented using the DDEG were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that all infrastructure projects for current FY to be implemented using DDEG had been incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan. Some of the DDEG projects planned were Rehabilitation of OPD at Nakilo HCII and rehabilitation of a staff house at Rupa HCII, as indicated in the procurement plan approved on 8th August, 2023 by the CAO, Chelimo Alex.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all infrastructure projects to be implemented in the current FY using DDEG were approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all DDEG funded projects in the current FY were approved by the contracts committee before commencement of construction. This was done by the Contracts Committee when they start on 1st November, 2023 under MIN03/CC/2023-2023 (4 -2) in which the contract award was approved.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the sector guidelines:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was a letter dated 21st March, 2022 signed by the CAO, Cheliomo Alex, in which the following were named to the project implementation team;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Orup Ceaser – DE- Project Manager 2. Oputa Paul- DEO-Contract manager 3. Lotyang John- DNRO -Environmental issues 4. Lolem Margie -DCDO -Social safe guards. <p>The team composition left out the Labour officer and clerk of works, therefore it was not properly established as per sector guidelines.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	d. Evidence that all infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs provided by the LG Engineer: Score 1 or else score 0	The LG engineer provided standard technical drawings which were followed during implementation of the project as was observed at Acherer primary school were the classroom windows were 1.1 x 1 m, doors were 0.9 x 2.4 m with PVO made from solid steel metal, classroom sizes were 5.8 x 8 m internal dimensions and the roof was made from timber trusses of 150 x 75 mm, purlins were 50 x 75 mm with iron sheet G.28 pre-painted red.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	e. Evidence that the LG has provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project prior to verification and certification of works in previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	There were supervision reports by the District Engineer dated; 27th April, 2023, 30th May, 2023 and 29th June, 2023 to show that the LG provided relevant technical supervision.	2
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	f. The LG has verified works (certified) and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes as per contract (within 2 months if no agreement): Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that the LG verified works and initiated payment of contractors within two months, for example, a payment request was raised on 8th June, 2023, by KEKE General Enterprises of Ugx 36,924,499/=, it was certified by District Engineer, DEO, DCDO, Environment officer, on 12th June, 2023 and was paid Ugx 34,709,209/= on 22nd June, 2023 under voucher number 6170131 for construction works at Acherer primary school.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution Maximum 8 points on this Performance Measure	g. The LG has a complete procurement file in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG had a complete procurement file in place for the contract and the file reviewed was Project: Construction of a 2-classroom block at Acherer primary school. Procurement ref: Moro538/wrks/2022-2023/DDEG/00002. The file contained the following documents; 1. Evaluation report dated 13th October, 2022 2. Signed works contract dated 5th December, 2022 with KEKE General Enterprises, 3. Contracts Committee minutes dated 18th October, 2022 that approved the award of the contract 4. Award letter, supervision report, certificate of payment, PP1, Call of bids, among other documents on file.	1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.</p> <p>Score: 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided at the time of assessment on designation of a focal person to coordinate response grievance/complaints and also no established centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) was availed.</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices.</p> <p>If so: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided at the time of assessment to show a record of grievances.</p>	0
14	<p>Grievance redress mechanism operational.</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p> <p>If so: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided at the time of assessment to show avenues of publicization of the grievances where aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled.</p> <p>Maximum 11 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were integrated in the DDP III as shown below:</p> <p>Environment and climate change Interventions are found on page 92. The interventions included: restoration of bear hills, increase forest and wetland coverage etc Social intervention on page 194 where gender mainstreaming and Women empowerment is captured.</p>	1

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	b. Evidence that LGs have disseminated to LLGs the enhanced DDEG guidelines (strengthened to include environment, climate change mitigation (green infrastructures, waste management equipment and infrastructures) and adaptation and social risk management score 1 or else 0	There was evidence that LG disseminated DDEG guidelines to LLGs during the TPC meeting held on 19th May 2023 in District Department Boardroom under Min no 06/DTP/May/22: Dissemination of DDEG Guidelines FY 2022.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	(For investments financed from the DDEG other than health, education, water, and irrigation): c. Evidence that the LG incorporated costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for DDEG infrastructure projects of the previous FY, where necessary: score 3 or else score 0	There were no investments financed from the DDEG that were planned and or implemented other than the construction of a 2 classroom block at Acher from the education sector with a total BoQ cost of UGX. 205,235,000 with items 48, 63, 69 and 75 of the preliminaries of Bill No.1 on environment and social mitigation measures costed at UGX. 2,500,000	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	d. Examples of projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change. Score 3 or else score 0	There were no projects with costing of the additional impact from climate change because they were not budgeted for in the procurement and projects list for the corresponding financial year of assessment.	3
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	e. Evidence that all DDEG projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access, and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence of a certificate of title issued on 16th June, 2014 with instrument number 00005421 at Block(Road) 1 Plot 58 for Acherer primary school where the constructed 2 classroom block DDEG project is located.	1

15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	f. Evidence that environmental officer and CDO conducts support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: Score 1 or else score 0	The Environmental Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring to ascertain compliance with ESMPs with reports for example on, 1. Supervision of chainlink fencing at Nawanatau primary school prepared on 16th March, 2023 2. Monitoring report for rainbow and Nawanatau primary school irrigation demonstration sites prepared on 6th October, 2023 3. Monthly report on environmental social safety measures for the Upgrade of Kalemingole HCII prepared in the month of June, 2023	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	g. Evidence that E&S compliance Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 1 or else score 0	There were inconsistencies in the completion and signing of certification forms by the Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects. For example, 1. Payment certificate no.1 issued on 12th May, 2023 for sitting, drilling and installation of 7 boreholes including casting of aprons, construction of cattle troughs and a production well where both the Environment Officer and CDO signed. 2. Payment certificate no. 1 issued on 15th June, 2023 for the construction of 2 washroom blocks and completion of a 2 stance latrine at Katikekile seed school where only the Environmental Officer signed 3. Payment certificate no. 1 issued on 16th March, 2023 for fencing of Kakingol HCIII where both the Environmental Officer and CDO signed.	0

Financial management

16	<p>LG makes monthly Bank reconciliations</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG makes monthly bank reconciliations and are up to-date at the point of time of the assessment:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made monthly bank reconciliations and were up to date at the point of time of the assessment as per the printed copies of the reconciled bank accounts availed to the Assessment Team as detailed below;</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p> <p>A/c name: MOROTO DISTRICT GENERAL FUND</p> <p>A/c No: 6310500017</p> <p>Bank Name: Centenary Rural Development Bank Limited</p> <p>Reconciled up to 31st October 2024</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 101,643,816.</p> <p>A/c name: MOROTO UWEP RECOVERY ACCOUNT</p> <p>A/c No: 9030012224396</p> <p>Bank Name: Stanbic Bank Uganda Limited</p> <p>Reconciled up to 31st October 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 22,336,059.</p> <p>A/c name: MOROTO DISTRICT YLP RECOVERY</p> <p>A/c No: 9030009659918</p> <p>Bank Name: Stanbic Bank Uganda Limited</p> <p>Reconciled up to 31st September 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 12,324,764.</p>	2
17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that LG has produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY.</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY as shown below;</p> <p>1st quarter report was produced on 3rd January 2023.</p> <p>2nd quarter report was produced on 31st March 2023.</p> <p>3rd quarter report was produced on 18th July 2023.</p> <p>4th quarter report was produced on 28th July 2023.</p>	2

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG provided information to the Council Chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of the implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY.</p> <p>Quarter one on 3rd January 2023.</p> <p>Quarter two on 31st March 2023.</p> <p>Quarter three on 18th July 2023.</p> <p>Quarter four on 31st July 2023.</p>	1
----	--	--	--	----------

Score 1 or else score 0

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the internal audit reports for FY 2022/2023 by LG were submitted to CAO, LGPAC, Lg Accountant Office and RDC/LCV Chair through the Registry. However, only quarter one report was discussed by the LG PAC as per the dates.</p> <p>Quarter 1 report is dated 3rd January 2023 submitted on 3rd January 2023 - discussed on 24th April 2023 with reference LGPAC/MRT/APR/2023 as per the report that was provided however no LGPAC Minutes were presented to support the report.</p>	0
----	--	---	--	----------

Score 1 or else score 0

Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG planned revenue collection for the last FY was Ushs 756,000,000 (Final draft Accounts FY 2022/23 page 35) and the Actual Revenue collected was Ushs 193,622,160 which gave a variance of Ushs (562,377,840) this indicates that Moroto District Local Government collected less local revenue compared to what they had planned to correct.</p> <p>$((562,377,840)/756,000,000) \times 100\% = (74\%).$</p> <p>This indicates that the LG corrected 26% of the planned revenue which implies poor performance in revenue collection.</p>	0
----	---	---	---	----------

19	<p>The LG has increased LG own source revenues in the last financial year compared to the one before the previous financial year (last FY year but one)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure.</p>	<p>a. If increase in OSR (excluding one/off, e.g. sale of assets, but including arrears collected in the year) from previous FY but one to previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 10 %: score 2. • If the increase is from 5% -10 %: score 1. • If the increase is less than 5 %: score 0. 	<p>The ratio of OSR for the LG for previous FY as compared to that of the previous FY but one as per Final draft A/c 2022/23 page 35 was;</p> <p>OSR 2021/22</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 325,623,070</p> <p>OSR 2022/23</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 118,481,136</p> <p>Therefore</p> <p>Revenue 2022/23 Less revenue 2021/22</p> <p>Ushs 118,481,136- Ushs 325,623,070= Ushs (207,141,934)</p> <p>=(- 207,141,934/325,623,070) x 100= (63)%</p> <p>Therefore, the OSR for FY 2022/23 decreased by 63%.</p>	0
20	<p>Local revenue administration, allocation, and transparency</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure.</p>	<p>a. If the LG remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenues during the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The shareable revenue of Ugx 24,765,000 was transferred as required to the LLGs as below:</p> <p>Katikekile S/C received Ushs 1,195,250.</p> <p>Loputuk S/C received Ushs 1,982,500.</p> <p>Lotisan S/C received Ushs 0</p> <p>Nadunget S/C received Ushs 164,450.</p> <p>Nadunget T/C received Ushs 5,302,310.</p> <p>Rupa S/C received Ushs 1,690,000.</p> <p>Tapac S/C received Ushs 393,250</p>	2

Transparency and Accountability

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the procurement plan and awarded contracts and all amounts are published: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence available to show that the LG publicised information to citizens on awarded contracts and amounts this was observed from one document on file that had been removed from the notice board it read.</p> <p>“Best Evaluated Bidder Notice</p> <p>Subject of procurement: Construction of Katikekile Seed Secondary school in Moroto District, Iriiri seed secondary school in Napak district and Loro Seed secondary school in Amudat District Lot 22</p> <p>Type of procurement: Open Domestic bidding</p> <p>Name of best evaluated bidder: ADLER CONSTRUCTION COMPANY</p> <p>Contract price: Katikekile SSS: Ugx 3,172,890,840/= VAT inc</p> <p>2,688,890,542/= VAT exc Ugx</p> <p>Irriri SSS: Ugx 3,172,890,840/= VAT inc</p> <p>2,688,890,542/= VAT exc Ugx</p> <p>Loro SSS: Ugx 3,175,038,440/= VAT inc</p> <p>2,690,710,542/= VAT exc Ugx</p> <p>Total contract amount: Ugx 9,520,820,119/= VAT inc</p> <p>8,068,491,626/= VAT exc Ugx</p> <p>Date of display: 2nd March,2022</p> <p>Date of removal: 15th March,2022</p>	2
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG performance assessment results and implications are published e.g. on the budget website for the previous year: Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had the performance assessment results and the implications for the FY 2021/22 on the District Local Government website under publication as per the link below; https://moroto.go.ug/publications/performance-assessment-report-2022.</p>	2

21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG during the previous FY conducted discussions (e.g. municipal urban fora, barazas, radio programmes etc.) with the public to provide feed-back on status of activity implementation: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>It was noted by the District Planner that they didn't have any Barraza or radio programmes due to finance difficulties in the previous financial year.</p>	0
21	<p>LG shares information with citizens</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has made publicly available information on i) tax rates, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal: If all i, ii, iii complied with: Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG made publicly available information on i) tax rates, dated 10th March 2023 with ref CR/212/13 on the notice board. However information about collection procedures, and procedures for appeal were not on notice board.</p>	1
22	<p>Reporting to IGG</p> <p>Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. LG has prepared a report on the status of implementation of the IGG recommendations which will include a list of cases of alleged fraud and corruption and their status incl. administrative and action taken/being taken, and the report has been presented and discussed in the council and other fora. Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no IGG issues at Moroto District LG.</p>	1

**Educational
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG PLE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 4 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>School year 2020 is considered since school year 2021 did not have PLE results</p> <p>Total No. of candidates registered was = 700</p> <p>Total absentees were 12</p> <p>Total that sat were (700 - 12) = 688</p> <p>Total Grades (1,2&3) = 49 + 453 + 113 = 615</p> <p>Pass rate = $615/688 \times 100 = 89.38\%$</p> <p>School year 2022</p> <p>Total No. of registered candidates was = 928</p> <p>Total absentees were 10</p> <p>Total that sat were (928 - 10) = 918</p> <p>Total grades (1,2& 3) = 90 + 544 + 159 = 793</p> <p>% pass rate = $(793/918) \times 100 = 86.92$.</p> <p>This represented: $86.92 - 89.38 = -2.46\%$</p>	0

1	<p>Learning Outcomes: The LG has improved PLE and USE pass rates.</p>	<p>b) The LG UCE pass rate has improved between the previous school year but one and the previous year</p>	<p>School year 2020 Total No. of candidates registered was =358</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If improvement by more than 5% score 3 • Between 1 and 5% score 2 • No improvement score 0 	<p>Total absentees were =2 Total that sat were (358 - 2) =356 Total Grades (1,2&3) = 09+74 +110 =193 % Pass rate = 193/356 x 100 =54.2</p>	
			<p>School year 2022 Total No. of registered candidates was = 454 Total absentees were =7 Total that sat were (454 - 7) =447 Total grades (1,2& 3)= 30 +111 +143 = 284 % pass rate= 284/447 x 100 = 63.5 % improvement = 63.5 - 54.2=9.3%</p>	
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Increase in the average score in the education LLG performance assessment.</p>	<p>a) Average score in the education LLG performance has improved between the previous year but one and the previous year</p>	<p>The average score of education LLG performance increased by 3% from 93% in 2022 to 96% in 2023.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 2 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5%, score 2 • Between 1 and 5%, score 1 • No Improvement, score 0 		
		<p>NB: If the previous average score was 95% and above, Score 2 for any increase.</p>		
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p>	<p>a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0</p>	<p>DLG did receive Sector Development Grant amounting to Ugx 1,310,085,000 for FY 2022/2023 and was spent as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renovation of a two-classroom block of Lia Primary School at Ushs 28,708,000. 2. Construction of a 3-unit teacher house at Acherer Primary School at Ugx 210,000,000. 3. Phase two construction of a classroom block at Kasimeri Primary School at Ushs 900,095,000. 	2
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b) If the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors score 2 or else score 0

There was evidence the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO certified works for sampled Education construction projects implemented in the previous FY before the LG made payments to the contractors. For example;

1. - Voucher no. 6170131 dated 22nd June 2023 for the construction of 2 stance classroom Blocks at Acherer Primary School at Ushs 34,709,029 by Keke General Enterprise Uganda Ltd was certified by DEO on 12th June 2023, District Environment Officer on 12th June 2023, district Engineer on 12th June 2023 and DCDO on 12th June 2023 was initiated on 8th June 2023 and paid on 22th June 2023 which was within the timeline.
2. - Voucher no. 6105385 dated 22th June 2023 for the construction of Chain Link Fence at Nawanatau Primary School at Ushs 142,036,388 by Galaxy Gen Suppliers & Contractors Ltd was certified by DEO on 20th June 2023, District Environment Officer on 13th June 2023, district Engineer on 13th June 2023. However, DCDO didn't certify the work. Payment was initiated on 12th June 2023 and paid on 22th June 2023 which was within the timeline.
3. - Voucher no. 6075009 dated 22th June 2023 for the construction of a Wash room and Completion of 2 Stance Vip Latrine ar Katikekile SSSS at Ushs 26,484,368 by 21st Century Architects Limited was certified by DEO on 26th June 2023, District Environment Officer on 13th June 2023, district Engineer on 13th June 2023. However, DCDO didn't certify the work. Payments were initiated on 13th June 2023 and paid on 22th June 2023 which was within the timeline.

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

Three projects were implemented; Two were within +/- 2.27%, complied with +/-20% acceptable variation. The other was -164.40% did not comply.

The projects;

Project 1: Construction of a 2-classroom block at Acherer primary school

Procurement ref: Moro538/2021-2023/wrks/00002

Project 2: Construction of a 3-unit staff house at Acherer primary school

Procurement ref: Moro538/2022-2023/wrks/00003

Project 3: Construction of Katikekile Seed secondary school

Procurement ref: Moro538/2021-2022/wrks/UGIF/00003

Project 1

Estimate cost: Ugx 78,000,000/=

Contract cost ; Ugx 78,790,960/=

Variation cost: Ugx -790,960/=

%age variation (-790,960/78,000,000) x 100%

=-1.01%

Project 2:

Estimated cost: Ugx 210,000,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 205,235,000/=

Variation cost: Ugx 4,765,000/

%age variation (4,765,000/210,000,000) x 100%= +2.27%

Project 3

Estimate cost: Ugx 1,200,000,000/=

Contract cost ; Ugx 3,172,890,840/=

Variation cost: Ugx -1,972,890,840/=

%age variation (-1,972,890,840/1,200,000,000) x 100%

=-164.40%

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY	The report by the District Engineer, dated 27th June, 2023 indicated that the works done at the time report was made was at 20% of the planned works, this was due to the contractors failure to have adequate resources on site.	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 		
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines	<p>Moroto LG Teacher’s list was 344 teachers posted in the 16 UPE schools</p> $344/345 \times 100 = 99.7\%$	2
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 – 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 	This implied that the LG was 99.7% compliant with the MoES staffing guidelines of one teacher per class.	
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards	b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,	<p>The LG Consolidated Assets register for Moroto LG 2022/2023 that captured assets for 16 registered UPE schools that met the DES basic requirements and minimum standards of compiling the assets register in the recommended format. The assessment further verified this from the 3 sampled Primary Schools of;</p> <p>Nadunget primary school had 11 classrooms, 54 desks, 20 latrine stances and 12 teacher’s houses.</p> <p>, Moroto Army primary school had 12 classes, 188 desks, 20 latrine stances and 38 teacher’s houses.</p> <p>Kasimeri integrated primary school with 14 classrooms, 241 desks, 38 latrine stances and 9 teachers houses</p> <p>All asset registers tallied with those at the DEO’s office.</p> <p>Percentage of Schools that met DES guidelines was;</p> <p>Total schools that complied</p> $\frac{16}{16} \times 100 = 100\%$	3
	Maximum 6 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 		

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has accurately reported on teachers and where they are deployed.</p>	<p>The LG/DEO's deployment list consisted of 344 primary school teachers. The LG accurately reported on the teachers and the respective schools where they were posted and serving. During visits to three schools, namely Moroto Army, Primary School taken as urban Kasemeri Primary School taken as semi-urban, and Nadunget Primary School taken as rural, the actual presence of the teachers, as per the deployment list at the DEO's office, was verified.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At Moroto Army P/S, the staff list posted on the wall of the Head Teacher's office indicated that there were 34 GOU teachers, 12 teachers deployed by the UPDF and 1 part timer which did not match the DEO's deployment list. • Meanwhile, at kasemeri Primary School, the staff list on the wall of the Head Teacher's office showed that there were 44 GOU teachers which was inconsistent with the DEO's deployment list that had 40 teachers. • At Nadunget P/S, the staff list on the wall of the Head Teacher's office indicated that there were 23 GOU teachers, a number that aligned with that displayed on the notice board at the DLG offices. 	
5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has accurately reported on teaching staff in place, school infrastructure, and service performance.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that LG has a school asset register accurately reporting on the infrastructure in all registered primary schools.</p>	<p>The consolidated school asset register at the DEO's office accurately reported on the primary school assets for all UPE schools under the LG in total they were 157 classrooms, 345 latrine stances, 2045 desks and 106 teacher's houses..</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>Kasemeri intergrated primary school had 14 classrooms, 241 desks, 42 latrine stances, and 9 teachers houses.</p> <p>Moroto Army primary school had 12 classrooms, 139 desks, 2 teachers' houses and 15 latrine stance</p> <p>Nadunget primary schools had 11 classrooms, 54 desks, 12 teachers houses and 20 latrine stances.</p>	

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

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

- If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4

- Between 80 - 99% score: 2

- Below 80% score 0

The DLG had registered 16 UPE schools but only 13 submitted the annual school reports for 2022 that complied with annual school budget guidelines. For instance,

Nadunget primary school taken as rural had its budget and report handed in on 10th January 2023.

Kasemeri primary school taken as semi urban had its annual report presented on 3rd December, 2023 plus minutes from the annual general meeting.

Moroto Army primary school taken as urban had no records for this cause seen at the time of assessment.

$$2/3 \times 100 = 66.6\%$$

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:

- If 50% score: 4

- Between 30- 49% score: 2

- Below 30% score 0

There was evidence that schools were supported by the DLG education department to prepare the work plans on SIP and implement SIPs in line with inspections school had individual school improvement plans assisted by the parents and the SMC.

The schools visited had their sips in place such as;

Nadunget primary school, sip dated 8th Feb,2023 to November 2023 fully supported by the smc and PTA.

Kasemeri primary school, were dated 9th March,2022 to November 2023 endorsed by the head teacher mr. Ewangu Samuel the headteacher and they were to begin with immediate effect with improving the academic performance.

Moroto Army primary school sips were in place dated 19th March,2023 as the commencement date

$$3/3 \times 100 = 100\%$$

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 4: • Between 90 – 99% score 2 • Below 90% score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the LG education department compiled EMIS information for all registered school as of 3rd November, 2023.Total for all learners registered = 21,513</p> <p>16/16 x 100 = 100%</p>	4
---	--	---	--	---

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY:</p> <p>Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>From the wage estimates 2023/2024.the LG budgeted for a head teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school or a minimum of one teacher per class for schools with less than P.7 for the current FY. The total Budget was 3,956,324,000/=.</p>	4
---	--	---	---	---

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY,</p> <p>Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence from the staff list that the LG had deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY. The DLG had deployed 344 teachers at the time of assessment. For instance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moroto Army primary school had. 34 local government teachers, 12 soldier teachers and 1 part time teacher according to the list found on the school notice board. 2. Kasmeri integrated primary school had 44 teachers. 3. Nadungent primary school had 23 teachers. 	3
---	--	---	--	---

7	<p>Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff: LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board,</p> <p>score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>. There was evidence of dissemination of deployed teachers on the LG notice board dated 7th August, 2023.</p> <p>Kasmeri primary school had 44 teachers.</p> <p>Nadungent primary school had 23 teachers.</p> <p>Moroto Army primary school had 40 teachers publicised on the LG notice board.</p>	1
---	--	---	---	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) If all primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO/MEO</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>Some primary school head teachers have been appraised with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM with copy to DEO. However the LG could not provide a sample of at least 10 Primary School Headteacher's appraisals.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Arou Okiror Robert, Head Teacher Loletekia PS was appraised on 13th February 2023 by the SAS 2. Okiror Richard Edmond, Head Teacher Musas PS was appraised on 6th February 2023 by the SAS 3. Lokong Charles, Head Teacher Kakingole PS was appraised on 7th February 2023 by SAS 4. Elanyo Joseph, Head Teacher Acherere PS was appraised on 15th February 2023 by SAS 5. Marjan Lukyia, Head Teacher Lia PS was appraised on 8th February 2023 by SAS 6. Opoloto Simon, Head Teacher Musupo PS was appraised on 6th February 2023 by SAS 7. Maruk Peter, Head Teacher Loputuk PS was appraised on 15th February 2023 by SAS 	0
---	--	--	---	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) If all secondary school head teachers have been appraised by D/CAO (or Chair BoG) with evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The LG had 3 Secondary School teachers and none was appraised during the last FY.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p> <p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The HR department did not provide any appraisals for the education department.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	----------

8	<p>Performance management: Appraisals have been conducted for all education management staff, head teachers in the registered primary and secondary schools, and training conducted to address identified capacity gaps.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) The LG has prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level,</p> <p>score: 2 Else, score: 0</p>	<p>The Education department prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at both the school and LG levels. This plan was dated 22nd May, 2023 and was designed to target the performance gaps identified through staff appraisals. The plan was encompassing the following areas:</p> <p>Training head teachers, deputy head teachers, and departmental heads on conducting regular internal support supervision, documentation, continuous assessment at the school level and how to use the Tela effectively by end of term 2 2023.</p>	2
---	--	--	---	----------

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) The LG has confirmed in writing the list of schools, their enrolment, and budget allocation in the Programme Budgeting System (PBS) by December 15th annually.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>The assessment from the DEO indicated that the LG was compliant and had no errors requiring correction in the submitted school lists and enrollment data. Consequently, there was no need to communicate any corrections or revisions for school lists and enrollment data. The school enrollment and budget allocations had been successfully entered into the PBS system.</p>	2
---	---	---	--	----------

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG made allocations to inspection and monitoring functions in line with the sector guidelines.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score:2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>Moroto LG made allocations of UGX 12,564,000 to Education Department for inspection and monitoring on page 31 of 58 of LG Approved Budget Estimates FY 2022/2023 This was in line with sector guidelines</p>	2
---	---	--	---	----------

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c) Evidence that LG submitted warrants for school's capitation within 5 days for the last 3 quarters</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else score: 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Quarter was released on 2nd July, 2022 and warranted on 4th August, 2022 after 18 days. • 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 17th October, 2022 after 14 days. • 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 18th January, 2023 after 15 days. • 4th Quarter released on 11st April, 2023 and warranted on 20th April, 2023 after 9 days. 	0
---	---	---	--	----------

9	<p>Planning, Budgeting, and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.</p> <p>If 100% compliance, score: 2 else, score: 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely invoicing/communication (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 funds was released on 2nd July 2022 and warranted on 4th August 2023, communications were made on 18th August 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022, warranted on 17th October 2022 and the communications were made on 17th October 2022 which was within the 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds was released on 2nd January 2023, warranted on 18th January 2023 and the communication were made on 19th January 2023 which was within 5 days.</p> <p>As per Q1 the LG was compliant however all communications were on the notice board.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 	<p>There was evidence that the DLG Education Department prepared an inspection work plan for schools in the district on 14th July, 2023 To support head teachers, deputy head teacher and head of departments to follow, implement and to develop inclusive school improvement plans.</p> <p>To assess the general conditions in the schools.</p> <p>To assess teacher presence and learner's attendance. It was attended by 10 inspectors</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>There was evidence seen at the time of assessment that registered UPE schools were inspected and monitored .</p> <p>Term I, 2023- (16/16x100 =100% dated 26th March, 2023.</p> <p>Term II, 2023- (16/16x100 =100% dated 26th September, 2023.</p> <p>Term III, 2023 - (16/16x 100 =100% dated 2nd November, 2023.</p> <p>Percentage inspection was 100%</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that inspection reports have been discussed and used to recommend corrective actions, and that those actions have subsequently been followed-up,</p> <p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence presented at the time of assessment that inspection reports had been discussed.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the DIS and DEO have presented findings from inspection and monitoring results to respective schools and submitted these reports to the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES): Score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of submission of inspection reports to the Directorate of Education Standards. The acknowledgment by DES was dated 20th September, 2023. For all termly submissions. only acknowledgement forms were presented consisting of the following;</p> <p>Quarter II, III and IV inspection.</p> <p>Reports 2022/2023 submission.</p> <p>Submission of school inspection accountability report for quarter 2,3 &4 2022/23.</p> <p>Submission of 2023/24 inspection work plan.</p> <p>They were received and stamped, by Took Victoria on behalf of the D.E.S.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection and monitoring findings, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY: score 2 or else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Council Committee responsible for the education sat and discussed delivery issues in meeting that was held on 17th October 2022 at the District Council Chambers where at least 7 members were present. Under Min no MIN 02/CCS/10/2022.Presentation Department reports for the First 2022/2023 and reactions. Under Education sector some of the issues that were discussed was parent failure to play active role in their children ie not providing children with the basic school requirements, operationalization of the two seed secondary schools.Recommendations for the above issues were all also captured.</p> <p>Another Meeting held on 21st December 2022 at District Council Chambers where at least 13 members were present it was resolved under Min no 05/DLG/12/2022 in education sector that Nawanatau Primary School should be fenced since its day and boarding school with may facilities and properties.</p>	2

11	Mobilization of parents to attract learners <i>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school, <i>score: 2 or else score: 0</i>	There was evidence that the LG education department conducted activities to mobilise, attract and retain children in school called "Go back to school" campaign from both DLG education office and sampled schools. Evidence of sensitization meetings conducted were; • Radio Talk show on 23rd January, 2023 on Akica FM. Moroto by the DEO in a program known as "leave no one behind" between 4pm -5pm	2
----	--	--	--	----------

Investment Management

12	Planning and budgeting for investments <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	The consolidated school asset register at the DEO's office accurately reported on the primary school assets for all UPE schools under the LG in total they were 157 classrooms, 345 latrine stances, 2045 desks and 106 teacher's houses..of which the assessed schools had the following assets; Kasemeri intergrated primary school had 14 classrooms, 241 desks, 42 latrine stances, and 9 teachers houses. Moroto Army primary school had 12 classrooms, 139 desks, 2 teachers' houses and 15 latrine stance Nadunget primary schools had 11 classrooms, 54 desks, 12 teachers houses and 20 latrine stances.	2
12	Planning and budgeting for investments <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP III; (ii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, DDEG). If appraisals were conducted for all projects that were planned in the previous FY, <i>score: 1 or else, score: 0</i>	There was evidence of conducting desk appraisal on 17th July 2022 for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability, and use of customized designs for eligible projects under education, and all projects were derived from DDP III page 148 as follows; - Renovation of a two-classroom block of Lia Primary School and it was recommended for field appraisal - Construction of a 3 Unit teacher house at Acherer Primary School and it was recommended for field appraisal. - Phase two construction of a classroom block at Kasimeri Primary School. The Desk Appraisal report was Endorsed by the Ag, Planner.	1

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal for (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs over the previous FY, score 1 else score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of conducting field appraisal checking for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and use of customized designs as per the examples;</p> <p>Field appraisal Renovation of a two classroom block of Lia Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 25th July 2022.</p> <p>Field appraisal Construction of a 3 Unit teacher house at Acherer Primary school. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 25th July 2022</p> <p>Field appraisal Phase two construction of a classroom block at Kasimeri Primary School. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 25th July 2022.</p> <p>All field appraisal forms were Signed by District Planner, SCDO, and District Environment Officer.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) If the LG Education department has budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects have been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>The was evidence to show that the LG education department budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects had been approved and incorporated into the consolidated procurement plan. The plan was approved on 8th August, 2022 by CAO, Chelimo Alex, it had construction of Seed Secondary School at Katikekile in Nakiloro and Staff house and kitchen at Katikekile Seed Secondary School in Tapac.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold) before the commencement of construction, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence to show that school infrastructure were approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by Solicitor General before commencement of construction. This was done in the sitting of the Contracts Committee of 1st March, 2022 in min 33/cc/March/2021-2022(1) and in the Solicitor General letter dated 11th August, 2022, singed by Magomu David Andrew, that cleared the contract for construction of Katikekile Seed Secondary School.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the LG established a Project Implementation Team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per the guidelines. <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was a letter dated 21st March, 2023 signed by the CAO, Chelimo Alex, in which the following were named to the project implementation team (PIT) 1. Orup Ceaser – DE Project Manager 2. Oputa Paul- DEO Contract manager 3. Lotyang John- DNRO Environmental issues 4. Lolem Margie -DCDO social safe guards. The team composition left out the Labour officer and Clerk of works, therefore it was not established as per sector guidelines.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES <i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i>	The LG engineer provided standard technical drawings which were followed during implementation of the project as was observed at Acherer primary school were the classroom windows were 1.1 x 1m, doors were 0.8 x 2.4m with PVO made from solid steel metal , classroom size were 5.8n x 8 m internal dimensions and the roof was made from timber trusses of 150 x75 mm, purlins were 50 x75mm with iron sheet G.28 pre-painted red.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There were a number of supervision reports by the District Engineer dated; 28th September, 2022, 30th October, 2022, 29th November, 2022 and 17th December, 2022 to show that monthly site meetings were conducted.	1
13	Procurement, contract management/execution <i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i>	f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i>	There was no evidence in form of joint supervision reports to show that there was joint supervision during critical stages of construction at the time the assessment was done.	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g) If sector infrastructure projects have been properly executed and payments to contractors made within specified timeframes within the contract, <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence the sector infrastructure projects were properly executed and payments to contractors were within specified timeframes and within the contract. For example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Voucher no. 6170131 dated 22nd June 2023 for the construction of a 2 stance classroom Blocks at Acherer Primary School at Ushs 34,709,029 by Keke General Enterprise Uganda Ltd was initiated on 8th June 2023 and paid on 22nd June 2023 which was within the timeline. 2. Voucher no. 6105385 dated 22nd June 2023 for the construction of a Chain Link Fence at Nawanatau Primary School at Ushs 142,036,388 by Galaxy Gen Suppliers & Contractors Ltd was initiated on 12th June 2023 and paid on 22nd June 2023 which was within the timeline. 3. Voucher no. 6075009 dated 22nd June 2023 for the construction of a Washroom and Completion of 2 Stance Vip Latrine ar Katikekile SSSS at Ushs 26,484,368 by 21st Century Architects Limited was initiated on 13th June 2023 and paid on 22nd June 2023 which was within the timeline. 	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>h) If the LG Education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30, <i>score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to procurement unit by April 30th. The submission was on the 14th April, 2022. The plan had construction of a two-classroom block and a 3-unit staff house at Acherer primary school.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>i) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law <i>score 1 or else score 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the LG had complete files for each school infrastructure contract with all records as required by PPDA. The files reviewed were;</p> <p>1. Construction of Katikekile Seed Secondary School</p> <p>Procurement ref; Moro538/21-22/wrks/0003: This file had,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluation reported dated 4th February, 2022, 2. Contracts Committee decision dated 1st March, 2022 3. Signed works contract dated 15th August, 2022 with Adler Construction Company Limited. 4. PP1 form, call of bid notice, supervision reports among other documents on file. <p>2. Construction of classroom block at Acherer primary school.</p> <p>Procurement ref: Moro538/wrks/2022-2023/00003: This file had;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluation reported dated 13th October, 2022, 2. Contracts Committee decision dated 18th October, 2022 3. Signed works contract dated 5th December, 2022 with Keke general Enterprises 4. PP1 form, call of bid notice, issue and receipt of bids record, supervision reports among other documents on file
----	--	--	--

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0</p>	<p>There were no records of grievances handling and neither a log book of recorded grievances availed at the time assessment.</p>
----	--	---	---

15	Safeguards for service delivery. <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that LG has disseminated the Education guidelines to provide for access to land (without encumbrance), proper siting of schools, 'green' schools, and energy and water conservation <i>Score: 3, or else score: 0</i>	A report on training of teachers on school guidelines dated 22nd May, 2023, where 21 primary school head teachers were invited was availed and the dissemination of several education guidelines was carried out. The training was handled using extracts of themes from the guidelines including teacher effectiveness and learner achievements (TELA), competence based assessment (CBA), Abridged curriculum (AC) and Life skills and environment management for schools from 22nd May to 26th May 2023 at Moroto Core PTC.	3
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a) LG has in place a costed ESMP and this is incorporated within the BoQs and contractual documents, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i>	The LG did not prepare costed ESMPs for all projects in the education sector although the reviewed BoQs and contractual documents showed that environmental and social safeguards had been integrated for example, the construction of 2 wash room blocks and completion of a 2 stance latrine at Katikekile seed school at a contract award amount of UGX. 28,174,860 and a provision of environmental safeguards with item no. 16 for removing rubbish and cleaning which was costed at UGX. 200,000	0
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	b) If there is proof of land ownership, access of school construction projects, <i>score: 1, else score:0</i>	There was evidence of a certificate of title issued on 16th June, 2014 with instrument number 00005421 at Block(Road) 1 Plot 58 for Acherer primary school where the construction of a 2 classroom block at Acherer is located.	1
16	Safeguards in the delivery of investments <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	c) Evidence that the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring (with the technical team) to ascertain compliance with ESMPs including follow up on recommended corrective actions; and prepared monthly monitoring reports, <i>score: 2, else score:0</i>	The Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring for the following education projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs, including follow-up on recommended corrective actions; 1. Supervision of chainlink fencing at Nawanatau primary school prepared on 16th March, 2023 2. Monitoring report to rainbow and Nawanatau primary school irrigation demonstration sites prepared on 6th October, 2023 3. Monthly report on environmental social safety measures for micro-irrigation demonstration sites at Nawanataba primary school May, 2023	2

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

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

Score: 1, else score:0

The certification of civil works in the education sector were inconsistently approved and signed by the Environmental Officer and CDO prior to executing the project contractor payments for example,

1. Payment certificate no. 1 issued on 15th June, 2023 for the construction of 2 washroom blocks and completion of a 2 stance latrine at Katikekile seed school where only the Environment Officer signed.
2. Payment certificate no. 1 issued on 8th June, 2022 for the construction of a chain-link at Nawanatau primary school only the Environment Officer signed.
3. Payment certificate no. 2 issued on 12th June, 2023 for the construction of a 2 classroom block at Acherer primary school where the Environment Officer and CDO signed.

**Health
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>New_Outcome: The LG has registered higher percentage of the population accessing health care services.</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the LG registered Increased utilization of Health Care Services (focus on total deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 20% or more, score 2 • Less than 20%, score 0 	<p>From the annual HMIS reports 107, the Annual deliveries for 3 Health facilities: Nadunget HCIII, St Pius KidepoPNFPHC III and Kakingol HCIII for the FY 2021/22 were:183,180 and 124 respectively .The Total deliveries for the 3 above mentioned Facilities for FY 2021/22 was 487</p> <p>The Annual deliveries for the same Health facilities for the FY 2022/23 were : 247,242 and 146 respectively. The total Deliveries for the three above mentioned Facilities for FY 2022/23 was 635.</p> <p>Moroto District registered an increase in utilization of Health care services.</p> <p>The Percentage increase was 30.4%</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70% and above, score 2 • 50% - 69%, score 1 • Below 50%, score 0 	<p>The the average score in Health for LLG performance assessment for the current year under review was 84% as per the OPAMS.</p>	2
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the Health LLG performance assessment.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the average score in the RBF quality facility assessment for HC IIIs and IVs previous FY is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% and above; score 2 • 65 - 74%; score 1 • Below 65; score 0 	<p>RBF was incorporated into PHC as per the MOH letter to CAOs dated 7th Dec, 2022.</p>	0

3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	a. If the LG budgeted and spent all the health development grant for the previous FY on eligible activities as per the health grant and budget guidelines, score 2 or else score 0.	DLG did receive Sector Development Grant Ushs 998,199,000 for FY 2022/2023 and was used towards; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fencing of Kankingol HC II at Ushs 78,199,000 approved Budget page 27. 2. Upgrade of Kalemugole HC II to HC III (construction of an out Patient department) at Ushs 770,000,000 approved Budget page 27. 	2
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	b. If the DHO/MMOH, LG Engineer, Environment Officer and CDO certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers score 2 or else score 0	The verified vouchers indicated the District Health Officer, District Environment Officer, District Community Development Officer, and LG Engineer certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Voucher no 6433295 dated 28th June 2023 for Ushs 142,739,715; Certificate No; dated 16th February 2023; Contract No.MoH-UgiFT/WRK/22/00001: Project; Upgrade of Kalemungole HCII to HC III was certified by DHO, District Environment Officer, District Engineer, and DCDO as all endorsed on the payment certificate. 2. Voucher no 6166038 dated 22nd June 2023 for Ushs 11,763,724; Certificate No. 2; dated 21st November 2022; Contract No.Moro538/2223/WRKS/SDG/00007: Project; Fencing of Kakingol HC III was certified by DHO on 15th June 2023, District Environment Officer ,District Engineer and DCDO on 15th June 2023. 3. Voucher no 6166038 with dated 22th June 2023 for Ushs 11,763,724; Certificate No 1; dated 21st November 2022; Contract No.Moro538/2223/WRKS/SDG/00007: Project; Fencing of Kakingol HC III was certified by DHO on 02nd June 2023 ,District Environment Officer ,District Engineer and DCDO on 02nd June 2023. 	2

3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the variations in the contract price of sampled health infrastructure investments are within +/-20% of the MoWT Engineers estimates, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>Two projects were implemented one with - 5,82% complied, the other of -22.27%, was above +/-20% allowable variation.</p> <p>The projects reviewed were;</p> <p>Project 1: Construction of chain link fence at Kakingol HCIII c</p> <p>Procurement ref: Moro538/wrks/2021/000029</p> <p>Project 2: Upgrade of Kalemungole HCII-HC II</p> <p>Procurement ref: MOH-UgFit/wrks/2022-2023/00001</p> <p>Project 1:</p> <p>Estimated cost: Ugx 78,000,000/=</p> <p>Project cost: Ugx 82,541,000/=</p> <p>Variation Ugx -4,541,000/=</p> <p>%age variation $(-4,541,000/78,000,000) \times 100\% = -5.82\%$</p> <p>Project 2:</p> <p>Estimated cost: Ugx :750,000,000/=</p> <p>Contract cost: Ugx: 917,079,435/=</p> <p>Variation cost: Ugx -167,079,435/=</p> <p>%age variation $(-167,079,435/750,000,000) \times 100\% = -22.27\%$</p>	0
3	<p>Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0 	<p>A work progress report dated 28th June, 2023 by the District Engineer indicated that the works were at 75% at the time of reporting.</p>	0

4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 	<p>The LG had 89.8% deployment at the the time of assessment. The required staff were 137 and the actual staff deployed were 123. Hence, $123/137=89.8\%$.</p>	1
4	<p>Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs, this observed at Upgrade of Kalemungole HCII to HCIII were the dimensions of the windows on general ward were 1.45 x 1.2 M with four shutters of 0.5 x 0.7 m, the delivery room internal size was 5.3 x 5 m and the post natal ward was 7.9 x 7 m as per the MoH designs.</p>	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the information on positions of health workers filled for Nadunget HCIII, St Pius KidepoPNFPHC III, Kakingol HCIII, was accurate as indicated below:</p> <p>Nadunget had 20staff (DHO Facility Staff list). This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the staff list at the health facility noticeboard and the confirmed staff deployed on site).</p> <p>St Pius KidepoPNFPHC III had 14 Staff. (DHO Facility Staff list) This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the staff list at the health facility noticeboard and the confirmed staff deployed on site)</p> <p>Kakingol HCIII had 7 Staff. (DHO Facility Staff list).This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the staff list at the health facility noticeboard and the confirmed staff deployed on site)</p>	2
---	--	--	--	----------

5	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that information given on health facilities upgraded, constructed and functional is accurate. Kalemungole HCII was upgraded to HCII, there was also Construction of a Chain link fence at Kakingole HC II. The facility was functional. (Moroto District approved Budget 2023/24 pg 27)</p>	2
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities prepared and submitted Annual Workplans & budgets to the DHO/MMOH by March 31st of the previous FY as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was no evidence that all the sampled Health facilities Nadunget HCIII, St Pius KidepoPNFPHC III, Kakingol HCIII, prepared and submitted annual workplans and budgets to the DHO for FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The Annual work plan and Budget for Kakingol could not be traced in the DHO's Office.</p> <p>St Pius Kidepo submitted its workplna and Budget on 14th July 2022;This was late submission later than 31st March of the previous FY.</p> <p>Nadingot submitted 10th July 2022</p> <p>All the sampled Health facilities did not comply to as per the LG Planning Guidelines for Health Sector</p>	0
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Health facilities prepared and submitted to the DHO/MMOH Annual Budget Performance Reports for the previous FY by July 15th of the previous FY as per the Budget and Grant Guidelines :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>There was no evidence to show that all the 3 sampled Health facilities Nadunget HCIII, St Pius KidepoPNFP HC III, Kakingol HCIII, prepared and submitted Budge performance Reports to the DHO for FY 2022/23.</p> <p>None of the Health sampled Health Facilities' report was available in the DHO's office at the time of assessment...</p>	0

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Health facilities have developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporate performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score 2 or else 0 	<p>Of the 3 Sampled Health Facilities: Nadunget HCIII, St Pius Kidepo PNFP HCIII, Kakingol HCIII, only 2 facilities developed Submitted their facility improvement plans.</p> <p>The Facilities that developed and submitted were St Pius KidepoPNFP HCIII and Nadunget HCIII.</p> <p>St Pius KidepoPNFP HCIII submitted its Facility improvement Plan to the DHO on 12th July 2023.</p> <p>Nadunget HC III submitted its Plan on 5th July23.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7 days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • score 2 or else score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the three sampled Health facilities Nadunget HCIII, St Pius Kidepo HCIII, Kakingol HCIII submitted all monthly and Quarterly HMIS reports timely. The health facility report submission dates were as shown below:</p> <p>July 2022</p> <p>Nadunget HCIII submitted on 3rd August ,2022</p> <p>St Pius Kidepo HCIII submitted on 4th August ,2022</p> <p>Kakingol HCIII submitted on 4th August ,2022</p> <p>August 2022</p> <p>Nadunget HCIII submitted on 7th September 2022</p> <p>St Pius KidepoHCIII submitted on 5th Sept,2022</p> <p>Kakingol HCIII submitted on 5th Sept,2022</p> <p>September 2022</p> <p>Nadunget HCIII submitted on 7th Oct,2022</p> <p>St Pius Kidepo HCIII submitted on 6th Oct, 2022</p> <p>Kakingol HCIII submitted on 6th Oct ,2022</p> <p>October 2022</p> <p>Nadunget HCIII submitted on 2nd Nov,2022</p> <p>St Pius Kidepo HCIII submitted on 6th Nov 2022</p> <p>Kakingol HCIII submitted on 4th Nov,2022</p> <p>November 2022</p> <p>Nadunget HCIII submitted on 2nd Dec, 2022</p>	2
---	--	--	---	---

St Pius Kidepo HCIII submitted on 5th Dec,2022

Kakingol HCIII submitted on 4th Dec,2022

December 2022

Nadunget HCIII submitted on 4th Jan,2023

St Pius Kidepo HCIII submitted on 6th Jan,2023

Kakingol HCIII submitted on 6th Jan 2023

January 2023

Nadunget HCIII submitted on 6th Feb 2023

St Pius Kidepo HCIII submitted on 7th Feb,2023

Kakingol HCIII submitted on 5th Feb 2023

February 2023

Nadunget HCIII submitted on 6th March,2023

St Pius Kidepo HCIII submitted on 7th March 2023

Kakingol HCIII submitted on 5th March 2023

March 2023

Nadunget HCIII submitted on 5th April ,2023

St Pius Kidepo HCIII submitted on 6 th April ,2023.

Kakingol HCIII submitted on 4th April, 2023
April 2023

Nadunget HCIII submitted on 5th May,2023

St Pius KidepoPNFPHCIII submitted on 5th May, 2023

Kakingol HCIII submitted on 4th May ,2023

May 2023

Nadunget HCIII submitted on 5th June ,2023

St Pius KidepoPNFPHCIII submitted on 5th June ,2023

Kakingol HCIII submitted on 5th June, 2023

June 2023

Nadunget HCIII submitted on 7th July,2023

St Pius KidepoPNFPHCIII submitted on 7th July,2023

Kakingol HCIII submitted on 7th July ,2023

HMIS Quarterly Reports

1 Quarter

Nadunget HCIII submitted on 6th Oct, 2022

St Pius KidepoPNFPHCIII submitted on 5th Oct 2022

Kakingol HCIII submitted on 6th Oct,2022

2nd Quarter

Nadunget HCIII submitted on 7th Jan,2023

St Pius KidepoPNFPHCIII submitted on 6th Jan ,2023

Kakingol HCIII submitted on 6th Jan 2023

3rd Quarter

Nadunget HCIII submitted on 4th April ,2023

St Pius KidepoPNFPHCIII submitted on 6th April ,2023

Kakingol HCIII submitted on 6th April,2023

4th Quarter

Nadunget HCIII submitted on 5th July ,2023

St Pius KidepoPNFP HCIII submitted on 4thJuly, 2023

Kakingol HCIII submitted on 4th July 2023

There the above-mentioned Sampled health facilities submitted monthly and quarterly HMIS reports in accordance with the provided guideline (7 days following the end of every month or the quarter).

RBF program was incorporated into PHC as per the MOH letter to CAOs dated 7th Dec 2022.

0

6

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

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

e) Evidence that Health facilities submitted RBF invoices timely (by 15th of the month following end of the quarter). If 100%, score 2 or else score 0

Note: Municipalities submit to districts

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>f) If the LG timely (by end of 3rd week of the month following end of the quarter) verified, compiled and submitted to MOH facility RBF invoices for all RBF Health Facilities, if 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>RBF was incorporated into PHC program as per a letter from MOH to CAOs dated 7th December ,2022</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>g) If the LG timely (by end of the first month of the following quarter) compiled and submitted all quarterly (4) Budget Performance Reports. If 100%, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Planner could not track submission date for the QBPRs by the DHO. She noted the new system doesn't send email notification compared to previous system and therefore she could not ascertain the dates.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			
6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence to show that Moroto District health department developed Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities. There were no copies of Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities seen during the assessment.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>			

6	<p>Health Facility Compliance to the Budget and Grant Guidelines, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and Performance Improvement support.</p> <p>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for weakest performing facilities, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of implementation of Performance Improvement Plan for the weakest performing health facilities.</p>	0
---	--	--	--	----------

Human Resource Management and Development

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has:</p> <p>i. Budgeted for health workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Moroto budgeted for health workers in accordance with staffing norms. The Municipal Council approved wage for health workers for FY2023/24 was Ugx 2,540,238,000(Approved budget estimates for Moroto District 2023/24-page 26 Vote 895. This was in line with Health Sub Programme Grant Budget and Implementation Guideline for Local Government FY 2023/24 where the provided wage rate was 2,747,837,817 for Moroto Page 106 out of 421</p> <p>Therefore, Moroto District budgeted for health workers as per the guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms</p>	2
---	---	---	--	----------

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

There was no evidence to show that , Moroto LG had deployed Health Workers as per guidelines of deploying at least 75% of the Staff required in accordance with the staffing Norms.

In the sampled the sampled Health facilities, Nadunget HCIII, St Pius Kidepo PNFPHC III, Kakingol HCIII, Moroto LG deployed Health workers as follows:

Nadunget HCIII had 20 out of the approved 19 required Health workers for HCIII, giving 105.3 % of the required staffing norm for HCIII.

(Confirmed Staff list at Nadunget HCIII noticeboard)

St Pius KidepoPNFPHC III had 14 Out of 19 Required Health workers for HCIII,giving 73.7% of the required staffing norm for HCIII.

(Confirmed stafflist at St Pius KidepoPNFPHC III Notice Board.)

Kakingol HCIII had 7out of 19 require for HCIII , making 36.8% of the required staffing norm for HCIII

(Confirmed stafflist at St Pius KidepoPNFPHC III Notice Board).

Therefore, only one Health facility; Nadunget HCIII met the standard requirement of having atleast 75% of Staffing norms filled at each health Facility.

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

Maximum 9 points on this performance measure

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

While the majority of health workers were working to health facilities they were deployed , a few others were not. For instance;

Nadunget HCIII:

19 out of 20 Health workers deployed by the DHO at the Health Facility were present on the Health Facility Staff list on the Notice board and in the Daily attendance Book.

Some of the names found on the DHO's list, Health Facility's Staff list on the Notice board and in the daily attendance book were:

Lokut Joy Senior Clinical Officer

Lotee Phillip Assistant Nursing Officer and is the current Incharge

Auma Caroline Enrolled Midwife

Lomakol Julliana Clinical Officer was on study leave.

Lomulen Samuel was on leave.

Putan innocent Health Assistant was on DHO's staff list but not on the Health Facility Staff list and Daily attendance register. This is attached to a Sub county

Kakingol HCIII

4 out of the 7 Health workers deployed at

Kakingol HC III were present on the Health Facility Staff List on the Notice Board and in the Daily attendace Book on the dates of 5h ,6th and 7th November 2023 they Included:

Lokong Zachary Enrolled Nurse,

Achia Mary Grace,Enrolled Midwife

LosikePaul Peter Laboratory Assistant,

Akol John Bosco HIA

St Pius KidepoPNFPHC III

11 out 14 Health workers deployed by the DHO at Health Facility were present.

On the Health Facility Notice Board, Daily attendance book.

Some of the names present on the DHO deployment list, Health facility Notice board and daily attendance Book were:

Sr. Namazzi Virgina R/M

Anyait Beatrice Enrolled Nurse

Ojao Daniel Clinical Officer

Kiyae Mary Garret Enrolled Nurse

The names on the DHO's Deployment List that were not

in the Health Facility Stafflist on the Notice board and in the Daily attendance book were:

Lochoro Mark

Nawti Moses

Lomak Josephine

7	<p>Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted for, recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines (at least 75% of the staff required).</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the LG has publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had publicized health workers deployment and disseminated by, among others, posting on facility notice boards, for the current FY. For instance;</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Nadunget HCIII</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lokut Joy Senior Clinical Officer 2. Lotee Phillip Assistant Nursing Officer 3. Auma Caroline Enrolled Midwife 4. Lomakol Julliana Clinical Officer 5. Lomulen Samuel 	
			<p>Kakingol HCIII</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lokong Zachary Enrolled Nurse, 2. Achia Mary Grace, Enrolled Midwife 3. Losike Paul Peter Laboratory Assistant 4. Akol John Bosco HIA 	
			<p>St Pius Kidepo HC III</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sr. Namazzi Virginia RM 2. Anyait Beatrice Enrolled Nurse 3. Ojao Daniel Clinical Officer 4. Kiyae Mary Garret Enrolled Nurse 	
8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DHO/MMOHs has:</p> <p>i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Health facility In-charges against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DHO conducted annual performance appraisal for health facility In-charges against agreed performance plans during the FY 2022/2023. For instance;</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ayaa Betty In-charge Rupa HC II was appraised on 30th June 2023 by SAS 2. Lotee Francis In-charge Lopelipeli HC II was appraised 30th June 2023 by SAS 3. Lotee Phillip In-charge Nadugent HC III was appraised 30th June 2023 by SAS 4. Olupot Francis In-charge Acherere HC II was appraised on 30th June 2023 by SAS 5. Louse Paul Denis In-charge Kalemungole HC II was appraised on 26th June 2023 by SAS 6. Angiro Isiah In-charge Kakingole HC III was appraised on 30th June 2023 by SAS 7. Onyamasi Jephther In-charge Kosiroi HC II was appraised on 30th June 2023 by SAS 8. Korobe Emmanuel In-charge Nakiroro HC II was appraised on 30th June 2023 by SAS 9. Dengel Emmanuel In-charge Kodonyo HC II was appraised on 30th June 2023 by SAS 10. Komol Mangdalene Sophie In-charge Naduget HSD was appraised on 30th June 2023 by SAS 	

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

ii. Ensured that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY score 1 or else 0

There was evidence that Health Facility In-charges conducted performance appraisal of all health facility workers against the agreed performance plans and submitted a copy through DHO/MMOH to HRO during the previous FY. For instance;

1. Ocho Jane Frances, Enrolled Midwife-Kosiroi HC II was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the In-charge Onyamasi Jephther
2. Amei Peter, Health Information Assitant - Rupa HC II was appraised on 28th June 2023 by the In-charge Ayaa Betty
3. Lorotu Catherine, Senior Labaratory Technician - Naduget HSD was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the Incharge Komol Mangdalene
4. Ilukori Joyce- Enrolled midwife-Acherere HC II was appraised on 29th June by the In-charge Olupot Francis
5. Lomokol Paul- Enrolled Nurse- Naduget HC III was appraised on 30th June by the In-charge Lotee Phillip
6. Losike Paul Peter- Medical Lab Assistant- Kakingole HC II, was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the In-charge Okiror Timothy
7. Napeyok Rosemary, Enrolled Midwife-Lopelpel HC II, was appraised on 30th June by the In-charge Lotee Francis
8. Akori Caroline, Enrolled Nurse-Kalemungole HC II, was appraised on 30th June by the In-charge Louse Paul Denis
9. Amot Immaculate Grace, Enrolled Midwife- Kodonyo HC II, was appraised on 30th June by the In-charge Dengel Emmanuel
10. Awas Eric, Enrolled Nurse Nakiloro HC II, was appraised on 30th June by the In-charge Korobe Emmanuel

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

Maximum 6 points on this performance measure

iii. Taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports, score 2 or else 0

From the reviewed appraisals, there was evidence that the LG took corrective actions based on the appraisal reports. These included; emergency and obstetric care, management of sexual gender based violence and immunization practices.

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	b) Evidence that the LG: i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0	There was Evidence that Moroto District conducted training for health workers. For instance; 1. A training on Emergency and obstetric Care conducted on 26th – 29th June 2023 and covered 5 health Facilities Namely Nadunget Health Centre III, St Pius Kidepo HCIII, Kakingol HCIII, Moroto Army HC III and Kosiroi HCII 2. A training on Management of Sexual Gender based violence was conducted from 12th – 14th June 2023 3. A training on Immunization Practices was conducted from 27th September - 1st October 2022 4. HMIS training conducted on 26th -30th June 2023	1
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.	ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence for documentation of training activities. several training reports were available in DHO'office. some of the reports are indicated below: 1. A training on Emergency and obstetric Care conducted on 26th – 29th June 2023 and covered 5 health Facilities Namely Nadunget Health Centre III, St Pius Kidepo HCIII, Kakingol HCIII, Moroto Army HC III and Kosiroi HCII 2. A training on Management of Sexual Gender based violence was conducted from 12th – 14th June 2023 3. A training on Immunization Practices was conducted from 27th September - 1st October 2022 4. HMIS training conducted on 26th -30th June 2023	1

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.	a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0	There was evidence for the letter written by CAO Confirming the list of Health facilities (GOU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants was available at the time of assessment This letter written on 19 September 2023 indicating 12 out of 12 Health facilities were to benefit from PHC fund in the current financial year It indicated even the amount of money allocated each facility.	2
---	---	--	--	---

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG made allocations towards monitoring service delivery and management of District health services in line with the health sector grant guidelines (15% of the PHC NWR Grant for LLHF allocation made for DHO/MMOH), score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>A review of the annual budget performance report showed that on page 96 supervision & monitoring was allocated UGX 46,337,000 and on (page 27) ,PHC non -wage was allocated UGX 290,375,000.</p> <p>As per the computation Ugx 46,337,000/Ugx 290,375,000x100=16%.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. If the LG made timely warranting/verification of direct grant transfers to health facilities for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The District did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Quarter was released on 2nd July, 2022 and warranted on 4th August, 2022 after 18 days. • 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 17th October, 2022 after 14 days. • 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 18th January, 2023 after 15 days. • 4th Quarter released on 11st April, 2023 and warranted on 20th April, 2023 after 9 days. 	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. If the LG invoiced and communicated all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of receipt of the funds release in each quarter, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The evidence provided indicated that the invoicing and communicating of all PHC NWR Grant transfers for the previous FY to health facilities within 5 working days from the day of funds release in each quarter.</p> <p>Quarter 1 funds were released on 2nd July 2022 and the communication was made on 18th August 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds were released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 17th October 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds were released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 19th January 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4 funds were release on 11th April 2023 and the communication was made on 19th April 2023 which was more than 5 days.</p>	0
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				

9	<p>N23_Planning, budgeting, and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG has publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoFPED- e.g. through posting on public notice boards: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DLG had publicized all the quarterly financial releases to all health facilities within 5 working days from the date of receipt of the expenditure limits from MoPPED on the notice board.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department implemented action(s) recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting (s) held during the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Moroto District, health department implemented actions recommended by the DHMT Quarterly performance review meeting held during the previous FY 2022/23.</p> <p>The Quarterly performance Review meetings took place on the following Dates:</p> <p>Quarter 1 Performance review meeting took place on</p> <p>5th October 2022</p> <p>Quarter 2 meeting took place on 14th February,2023</p> <p>Quarter 3 meeting took place on 18th May 2023</p> <p>Quater 4 meeting took place on 20th July 2023</p> <p>Some of actions of the Performance review meeting implemented were:</p> <p>Health promotion and community engagement Activities done on Malaria and Malnutrition, done 19th June 2023, covered 20 villages in Nadunget Sub County.</p> <p>Radio Talk show on Akich FM on Early Antenatal care took place on 23rd January 2023. (DHT Health Progress report dated 19 th June 2023) These were among the actions recommended in the Quarter 1 Performance review meeting in order to the promote utilization of health Services at Health facilities.</p>	2

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the performance review meetings involved all Health in-charges, other departments and development partners. Example:</p> <p>The Quarter 2 Performance review meeting that took place on 14th Feb 2023 involved all Health In-charges like SR Namazzi Virginia I/C St Pius Kidepo HCIII</p> <p>Aya Betty SCO I/C Rupa HCII</p> <p>Lotee Phillip I/C Nadunget HCIII,</p> <p>It also involved members from other Departments like Community development, Education and had members from Development Partners like CUAMM, Mlaria Consotium, UHA,NAFO</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>Moroto District did not have any HCIV and any general Hospital receiving PHC</p>	1
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that DHT/MHT ensured that Health Sub Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY (where applicable), score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>• If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that DHT ensured that Health Sub-Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower level health facilities within the previous FY as detailed below</p> <p>There was an HSD support supervision conducted on Lopeli HCII, St Pius Kidepo HCIII and Kosiloi HCII on 10th Jan 2023. (Support supervision Report dated 24th Jan 2022)</p> <p>Some of the issues raised at Lopeli HCII support supervision included no display of health facility work plans and PHC utilization. No display of services offered at the Health Facility It was recommended that the InCharge should ensure display of workplans, budgets and PHC utilization and services offered at the Health Unit</p>	1

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the LG used results/reports from discussion of the support supervision and monitoring visits, to make recommendations for specific corrective actions and that implementation of these were followed up during the previous FY, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Moroto District used reports from discussion of the support supervision to make recommendations and some of the recommendations were implemented.</p> <p>For example, the recommendation of displaying workplans and services offered at the Lopeli HCII,</p> <p>A health facility activity report dated 23rd February 2023 reported this done.</p>	1
----	---	---	--	---

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the LG provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that Moroto District provided support supervision to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY2022/23</p> <p>As indicated below:</p> <p>Quarter 1 Medicine management Supervision (MMS)report dated 10th October,2022 prepared by Lotee Phillip and received submitted to DHO, indicated MMS activities done in all the Nine Health Facilities of the district. The report covered Supervision exercise which took place from 11th July 2022 to 22nd September 2022.The health Facilities covered included St. Pius Kidepo HCIII,Nadgenget HCII. Moroto Army HCII among others.</p> <p>The Quarter2 MMS report was also seen, compiled by Lotee Philip submitted to DHO Dr. James Lemukol on 14th January 2023 indicated the Medicine Management supervision done from 2nd October to 20th December 2022 and covered 7 Health facilities which include Moroto Prison HCIII, Kalemugo HC II among others.</p> <p>MMS reports for Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 FY2022/2023 were also available in DHO's Office.</p>	1
----	---	---	---	---

11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	a. If the LG allocated at least 30% of District / Municipal Health Office budget to health promotion and prevention activities, Score 2 or else score 0	The LG allocated less than 30% of DHO Budget for FY2022/23 to Health Promotion and Prevention activities is in line with Sector Budget Guidelines.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		<p>Evidence</p> <p>Budget Estimates FY2022/23</p> <p>DHO office Budgeted for Ugx 46,337,000</p> <p>At least 30% DHO Budget FY2022/23 for Health Promotion and Prevention Activities</p> <p>$46,337,000 \times 30\% = \text{UGX } 13,901,100$</p> <p>Allocated in the Budget FY2022/23</p> <p>Public Health Promotion and preventive activities was UGX 13,900,000</p> <p>Percentage calculation</p> <p>$(\text{UGX } 13,900,000 / 46,337,000) = 30\%$.</p>	
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	b. Evidence of DHT/MHT led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities as per ToRs for DHTs, during the previous FY score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence to show that District Health Team (DHT) led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		<p>For example, on 19th June 2023, there was Community engagement and Community sensitization on Malaria and malnutrition.</p> <p>It was done in Nadunget Subcounty, and it covered 30 Villages including the Cattle market and places of worship In Rupa Subcounty 20 villages were covered.</p> <p>(Health promotion Report by Onyango Chace DHE, submitted to DHO on 26th June 2023)</p> <p>There was also Radio Talk show on Akich FM on the topic Antenatal care. This took place on 23rd Jan 20rd Jan 2023 DHO on 26th June 2023).</p>	
11	Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization: The LG Health department conducted Health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities	c. Evidence of follow-up actions taken by the DHT/MHT on health promotion and disease prevention issues in their minutes and reports: score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence of the report to show that a follow up was done by DHT on Health Promotion and disease prevention.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Moroto District had an updated Assets register July 2023 which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards. For Example.</p> <p>The register included items old and newly procured or donated and their location, procurement date condition.</p> <p>Refrigerators for Vaccine Health facilities and their status.</p> <p>Vehicles for example the 2 Pickups; given in Covid campaign,1 Landcruiser and were all functional.</p> <p>Deta of registration number, Engine number, chassis number were also indicated.</p> <p>There was also register for infrastructure indicating the health facilities the building structures available. The Medical equipment per Health facilities</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the prioritized investments in the health sector for the previous FY were: (i) derived from the third LG Development Plan (LGDPIII);</p> <p>(ii) desk appraisal by the LG; and</p> <p>(iii) eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source (e.g. sector development grant, Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG)):</p> <p>score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The DLG presented desk appraisal for investment projects implemented under Health Sector in FY2022/23 to check whether these prioritized investments were derived DDP III and AWP as proof that they were eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines and funding source as per the example below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fencing of Kankingol HC II. 2. Kalemugole HC II to HC III (construction of an out Patient department). <p>All the projects were appraised on 17th July 2022 by the Senior Planner, Environment Officer, DCDO, District Engineer and other technical staff and all projects were recommended for field appraisal.</p>	1

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of conducting field appraisal checking for technical feasibility, environmental and social acceptability and use of customized designs as per the examples;</p> <p>- Field appraisal of Fencing of Kankingol HC II. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 25th July 2022 signed by DHO, District Planner, SCDO and District Environment Officer. Field appraisal Kalemugole HC II to HC III (construction of an out Patient department). Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 25th July 2022 signed by DHO, District Planner, SCDO and District Environment Officer.</p>	1
12	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction using the checklist: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>Health facility investments were screened for environmental and social risks and mitigation measures put in place before being approved for construction however, they were not subjected to monitoring using checklists for example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fencing of Kakingol HCIII screened on 15th August, 2022 2. Construction of an OPD (upgrade of Kalemungole HC from II to III) screened on 17th August, 2022. 	0
13	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>			
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG health department timely (by April 30 for the current FY) submitted all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into the approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health department timely by April 30th of current FY submit all its infrastructure and other procurement requests to PDU for incorporation into approved LG annual work plan, budget and procurement plans. This was done on 7th April, 2023. Their procurement plan had; Rehabilitation of DHO's office and Rehabilitation of OPD ward at Nakiloro HCII among the items in the plan.</p>	1
13	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>			
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p>	<p>b. If the LG Health department submitted procurement request form (Form PP1) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY: score 1 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG health department submitted procurement request form PP1 to PDU by 1st quarter of the Current FY. The forms were submitted on 4th August, 2023 and they were for; Rehabilitation of DHO's office at Ugx 370M and Rehabilitation of OPD ward at Nakiloro HCII at Ugx 50M among items on the PP1 form.</p>	1
13	<p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>			

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the health infrastructure investments for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee and cleared by the Solicitor General (where above the threshold), before commencement of construction: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were minutes of the Contracts Committee which sat on 18th October, 2022 approving the contract in Min 21/oct/cc/22-23 as items 6,7 and Solicitor General letter dated 14th December, 2022 signed by Peter Masaba clearing the contract for construction of Kalemungole HCII upgrade before commencement of works.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG properly established a Project Implementation team for all health projects composed of: (i) : score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was a letter dated 21st March, 2023 signed by the CAO, Chelimo Alex, in which the following persons were named to the project implementation team (PIT)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Orup Ceaser - DE Project Manager 2. Lemukol James- DHO Contract manager 3. Lotyang John- DNRO Environmental issues 4. Lolem Margie -DCDO social safe guards. <p>The team composition left out the Labour officer and Clerk of works, therefore it was not established as per sector guidelines.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>e. Evidence that the health infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoH: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was evidence that the upgrade of Kalemungole HCII to HCIII infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provide by the MoH during construction. This was confirmed when the measurements were taken and found to be 7 x 7.9 m, for the post Natal ward, 5.3 x 5 m for the delivery room and 1.45 x 1.2 m, windows with 4 shutters top hang of 0.7 x 0.5 m on general ward.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>f. Evidence that the Clerk of Works maintains daily records that are consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO, for each health infrastructure project: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There were no records seen to show that the Clerk of works maintained daily records that were consolidated weekly to the District Engineer in copy to the DHO.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee. No meetings minutes were presented to this effect.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>h. Evidence that the LG carried out technical supervision of works at all health infrastructure projects at least monthly, by the relevant officers including the Engineers, Environment officers, CDOs, at critical stages of construction: score 1, or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>Reports prepared by the District Engineer dated 15th March, 2023, 1st April, 2023, 2nd May, 2023 and 2nd June, 2023, showed that there was supervision by the relevant technical officers. Some of the challenges noted in one of the reports dated 1st April, 2023, was slow delivery of materials due to terrain of the site and lack of water availability.</p>	1

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0

The verified vouchers indicated the District Health Officer, District Environment Officer, District community Development Officer and LG Engineer certified works on health projects before the LG made payments to the contractors/ suppliers within stipulated time frame as follows;

1. Voucher no 6166038 with dated 22nd June 2023 for Ushs 11,763,724; Certificate No2; dated 21st November 2022; Contract No.Moro538/2223/WRKS/SDG/00007: Project; Fencing of Kakingol HC III was certified by DHO on 15th June 2023, District Environment Officer, District Engineer and DCDO on 15th June 2023, payment was initiated on 12nd June 2023 and payments were done on 22th June 2023 which was within the 10 working days.
2. Voucher no 6166038 with dated 22nd June 2023 for Ushs 11,763,724; Certificate No 1; dated 21st November 2022; Contract No.Moro538/2223/WRKS/SDG/00007: Project; Fencing of Kakingol HC III was certified by DHO on 02nd June 2023, District Environment Officer, District Engineer and DCDO on 02nd June 2023, payment was initiated on 12nd June 2023 and payments were made on 22nd June 2023 which was with in the 10 working days.

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

Maximum 10 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the LG had complete procurement files for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by PPDA law. The file reviewed were;

Project 1

Upgrade of Kalemungole HCII to HCII

Procurement ref: MoH-Ugfit/wrks/122-23/00001: Had the following documents;

1. Signed works contract dated; 3rd February, 2023 with Mangron Investments limited,
2. Contracts Committee minutes dated 18th October, 2022,
3. Evaluation report dated 13th October, 2023
4. Solicitor General letter dated 14th February, 2022,
5. PP1 form, call for bid and bid issue records, supervision reports, payment records, certificates of payment among the documents on file.

Project 2 Chain link fencing at Kakingol HCIV

Procurement ref: Moro538/wrks/2021/00029 had the following records

1. Signed works contract dated 21st November, 2022 with Ojoga & sons limited
2. Contracts Committee minutes dated 18th October, 2022
3. Evaluation report dated 13th October, 2022,
4. PP1 form, call for bids, bids receipt record, evaluation minutes, among the documents on file.

Environment and Social Safeguards

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

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

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

There were no grievances arising from the health sector projects that were handled in line with the LG grievance redress framework because the projects were successfully implemented without any arising anomalies.

15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has disseminated guidelines on health care / medical waste management to health facilities : score 2 points or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of a National Guidelines for WASH in Health Care Facilities, Uganda published in 2022 however, there was no proof of it's dissemination to the respective health centres.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was proof of a functional system for medical waste management which included coded bins for waste assortment for all health units, placenta and incinerators for HCIV and constructed pits particularly for non-wet waste that would be collected and burnt.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted training (s) and created awareness in healthcare waste management score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence availed at the time of assessment to show that the LG conducted training(s) and or created awareness in healthcare waste management. However, proof of other awareness and training that were carried out for example, a report for mentorship of health workers on the emergency obstetrical and neonatal care in 5 selected health facilities in Moroto district that was carried out from 25th to 29th June, 2023 was availed.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>A costed ESMP for the construction of an OPD and upgrade of Kalemungole HCII to HCIII was prepared on 4th April, 2023 at a cost of UGX. 5,000,000 and was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects under preliminaries item no. B for the removal of plant and rubbish costed at UGX. 4,000,000 environmental mitigation requirements costed at UGX. 1,000,000, whereas social safeguards on occupational health and safety, HIV/AIDS and Gender costed at 2,000,000.</p>	2

16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that all health sector projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of ownership, access and availability (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: score 2 or else, score 0</p>	<p>There was no proof of land ownership availed at the time of assessment for the two projects that were implemented in the respective financial years of assessment. That is Kalemungole HCIII where it's upgrade was carried out and Kakingol HCIII where it's fencing was carried out.</p>	0
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects to ascertain compliance with ESMPs; and provide monthly reports: score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects that had been screened in the previous FY to ascertain compliance with ESMPs for example, an ESMP was availed for the construction of an OPD (upgrade of Kalemungole HCII to HCIII that was prepared on 4th April, 2023 at a cost of UGX. 5,000,000. And their respective monitoring reports are listed below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monthly report on environmental social safety measures for the Upgrade of Kalemungole HCII prepared in the month of June, 2023 2. Monthly report on environmental social safety measures for the Upgrade of Kalemungole HCII prepared in the month of April, 2023 	2
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. Evidence that Environment and Social Certification forms were completed and signed by the LG Environment Officer and CDO, prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The Environment Officer and CDO completed and signed contract certification forms prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of all health infrastructure projects for example,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Payment certificate no. 2 issued on 21st June, 2023 for the upgrade of Kalemungole HCII to HCIII 2. Payment certificate no. 1 issued on 16th March, 2023 for fencing of Kakingol HCIII 	2

**Water &
Environment
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. % of rural water sources that are functional.</p> <p>If the district rural water source functionality as per the sector MIS is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>The percentage of the rural water sources that were functional in Moroto DLG in the previous FY was 84%</p>	1
1	<p>Water & Environment Outcomes: The LG has registered high functionality of water sources and management committees</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs). If the district WSS facilities that have functional WSCs is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 90 - 100%: score 2 o 80-89%: score 1 o Below 80%: 0 	<p>The percentage of the water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees in Moroto DLG during the FY 2022/2023 was 78% [this value was read off from the MoWE MIS real time reports key district facts Oct 2023 second last colmn (Management)]</p>	0
2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The LG average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current. FY. If LG average scores is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 80%, score 2 • 60% - 80%, score 1 • Below 60%, score 0 	<p>The LG average in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment for the current year under review was 75% as per the OPAMS.</p>	1

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. % of budgeted water projects implemented in the sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average in the previous FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % of water projects are implemented in the targeted S/Cs: Score 2 o If 80-99%: Score 1 o If below 80 %: Score 0 	<p>The number of water projects implemented in water stressed sub-counties with safe water coverage below the district average which was 87% were:-</p> <p>Drilling of 4 deep boreholes and design of one piped water system in Nadunget S/C with a safe water coverage of 79%, drilling of 3 deep boreholes and design of a piped water supply system in Tapac S/C with a safe water coverage of 80%.</p> <p>The projects that were implemented during the year under review were:-</p> <p>Drilling of 7 deep boreholes installed with hand pumps, design of 3 piped water supply systems.</p> <p>The projects implemented in water stressed LLGs were 7 in number. The total number of projects implemented in the FY were 7 in number.</p> <p>The percentage of projects implemented in water stressed sub-counties was $7/7*100\% = 100\%$</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If variations in the contract price of sampled WSS infrastructure investments for the previous FY are within +/- 20% of engineer's estimates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If within +/-20% score 2 o If not score 0 	<p>The variation in the contract price of the sampled infrastructure investment implemented in the previous FY were within +/-20% of the Engineers' estimate as illustrated below:-</p> <p>1). Drilling and installation of 7 boreholes in various Lower Local Governments:</p> <p>Engineer's estimate = UGX 232,000,000</p> <p>Contract Sum = UGX 202,831,380</p> <p>Various = UGX 29,168,620</p> <p>Percentage variance = $29,168,620/232,000,000 \times 100\% = 12.6\%$</p> <p>2). Design of 3 piped water supply systems in Tapac and Nadunget sub-counties.</p> <p>Engineers estimate = UGX 138,000,000</p> <p>Contract price = UGX 134,041,240</p> <p>Variation = UGX 3,958,356</p> <p>Percentage variation = $3,958,356/138,000,000*100\% = 2.9\%$</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the water and environment LLGs performance assessment</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d. % of WSS infrastructure projects completed as per annual work plan by end of FY.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100% projects completed: score 2 o If 80-99% projects completed: score 1 o If projects completed are below 80%: 0 	<p>Projects that were planned to be implemented in the previous FY as captured on page 16 and 17 of the AWP included the following:-</p> <p>Drilling of 7 deep boreholes installed with hand pumps in various Sub-Counties, design of 3 piped water systems in Tapac and Nduget Sub-Counties. Basing on the sampled facilities all of them were completed and were functioning well implying that the percentage of projects completed as per the annual work plan was: $10/10 \times 100\% = 100\%$</p>	2
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If there is an increase: score 2 o If no increase: score 0. 	<p>There was an increase in the percentage of water supply facilities that were functioning between the FY 2021/2022 and the FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>Percentage of the water supply facilities that were functioning in the FY 2021/2022 was 83% and FY 2022/2023 was 84% respectively.</p> <p>Hence percentage increase was $84\% - 83\% = 1\%$</p>	2
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If increase is more than 1% score 2 o If increase is between 0-1%, score 1 o If there is no increase : score 0. 	<p>There was an increase in the percentage of water facilities with functional water and sanitation committees between FY 2021/2022 and FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>The percentage of facilities with functional water and sanitation committees in the FY 2021/2022 and FY 2022/2023 was 66% and 78% respectively.</p> <p>The percentage increase therefore was $78\% - 66\% = 12\%$</p>	2

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

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

The DWO accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed and their performance in the previous FY as captured in pages 16 and 17 of the annual budget performance report, and the following facilities below were sampled;

- 1). Drilling of deep borehole in Katikekile Seed School in Tapac sub-county, funded under DWSCG, with a DWD number 86554 and completed on 14th April, 2023.
- 2). Drilling of deep borehole in Mojir village in Loputuk sub-county, funded under DWSCG, with a DWD number 86656 and completed on 17th April, 2023.
- 3). Drilling of deep borehole in Katanga village in Nadunget sub-county, funded under DWSCG, with a DWD number 86658 and completed on 19th April, 2023.

These projects were completed as per the plan,

Findings from the field visit of the three sampled projects showed that all projects were in place and functional, boreholes were well protected with no deep latrines in the radius of 30m, trees were planted around, water yield and water quality was visually good and all had functional WUCs. The hygiene and sanitation around the water sources was visibly clean.

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG Water Office collects and compiles quarterly information on sub-county water supply and sanitation, functionality of facilities and WSCs, safe water collection and storage and community involvement): Score 2</p>	<p>The DWO presented the quarterly reports and when reviewed the following was noted:</p> <p>In the first quarter report which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 18th October, 2022, on page 46, there was information about the status of the water facilities for each Lower Local Governments.</p> <p>For the second quarter report which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 20th January, 2023 on pages 29; the DWO had compiled the information about the functionality status of all the water sources in the Sub-counties in the District.</p> <p>While for the third quarter report which was submitted to the line Ministry on 25th April, 2023 the information about the water facilities status was found on pages 43.</p> <p>Finally, for the fourth quarter which was submitted to the line Ministry on the 31st July, 2023, the information on the water facility status was found on pages 57.</p> <p>Therefore, it was confirmed that the District Water Officer collects and compiles quarterly information on the sub-county water supply and sanitation functionality of facilities.</p>	2
5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG Water Office updates the MIS (WSS data) quarterly with water supply and sanitation information (new facilities, population served, functionality of WSCs and WSS facilities, etc.) and uses compiled information for planning purposes: Score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO updated the MIS with quarterly information. The DWO presented form 1 having the information on all the new water facilities that were constructed in the year. These forms were submitted to the MoWE on 31st July, 2023 for inclusion in the national data base. The DWO also presented form4 which had summaries of the status of all the water facilities per sub-county</p>	3

5	<p>Reporting and performance improvement: The LG compiles, updates WSS information and supports LLGs to improve their performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that DWO has supported the 25% lowest performing LLGs in the previous FY LLG assessment to develop and implement performance improvement plans: Score 2 or else 0</p> <p><i>Note: Only applicable from the assessment where there has been a previous assessment of the LLGs' performance. In case there is no previous assessment score 0.</i></p>	<p>The copy of the LLG assessment report was availed at the time of assessment, the overall average for the water sector performance in the district was 65%; however, there were no PIPs seen and no performance improvement reports seen for any of the LLGs at the time of the LG assessment exercise.</p> <p>Therefore, there was no evidence for justifying any score for this indicator for the LG.</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

Human Resource Management and Development

6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2</p>	<p>From the wage estimates for the FY 2023/2024, there was evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician. The total budget was 59,911,572/=.</p>	2
6	<p>Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer: Score 2</p>	<p>From the wage estimates for the FY 2023/2024, there was evidence that the Environment and Natural Resources Officer has budgeted for the following Environment & Natural Resources staff: 1 Natural Resources Officer; 1 Environment Officer; 1 Forestry Officer. The budget was 203,844,828/=</p>	2
7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DWO had appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY as below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lowot Musa, Water Officer was appraised on 30 June 2023 by Orup Ceasor, District Engineer. 2. Apolot Beatrice, Engineering Assistant was appraised on June 26th 2023 by Water Officer 	3

7	<p>Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. The District Water Office has identified capacity needs of staff from the performance appraisal process and ensured that training activities have been conducted in adherence to the training plans at district level and documented in the training database : Score 3</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the DWO had identified the capacity needs of the water staff and forwarded them to the Human Resource Management team hence, there was no training plan and no actual training provided by the Human Resource Management team for the Water staff.</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Evidence that the DWO has prioritized budget allocations to sub-counties that have safe water coverage below that of the district: • • If 100 % of the budget allocation for the current FY is allocated to S/Cs below the district average coverage: Score 3 • • If 80-99%: Score 2 • • If 60-79: Score 1 • • If below 60 %: Score 0 	<p>The DWO allocated over 80% of the budget for the current FY 2023/2024 to water stressed sub-counties which had safe water coverage below the district average which was 87%.</p> <p>The water stressed sub-counties were;</p> <p>Nadunget S/C with safe water coverage of 79% was allocated drilling of 3 boreholes and construction of a piped water system, Tapac S/C with safe water coverage of 80% was allocated drilling of 5 boreholes.</p> <p>The total budget allocation to water stressed LLGs was UGX 451,013,504.</p> <p>The total annual development budget for Moroto DWO for the current FY was UGX 530,739,815.</p> <p>Percentage allocation to water stressed LLGs was =</p> $451,013,504/530,739,815*100\% = 85\%$	2
---	---	--	---	---

8	<p>Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for service delivery: The Local Government has allocated and spent funds for service delivery as prescribed in the sector guidelines.</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the DWO communicated to the LLGs their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY: Score 3</p>	<p>There was evidence that DWO communicated to the LLG their respective allocations per source to be constructed in the current FY.</p> <p>The DWO presented the correspondence file in which communications to Lower Local Governments were contained.</p> <p>In this file there was a letter dated 5th May 2023 addressed to the different sub-county chiefs, of the following sub-counties Loputuk, Nadunget, and Tapac; a copy of the same letter was seen on the DWO notice board.</p> <p>The letter had details of the planned projects to be implemented in the current financial year and also detailing the allocations to each sub-county together with the financial amounts for each project.</p>	3
---	---	---	---	---

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)

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

There was evidence that the DWO monitored each of the WSS facilities at least quarterly.

The DWO presented a correspondence ref: CR/752/1 dated 25th August 2022 which detailed the monitoring road map for the entire FY, enclosed were the quarterly monitoring reports and quarterly progress reports, which upon review the following was found out:- During the first quarter as per the report dated 5th October, 2022, it was noted that 392 water facilities were monitored.

In the second quarter as per the progress report dated 9th January, 2023, a total of 389 water sources were monitored during this quarter.

Likewise, for quarter 3 report dated 7th April, 2023 the number of water sources monitored was 391.

In quarter 4 as per the report dated 7th July, 2023, gave a summary of the water facilities that were visited as 388.

On average, therefore the water facilities that were visited quarterly was = $392 + 389 + 391 + 388 = 1,560/4 = 390$.

Moroto DLG had a total of 394 WSS facilities as per the national data base from MoWE.

The percentage of the quarterly monitored water facilities was $390/394 * 100\% = 98\%$

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2

There was evidence that the DWO conducted DWSCC meetings quarterly, the DWO presented four sets of minutes of the DWSCC meetings. The following were the meetings that were conducted:-

A meeting held on 30th September, 2022 this was during the first quarter. The key issues discussed during this meeting were found in minute number Min.2 DWSCCM/09/2022 where the DWO emphasised on the field findings from the quarterly monitoring that was conducted jointly between the technical officers, development partners and the politicians and issues pointed out during the monitoring included the functionality of the water facilities and it was agreed that one of the partners ForAfrika takes up the rehabilitation of boreholes from the identified places where there was a lot of non- functional boreholes especially in Rupa Sub-county.

During the second quarter the meeting was held on 8th December, 2022 and the key issues discussed during the meeting

were found in minute Min.5 DWSCCM/12/2022 among the key issues discussed was the activity implementation status of one of the development partners namely C&D. The representative of C&D presented a report giving the completed activities i.e. borehole rehabilitation in Tapac Sub-county, and they were also carrying out follow up activities on the ODF campaign which was done in Nadunget sub-county and their next plan was to drill some boreholes in Loputuk Sub-county.

For the third quarter the meeting was held on 2nd March, 2023 and the major issues of discussion were found in minute Min.5.DWSCCM/03/2023. One of the main issue of discussion was the sanitation status of the District the DWO gave his presentation on the sanitation coverage by sub-county te best sub-county was Loputuk with a latrine coverage of 45.5% and the lowest was Tapac sub-county with 10.9%. He then made an appeal to the development partners to support the lowest sub-county to improve on their sanitation status.

Whereas in quarter 4 the meeting was held on 23rd June, 2023, and key issues discussed under minute Min.7 DWSCCM/06/2023. The specific issue discussed here was the project implementation status of the sector work plan of the financial year; and the DWO informed the house that all the projects in the plan were practically completed now awaiting commissioning that he said was planned for in the following week.

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2

The DWO publicized the budget allocations for the current FY to LLG with safe water coverage below the LG average which was 87% as per the letter dated 5th September, 2023 which was found on the DWO notice board. The letter was addressed to the sub-county chiefs of the following sub-counties Tapac, and Nadunget whose safe water coverages were 79%, and 80% respectively.

The letter detailed the projects allocated to these two LLGs together with their budgeted amounts. For Nadunget sub-county was allocated drilling of 3 deep boreholes and construction of a piped water supply system which was an equivalent of UGX 281,198,689 and Tapac sub-county was allocated drilling of 5 deep boreholes which was an equivalent of UGX 169,814,835

2

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0 	<p>The total NWR for the previous FY for Moroto DLG water sector was UGX 68,555,541. The DWO allocated UGX 27,422,216 towards mobilization activities.</p> <p>The percentage allocation therefore was $27,422,216/68,555,541 \times 100\% = 40\%$.</p> <p>This was a clear sign that the DWO followed the sector guidelines in the allocation of the NWR estimates for the mobilization activities</p>	3
----	---	--	---	----------

10	<p>Mobilization for WSS is conducted</p> <p><i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. For the previous FY, the District Water Officer in liaison with the Community Development Officer trained WSCs on their roles on O&M of WSS facilities: Score 3.</p>	<p>There was evidence that the DWO in liaison with the CDO trained the WSCs on their roles, and responsibilities and O&M. The DWO presented a training report dated 26th May, 2023. The training period spanned from 15th to 21st May, 2023. The topics handled included safe water chain, O&M, roles and responsibilities, simple book keeping skills among others.</p> <p>The trainers were Ms Jenifer Akot ADWO in charge mobilization and Lorwot Musa the DWO.</p>	3
----	---	--	--	----------

Investment Management

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG:</p> <p>Score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>The DWO presented an up to date water supply and sanitation facilities register which had all the water supply and sanitation facilities in the District by location and up on review it was noted that some of the newly constructed water facilities were included in the register as they were detailed in form 1 which was submitted to the Ministry of Water and Environment on 31st July, 2023 for inclusion in the national data base.</p>	4
----	--	--	--	----------

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

Score 4 or else score 0.

Evidence provided to the assessor showed LG conducted field appraisals and checked for technical feasibility environmental social acceptability, and customized designs for WSS projects for FY 2023/2024. LG DWO, District Planner, District water officer, Senior Environmental Officer and DCDO conducted field appraisals for all WSS projects in the budget and established the prioritized investments were derived from the approved district development plans and are eligible for expenditure under sector guidelines. The LG District Water Officer conducted a desk appraisals for water projects on 10th August 2023.

The projects were derived from LG DP III, pages- 199.

1. Drilling and Installation of a borehole in Nasuguru.
2. Drilling and Installation of a borehole in Maya
3. Drilling and Installation of a borehole in Ariu
4. Drilling and Installation of a borehole in Nariamarege
5. Drilling and Installation of a borehole in Loitamuroi
6. Drilling and Installation of a borehole in Kaloe
7. Drilling and Installation of a borehole in Akwapuwa
8. Drilling and Installation of a borehole in Lorengelap

Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

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

All the budgeted investments for the current FY had completed application forms from the beneficiary communities as per the records reviewed from a file of community application forms presented by the DWO to the assessor. Some of the sampled community applications included:

1). Application from Kawe village in Nadunget S/C, the application was dated 14th September, 2023, and the DWO recommended it to be included for implementation in FY 2023/2024 on 21st September, 2023. The application was endorsed by the LC I Mr. Lokon Nyangole and the following community members: Longoli Anyokin, Lorot Apainyang, and Dengel Iwolute.

2). Application from Maya/Lokiles village in Tapac S/C, the application was dated 3rd November, 2023, and was endorsed by the LCI Ilem Napet with the following community members Abura Timon, Nawot Alice and Nali Maria. The application was cleared by the DWO for implementation in 2023/2024 financial year on 4th November, 2023.

3) Application from Lomunyenkipurat village in Tapac S/C, this application was dated 3rd November, 2023, endorsed by the LCI Longura Lokoru with the following community members: Lomokol Lochabale, Asiwa Nakong and Itinga Nabuket. And this application was cleared for implementation in the FY 2023/2024 on 6th November, 2023 by the District Water Officer.

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d. Evidence that the LG has conducted field appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environmental social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs for WSS projects for current FY. Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence that field-based appraisals were conducted for WSS projects to determine whether they are technically feasible, environmentally, and socially acceptable and the designs have been customized in case of any technical issues</p> <p>Field appraisals were conducted on 16th August 2022 and reports were signed off by the District planner, District Engineer, District Water Officer, DCDO, and Environment Officer.</p> <p>The following projects were sampled:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Drilling and Installation of borehole in Nasuguru. 2. Drilling and Installation of a borehole in Maya 3. Drilling and Installation of a borehole in Ariu 4. Drilling and Installation of a borehole in Nariamarege 5. Drilling and Installation of borehole in Loitamuroi 6. Drilling and Installation of borehole in Kaloe 7. Drilling and Installation of a borehole in Akwapuwa 8. Drilling and Installation of a borehole in Lorengelap 	2
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>Water infrastructure projects for the current FY were not screened for environmental and social risks/impacts and ESMPs not prepared in spite of the fact that they had been approved and indicated in the LG project list for 2023/4. Below were the respective projects and their allocated costs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Drilling and Sitting of Seven (7) Hand Pump Boreholes in Selected sites and Construction of one (1) Production well costed at UGX. 278,000,000 2. Construction of a mini Piped supply water system costed at UGX. 240,000,000 	0

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the consolidated LG approved procurement plan dated 3rd August, 2023, signed by CAO, Chelimo Alex. These were; sitting , drilling and installation of 7 hand pumps and construction of 1 production well and construction of mini piped water supply water system.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>There was evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure, was approved by the contracts committee before commencement, this was done by the committee when they sat on 18th October, 2022, under Minute 21/Oct/cc/2022-2023 as items 4 & 5 where the contracts were awarded.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>There was a letter dated 21st March, 2023 signed by the CAO, Chelimo Alex, in which the following were named to the Project Implementation Team</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Orup Ceaser - DE as Contact Manager 2. Lowot Musa- DWO as Contract manager 3. Lotyang John- DNRO as Environmental issues 4. Lolem Margie -DCDO as Social Safe guards. <p>The team composition left out the Labour officer and Clerk of works, therefore it was not established as per sector guidelines.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p> <p>.</p>	<p>d. Evidence that water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed as per the standard technical designs provided by the DWO: Score 2</p>	<p>All the water and public sanitation infrastructure sampled were constructed in conformity to the standard designs provided by the District Water Officer for example a boreholes in Katanga village of Nadunget S/C, the platform stand was 600mm by 600mm and the apron depth and width was 100mm as prescribed on the designs.</p>	2

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>There was evidence to show that the relevant technical officers carried out monthly technical supervision on WSS infrastructure projects as observed from the reports dated 8th March, 2023, 15th May, 2023 and 19th June, 2023 signed by the District Water officer, the CDO and Environment officer.</p>	2
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2 o If not score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the DWO did verify works, however payments to the contractors were not within specified timeframes as per the guidelines;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Voucher no.5294030 dated 30th June 2023 for Ushs 34,833,600 with certificate no. 1 Dated 11th December 2022; contract no.Moro538/2223/DWD/WRKS/0004; Sitting, Drilling and Installation of 7 boreholes by Mama Bore Wells Africa Ltd was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 12th April 2023, payment was initiated on same date and payments were made on 17th May 2023 which was not within 30 days. 2. Voucher no.5893967 dated 15th June 2023 for Ushs 125,998,776 with certificate no. 1 Dated 21st December 2022; contract no.Moro538/2223/SRVCS/DWD/00005; Design of Mini Pipe Water System and BOQs by Real irrigation Engineering Company Ltd was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 03rd May 2023, payment was initiated on same date and payments were made on 15th June 2023 which was not within 30 days. 3. Voucher no.6071695 dated 22nd June 2023 for Ushs 63,116,918 with certificate no. 2 Dated 11th December 2022; contract no.Moro538/2223/DWD/WRKS/0004; Sitting, Drilling and Installation of 7 boreholes by Mama Bore Wells Africa Ltd was certified and verified by the District water Officer on 15th May 2023, payment was initiated on same date and payments were made on 22nd June 2023 which was not within 30 days. 	0

12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investment was in place for each contract with all records in place as required by the PPDA law. The file reviewed was</p> <p>Project: Drilling & Installation of 8 hand pump boreholes</p> <p>Procurement ref: Moro538/2022-2023/wrks/00004.The documents on file included</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Signed works contract dated 21st March, 2023 with Mama Bore wells Africa limited, 2. Evaluation report dated 3rd October, 2022, 3. Contracts Committee minutes dated 18th October, 2022 4. PP1, call for bids, record of bid receipt, acceptance letters, supervision reports, payment records among other documents. 	2
----	---	---	---	----------

Environment and Social Requirements

13	<p>Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided at the time of assessment on a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework.</p>	0
14	<p>Safeguards for service delivery</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of dissemination of guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs. The only guidelines availed were outdated guidelines published in May, 2013 and these included the Framework and Guidelines for water Source Protection volume 2: Guidelines for protecting Water Sources for Piped Water Supply Systems.</p>	0

15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>Water source protection plans and natural resource management plans for WSS infrastructure projects constructed during the previous FY were not fully prepared and implemented for example,</p> <p>Filled E&S screening forms were prepared for the Design of mini pipe water system feasibility study at Bomo North parish prepared on 11th August, 2022; Borehole drilling at Naregetomu village, Katikekile parish prepared on 1st February, 2022 and Borehole drilling at Katikekile seed secondary school prepared on 1st September, 2022.</p> <p>However, there respective environment social management plans were not prepared and implemented.</p>	0
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances:</p> <p>Score 3, If not score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that all the WSS projects were implemented on land where the LG had proof of consent. The DWO presented a file of all the land agreements for all the WSS projects that were implemented in the previous FY. Below are some of the agreements that were sampled by the assessor:-</p> <p>1). Land agreement signed on 21st March, 2023 between Lorot Raphael and the community of Katanga village of Nadunget S/C. This agreement was signed by Lomilo Moses the LCI on behalf of the community.</p> <p>2). Land agreement signed on 24th March, 2023 between Anukur Emmanuel and the community of Katikekile of Tapac S/C, and was signed by Pulkol Joseph the LCIII on behalf of the community.</p> <p>3). Land agreement signed on 22nd March, 2023 between Lochuu Lonukale and the community of Napusiligoi village of Nadunget S/C, it was also signed by Sagal Kali the LCI on behalf of the community.</p>	3
15	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects:</p> <p>Score 2, If not score 0</p>	<p>The Environmental Officer and CDO completed and signed certification forms listed below prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects for example,</p> <p>1. Payment certificate no. 1 issued on 6th May, 2023 for the design of mini pipe water system.</p> <p>2. Payment certificate no.1 issued on 12th May, 2023 for sitting, drilling and installation of 7 boreholes including casting of aprons, construction of cattle troughs and a production well.</p>	2

Safeguards in the
Delivery of Investments

*Maximum 10 points on
this performance
measure*

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

Score 2, If not score 0

There was no evidence availed at the time
of assessment to show monitoring and
supervision by the CDO and Environment
Officers to ascertain compliance with
ESMPs and provide monthly reports.

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Performance
Measures**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Local Government Service Delivery Results				
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has up to-date data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG presented data on irrigated land for the last two FYs disaggregated between micro-scale irrigation grant beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q2 report dated 3rd March 2023 submitted to MAAIF by DPMO showed the following acreage for irrigated land under individual micro irrigation systems, non-beneficially farmers on the shared pumped system for the FY 2021/2022 and 2022/2023. That is to say <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. KIDEP-5 acres 2. CID- 3acres 3. Agromax Drip irrigation system- 5 Acres 4. Nadunget farmer group (1) acre 5. Kitorosi farm (1)acre. 6. Save the Children (Tapac) sub-county – 2 acres. <p>MOUs were presented for the two (2) UgFIT Demo sites that were established in one primary school and one Seed Secondary School covering a total of 1.0 acres. i.e</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nawabatau P/S-Loputuk S/C (0.5 acres) 2. Rainbow P/S- Rupa S/C (0.5 acres) 	2
1	<p>Outcome: The LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p> <p>Maximum 20 points for this performance area</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has increased acreage of newly irrigated land in the previous FY as compared to previous FY but one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By more than 5% score 2 • Between 1% and 4% score 1 • If no increase score 0 	<p>This district LG had Seventeen (17) acres of irrigated land in FY 2021/2022.</p> <p>LG had installed two Demo sites covering a total of one (1) acre.</p> <p>Increase in acreage.</p> <p>= (18-17)/18 (100)</p> <p>= 5.6%</p>	2

2	<p>N23_Service Delivery Performance: Average score in the micro-scale irrigation for the LLG performance assessment. Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above 70%, score 4 • 60% - 70%, score 2 • Below 60%, score 0 	<p>The LG average score in the micro-scale irrigation for LLG performance assessment for the year 2022 was 77% and 66% for 2023 which gave an average of 71.5% as per the final LLGs comparative score provided by OPM.</p>	2
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant has been used on eligible activities (procurement and installation of irrigation equipment, including accompanying supplier manuals and training): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>It was evident that the development component of micro-scale irrigation grant was used on eligible activities. E.g.</p> <p>Approved annual workplan & Budget FY 22/23 prepared by the DAO, verified by the DPO, and approved by the CAO, Alex Chelimo on 19th January 2023. The work plan reveals that.</p> <p>i). Awareness raising of leaders at parish, LLG and LG was costed at Ugx 17,689,508 (15% Max).</p> <p>ii). Awareness raising for farmers 47,172,022 (40% of the budget)</p> <p>iii). Farm visits cost UGX 17,689,508 (15% Min).</p> <p>iv). Demos, equipment, and machinery cost UGX 35,379,017 (30% Max).</p> <p>The budget performance reports found in Q1(30th June 2023), Q2 (30th June 2023), Q3 (30th June 2023), and Q4 (30th June 2023) showed that LG spent UGX 73,076,000 on awareness raising for both LG, farmers and LLG Vs UGX 82,551,110 that was planned in the workplan.</p> <p>Additionally, DLG followed the latest Grant guidelines version 3, April 2023.</p>	2

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	b) Evidence that the approved farmer signed an Acceptance Form confirming that equipment is working well, before the LG made payments to the suppliers: Score 1 or else score 0	There was no evidence that was provided and the CFO noted that the LG is still in the implementation stage of micro-scale irrigation.	0
Maximum score 6				
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/- 20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	<p>Variations in the contract price were within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineer's estimates excluding the cost of agricultural inputs was calculated as follows.</p> <p>SAE costed figure = UGX 35,380,000</p> <p>Contractor's costed figure = UGX 35,439,256</p> $\text{Variation} = \frac{(35,387,000 - 35,439,256)}{35,387,000} \times 100$ $= -0.147670048\%$ <p>Hence the variation was within +/- 20% of the engineer's estimates.</p>	1
Maximum score 6				
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines	<p>d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>The Micro-scale irrigation equipment supplies and installation completion rate was less than 80% due to ongoing installations at Nawanatau P/s. Only one of the two planned demonstrations had been finished, while the other was still in progress.</p> <p>A signed supplier contract (Part 4 section 9 contract form), ref: Moro538/2223/WRKS/DDEG/00030 dated 31st May 2023, with Joloks Fast General Services and Moroto DLG.</p> $\text{percentage completion} = \frac{1}{2} \times 100$ $= 50\%$ <p>A system-generated payment voucher of Ugx 35,439,256 that was approved by the CAO on 8th June 2023 was presented.</p> <p>Goods received notes (GRN) were not available.</p> <p>Completion certificates were not available.</p>	0
Maximum score 6				

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 	The LG had deployed 18 out of the 23 required extension workers putting the staffing levels at 78%.	1
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	<p>b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 	<p>There was evidence that the irrigation demonstration sites in the different LLGs met standards as defined by MAAIF. Site acreages were in line with MAAF standards i.e Nawabatau P/S-Loputuk S/C (0.5 acres) and Rainbow P/S- Rupa S/C (0.5 acres)</p> <p>The installed systems were sprinkler rain-gun both solar and generator-powered, which were in line with MAAIF standards with the following specifications.</p> <p>Low flow micro sprinkler was installed on 1/2 an acre, storage tank of 5000L, tank stand structure made from Steel, head of 3M, GI pipe of Dia, 40mm for supply and wash outlet. It had 16 sprinkler rise pipes, a QRC service saddle, QRC end caps and the floating rain gun. It had an electric pool and Tub pump, 1HP 0.75KW, 10.5M (Max head), 340L/min Max flowrate.</p>	2
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards	<p>b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0 	<p>Upon site visits on the 2 Demos, it was found that one Demo installation was functional and the other was not.</p> <p>Rainbow P/S- Rupa S/C (0.5 acres) was tested and found functional, however, the sprinkler head with a rated Spray Range of 12m wasn't rotating.</p> <p>Rainbow P/S- Rupa S/C (0.5 acres) had 2 faulty solar panels and required high-wattage batteries to be able to invert the DC power to AC to run the booster pump.</p> <p>Both Demos had a poor installation of the reservoir tank. The tank base was not supported well which had already damaged the tank.</p>	0

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence from the staff list and attendance registers seen in the LLGs visited that extension workers were working in LLGs where they were deployed as below;</p> <p>Orode Timothy, Assistant Animal Production Officer - Rupa Sub County.</p> <p>Okello Pius, Veterinary Officer- Naduget Sub County.</p> <p>Olinga John- Agricultural Officer- Naduget Sub County.</p>	2
5	<p>Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>The inventory report, presented by the AO and dated 23rd June 2023, highlighted the installed components. However, upon a site visit, it was observed that the demonstrations were only partially functional.</p>	0
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that information was collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed, provision of complementary services, and farmer EOI.</p> <p>For example, Q1(30th June 2023), Q2 (30th June 2023), Q3 (30th June 2023), and Q4 (30th June 2023)</p> <p>For example, the quarterly progress reports compiled by AO and endorsed by the CAO dated 30th June 2023.</p> <p>Q4 report indicated Farmers registration for the expression of interest collected was 137 farmers, and data collected on eligible farmers was 37.</p> <p>Q3 report indicated that Radio talk shows and run short messages for dissemination and public awareness were 2.</p> <p>Q2 report indicated that Events organized to connect farmers to financing institution were 100 attendees.</p> <p>Q1 report indicated that Awareness raising at the district leaver for the district leadership was organized and had 60 attendees.</p>	2

6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was an up-to-date LLG information entry into MIS.</p> <p>For example, 167 EOI and EOI with prepared farm visit = 50, 37 farm visits, Workshop and seminar held with farmers for awareness raising = 266 1</p> <p>The LG presented evidence of the hard copies of the EOI application and the up-to-date MIS database on the EOI. This was found tallying at 167 candidates.</p> <p>AO logged into his Irri Track application, and the assessor verified data on the farm visits as shown as an output in the MIS database.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>			
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG prepared quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS.</p> <p>Q4 and Q3 reports signed by the CAO on 30th June 2023 presented Key statistics generated from the MIS dashboard. For example, graphical Data on EOIs per Sub-County, and 12 farm visits. Q1 report presented statistics on the number of awareness raising events done per subcounty.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>			
6	<p>Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG had developed and an approved Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). Moroto is a Phase II district and PIP was only applicable to Phase I districts.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 6</p>			

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG had Implemented Performance Improvement Plans for lowest performing LLGs.	0
	Maximum score 6			

Human Resource Management and Development

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	a) Evidence that the LG has: i. Budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms score 1 or else 0	From the wage estimates 2023/2024, the LG had budgeted for extension workers as per guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms. The Budget was 804,744,000/=.	1
	Maximum score 6			

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

Maximum score 6

ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0

The DLG had deployed 18 out of 26 extension workers provided for in the LG structure as below;

1. Orode Timothy, Assistant Animal Production Officer - Rupa Sub County
2. Jawange Peter, Agricultural Officer- Loputuk Sub-county
3. Okello Pius, Veterinary Officer- Naduget Sub County
4. Chelangat Abijah, Veterinary Officer- Katikekile Sub County
5. Kibwota Eric Ronnie, Veterinary Officer- Tapac Sub County
6. Walakira Moses, Assistant Agriculture Officer
7. Olinga John, Agriculture Officer
8. Omonuk Paul, Assistant Agriculture Officer
9. Olupot Patrick, Agriculture Officer
10. Benga Titus, Vermin Control Officer
11. Loli Mark, Principal Agricultural Officer
12. Amodoi Josephine, Animal Husbandry Officer
13. Orongo Tommy Walter, Senior Veterinary Officer
14. Okwi Francis, Senior Agricultural Officer
15. Edonu Janaan, Senior Entomologist
16. Okino Moses Andrew, Principal Veterinary Officer
17. Inangolet Francis Olaki, District Production and Marketing Officer
18. Ewatu Noah Ojwok, Agricultural Officer

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

Maximum score 6

b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0

There was evidence from the staff list that that extension workers were working in LLGs where they are deployed. For instance from the staff lists of the LLGs visited, the following extension workers were at the stations;

1. Orode Timothy, Assistant Animal Production Officer - Rupa Sub County
2. Okello Pius, Veterinary Officer- Naduget Sub County
3. Olinga John- Agricultural Officer- Nadunget Sub County
4. Chelangat Abijah, Veterinary Officer- Katikekile Sub County

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines	c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board	0
Maximum score 6				
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: i. Conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: Score 1 else 0	The District Production Coordinator had conducted annual performance appraisal of all Extension Workers against the agreed performance plans and has submitted a copy to HRO during the previous FY: For instance 1. Okello Pius, Veterinary Officer- Naduget Sub County was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Naru Gertrude, SAS 2. Chelangat Abijah, Veterinary Officer- Katikekile Sub County was appraised on 30 June 2023 by Onyang Joseph SAS 3. Kibwota Eric Ronnie, Veterinary Officer- Tapac Sub County was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Lotuk Godfrey, SAS 4. Olinga John, Agriculture Officer, was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Naru Gertrude, SAS 5. Omonuk Paul, Assistant Agriculture Officer, was appraised on 30 June 2023 by Lokong Samuel, SAS 6. Olupot Patrick, Agriculture Officer, was appraised on 30 June 2023 by Onyang Joseph SAS 7. Loli Mark, Principal Agricultural Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Inangolet Francis, DPMO 8. Okwi Francis, Senior Agricultural Officer, was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Loli Mark, Principal Agriculture Officer 9. Edonu Janaan, Senior Entomologist, was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Inangolet Francis, DPMO 10. Okino Moses Andrew, Principal Veterinary Officer was appraised on 30th June 2023 by Inangolet Francis, DPMO	1
Maximum score 4				

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	There was evidence from the appraisals reviewed that the District Production Officer had taken corrective actions for the extension staff which included; refresher training on the SOPs of lab tests and attachment to the National Labs; Capacity Building on Budgeting and Resource Allocation in Local Governments, training in data analysis using SPSS, and hands on training on extension methods and data analysis.	1
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	The DLG did not provide a training plan for extension workers or evidence that training activities were conducted in accordance with the training plans at the district level. However, some extension workers completed the six modules of MSI program as a requirement.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	ii Evidence that training activities were documented in the training database: Score 1 or else 0	There were no training activities uploaded in the training database except for trainees' certificates for those who completed the MIS modules. These reports were found in the MIS database.	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

9	Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines. Maximum score 10	a) Evidence that the LG has appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between (i) capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment); and (ii) complementary services (in FY 2020/21 100% to complementary services; starting from FY 2021/22 - 75% capital development; and 25% complementary services): Score 2 or else 0	The LG had appropriately allocated the micro scale irrigation grant between capital development (micro scale irrigation equipment) and complementary services. The budget for Micro Scale irrigation during the year was UGX 117,930,056 of which UGX 88,447,542 representing 75% of the budget was allocated to Capital Development and UGX 29,482,514 representing 25% was allocated to Complimentary Services.	2
---	--	--	--	---

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>b) Evidence that budget allocations have been made towards complementary services in line with the sector guidelines i.e. (i) maximum 25% for enhancing LG capacity to support irrigated agriculture (of which maximum 15% awareness raising of local leaders and maximum 10% procurement, Monitoring and Supervision); and (ii) minimum 75% for enhancing farmer capacity for uptake of micro scale irrigation (Awareness raising of farmers, Farm visit, Demonstrations, Farmer Field Schools): Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>LG which was in phase 2,100% micro-scale irrigation grant was allocated to complementary services as below;</p> <p>15% LG awareness creation was Uhs.17,689,508</p> <p>40% farmer awareness creation was Uhs.47,172,022</p> <p>30% irrigation demonstrations were Uhs.35,379,077</p> <p>15% of farmer visits were Ushs 35,379,017</p> <p>The above allocations were in accordance with Page 7 of Sector Grant guideline.</p>	2
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of co-funding planned as per the current budget.</p> <p>Moroto DLG is in its first year of implementation and has not reached the stage of co-funding of the MSI projects.</p>	0
Maximum score 10				
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Not applicable since the LG were still under their first year of implementation.</p>	2
Maximum score 10				

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the LG had disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding e.g.,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Awareness creation report (farmer registration) of EOI on irrigation program dated 27th June 2023. 2. Technical support and training workshop on the implementation of Ugift MSI program dated 29th June 2023. 3. Awareness raising report (Political Leaders and HODs) dated 24th March 2023. 4. Awareness creation raising report (LLG political Leaders, HODs, and parish chiefs dated 11th April 2023. 5. Ugift field day activity report dated 27th June 2023. 6. Benchmarking Activity report (Jinja Trade show) dated 15th August 2023. 	2
	<p>Maximum score 10</p>			
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 Less than 70% score 0 	<p>There was no evidence that the DPO has monitored the installed micro-scale irrigation equipment on a monthly basis.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score 8</p>			
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has overseen technical training & support to the Approved Farmer to achieve servicing and maintenance during the warranty period: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Moroto DLG was in its first year of implementation and has not reached the stage of co-funding of the MSI projects.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum score 8</p>			

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	c) Evidence that the LG has provided hands-on support to the LLG extension workers during the implementation of complementary services within the previous FY as per guidelines score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence that the Local Government (LG) provided hands-on support to the Local Level Government (LLG) extension workers during the implementation of complementary services in the previous financial year. Supervision reports were not on file, and minutes of field meetings were also not documented.	0
10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	d) Evidence that the LG has established and run farmer field schools as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	Moroto DLG was in its first year of implementation and has not reached the stage of co-funding of the MSI projects.	2
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the LG conducted activities to mobilize farmers as per guidelines for example, the awareness raising report for the nine LLG dated 27th June 2023 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <input type="checkbox"/> Nadunget LLG • <input type="checkbox"/> Tapaca LLG • <input type="checkbox"/> Loputuk Katikekile • <input type="checkbox"/> Rupa LLG • <input type="checkbox"/> South division • <input type="checkbox"/> Nadunget T/C • <input type="checkbox"/> Lotisan S/C • <input type="checkbox"/> North division 	2
11	Mobilization of farmers: The LG has conducted activities to mobilize farmers to participate in irrigation and irrigated agriculture. Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that the District has trained staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels: Score 2 or else 0	Evidence was presented about the training of staff and political leaders at District and LLG levels, for example, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Awareness creation raising report (LLG political Leaders, HODs, and parish chiefs dated 11th April 2023. 2. Benchmarking Activity report (Jinja Trade Show) dated 15th August 2023. 	2

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY as per the format: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that LG has an updated register of micro-scale irrigation equipment supplied to farmers in the previous FY under ugift Demos.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG keeps an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was an up-to-date database of applications at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>At the time of assessment, hard copies of Expression of Interest (EOI) application forms were on file and verified in the Irri Track application and MIS database.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the District has carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence presented that the district had carried out farm visits to farmers that submitted complete Expressions of Interest (EOI).</p> <p>MIS data in Q4 report (30th June 2023) showed that out of 112 successful EOI applicants, only 12 farm visits had been done.</p> <p>There was no documentation indicating an agreement to proceed with the quotation form.</p>	0
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments: The LG has selected farmers and budgeted for micro-scale irrigation as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>d) For DDEG financed projects: Evidence that the LG District Agricultural Engineer (as Secretariat) publicized the eligible farmers that they have been approved by posting on the District and LLG noticeboards: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no information found on the LLG noticeboards publicizing eligible farmer approval.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems were incorporated in the LG approved procurement plan for the current FY: Score 1 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The approved consolidated procurement plan signed by the CAO, Chelimo Alex, dated 3rd August, 2023 had item for MIS incorporated, it was supply of Irrigation Equipment.</p>	1

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence to show that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF).	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	c) Evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria: Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence that the LG concluded the selection of the irrigation equipment supplier based on the set criteria of giving the contract to the lowest bidder.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	d) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee: Score 1 or else 0	There were no records in form of Contract committee minutes to the effect that the micro-scale irrigation systems for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	e. Evidence that the LG signed the contract with the lowest priced technically responsive irrigation equipment supplier for the farmer with a farmer as a witness before commencement of installation score 2 or else 0	The MIS program had not been rolled out to start co-funding with farmers the district during the year under review FY 2022/2023.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	f) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by IrriTrack App): Score 2 or else 0	There was no evidence presented that the micro-scale irrigation equipment installed is in line with the design output sheet (generated by irriTrack App). This is because the DLG is in its first year of implementation, and for Ugift demonstrations, the DLG receives approved designs from MAAIF that they customize to fit site conditions.	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Evidence was presented indicating that the Local Government (LG) conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects through relevant technical officers. For instance, a report on field supervision and monitoring, compiled by the SAE-Volunteer and dated 6th October 2022, was available. During the assessment, it was confirmed that the site books were present in the two schools hosting the demonstrations.</p>	2
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during:</p> <p>i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG oversaw the irrigation equipment testing for functionality.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>ii. Hand-over of the equipment to the Approved Farmer (delivery note by the supplies and goods received note by the approved farmer): Score 1 or 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that LG had overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during the handover of the equipment to the Approved Farmer.</p> <p>However, SAE presented a payment voucher for the contract, dated 27th June 2023 for the supply and installation of MSI equipment.</p> <p>The handover had not been done yet (less than 6 months after installation).</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 18</p>	<p>i) Evidence that the Local Government has made payment of the supplier within specified timeframes subject to the presence of the Approved farmer's signed acceptance form: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>At the time of the assessment, there was no evidence indicating that the Local Government had made payments to the supplier within the specified timeframes, and no approved farmers' signed acceptance forms were available. In the Financial year 2022/2023, the Local Government was in its first year of implementation, and it had not reached the farmer co-funding stage.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines	j) Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each contract and with all records required by the PPDA Law: Score 2 or else 0	The MIS program had not started being implemented in the district he in year under review FY 2022/2023, so there were no files.	0
	Maximum score 18			

Environment and Social Safeguards

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

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: i). Recorded score 1 or else 0 ii). Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii). Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv). Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There were no records on grievances recorded.	0
	Maximum score 6			

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	There were no records on grievances recorded.	0
	Maximum score 6			

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been:</p> <p>iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0</p> <p>iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no records on grievances recorded.</p>	0
----	---	--	--	----------

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

Environment and Social Requirements

15	<p>Safeguards in the delivery of investments</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro- irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc.</p> <p>score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of the micro scale irrigation program improving farmers' livelihood guide for farmers dated April, 2023 part 1 and 2 plus a UgIFT Micro-Scale Irrigation Program Improving farmers' livelihood Technical Guidelines version 3, April 2023.</p> <p>An awareness creation report dated 11th April, 2023 at Tapac was also availed that detailed the awareness program and the respective beneficiaries and dates when the awareness was conducted.</p>	2
----	---	--	--	----------

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	<p>b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment.</p> <p>i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG carried out Environment and Social screening for the following projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Irrigation demonstration site at Rainbow primary school on 24th March, 2023 2. Irrigation demonstration site at Namanator primary school on 28th March, 2023 <p>And a costed ESMP for Irrigation demonstration site at Rainbow primary school prepared on 4th April, 2023 at a cost of UGX. 1,000,000</p> <p>However, no ESIA's were carried out because the projects that were implemented in the micro scale sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIA's) because at the screening stage they required simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only required screening and costing for environmental management planning as categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019 for projects that require ESIA's.</p>	1
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	<p>ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of monitoring of irrigation impacts for example;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A monthly report on environmental social safety measures for micro-irrigation demonstration sites at Nawanataba primary school May, 2023 2. A monthly report on environmental social safety measures for micro-irrigation demonstration sites at Nawanataba primary school that was prepared in the month of June, 2023 	1
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	<p>iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There were no certification forms available at the time of assessment to ascertain whether the Environmental Officer completed and signed prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects.</p>	0

15

Safeguards in the delivery of investments

Maximum score 6

iv. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0

There were no certification forms available at the time of assessment to ascertain whether the CDO completed and signed prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects.

0

**Crosscutting Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	a. Chief Finance Officer/Principal Finance Officer, score 3 or else 0	Egesa David Wabudi was substantively appointed as Chief Finance on 4th May 2022 under Minute No. 39(26)/MDSC/2022.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	b. District Planner/Senior Planner, score 3 or else 0	Opio Paula was substantively appointed as District Planner on 31 January 2019 under Minute No. 50/MDSC/2019.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	c. District Engineer/Principal Engineer, score 3 or else 0	Orup Ceasor was subatantively appointed as District Engineer on 31 January 2019 under Minute No. 51/MDSC/2019.	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	d. District Natural Resources Officer/Senior Environment Officer, score 3 or else 0	Latyong John was substantively appointed as District Natural Resources Officer on 24 June 2023 under Minute No. 12MDSC/June/2023(1).	3
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.	e. District Production Officer/Senior Veterinary Officer, score 3 or else 0	Inangolet Francis Olaki was sunstantively appointed as District Production Officer on 26th May 2017 under Minute No. 106(a)/MDSC/2017.	3

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>f. District Community Development Officer/Principal CDO, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Lolem Maggie was substantively appointed as District Community Development Officer on 24th May 2021 under Minute No. 19/DSC/KTD/May/2021(a).</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>g. District Commercial Officer/Principal Commercial Officer, score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>Achia Lauwence was substantively appointed as District Commercial Officer on 31st May 2018 under Minute No. 27/MDSC/2018.</p>	3
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. A Senior Procurement Officer /Municipal: Procurement Officer, 2 or else 0.</p>	<p>Maruk Joseph was substantively appointed as Senior Procurement Officer on 6th June 2019 under Minute No. 74/MDSC/2019.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>ii. Procurement Officer /Municipal Assistant Procurement Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Lochor Abel was substantively appointed as Procurement Officer on 24th May 2021 under Minute No. 18/DSC/KTD/MAY/2021.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>i. Principal Human Resource Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Akello Annet Sarah was substantively appointed as Principal Human Resource Officer on 25th May 2020 under Minute No. 11/MDSC/2020.</p>	2

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Angella Zachary was substantively appointed as Senior Environment Officer on 24th June 2023 under Minute No. 11/MDSC/June/2023(1).</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Kinyosi Micheal Chemasuet Cabral was substantively appointed as Senior Land Management Officer on 11th July 2012 under Minute No. 25/MDSC/2012.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Longeth Rosemary was substantively appointed as Senior Accountant on 28th January 2015 under Minute No. 23/MDSC/2015(d).</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Khisa Moses Mitielo was substantively appointed as Principal Internal Auditor on 21st August 2020 under Minute No. 80/MDSC/2020.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>n. Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC), score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Lopeyon Richard Alepel was substantively appointed as Principal Human Resource Officer (Secretary DSC) on 28th January 2015 under Minute No. 23/MDSC/2015(g).</p>	2

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

Maximum score is 15

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

Moroto LG had 7 LLGs and had substantively appointed Senior Assistant Secretaries as below;

1. Naru Gertrude, Senior Assistant Secretary- Naduget Sub County, was appointed on 30th June 2013 Under Minute No. 20/MDSC/2013
2. Lotuk Godfrey, Senior Assistant Secretary- Tapac Sub County, was appointed on 30th June 2013 Under Minute No. 20/MDSC/2013
3. Onyang Joseph, Senior Assistant Secretary- Katikekile Sub County, was appointed on 28th June 2019 Under Minute No. 163/MDSC/2019
4. Lokong Samuel, Senior Assistant Secretary- Rupa Sub County, was appointed on 30th June 2013 Under Minute No. 20/MDSC/2013

The Town Council, Lotisan and Lopotuk Sub Counties did not have a substantively appointed Senior Assistant Secretary at the time of assessment.

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

Maximum score is 15

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

Moroto LG had 7 LLGs and had substantively appointed Community Development Officers as below;

1. Anthony Abbott, Community Development Officer- Lopotuk Sub County, was appointed on 14th June 2010 Under Minute No. 14/MDSC/2010
2. Anyakun Addah, Community Development Officer- Naduget Sub County, was appointed on 28th January 2015 Under Minute No. 26/MDSC/2015
3. Nangiro Cecilia, Community Development Officer- Rupa Sub County, was appointed on 14th June 2010 Under Minute No. 14/MDSC/2010
4. Loru Moses Nagiro King, Community Development Officer- Lotisan Sub County, was appointed on 28th January 2015 Under Minute No. 23/MDSC/2015 (c)
5. Lowal Israel James, Community Development Officer- Naduget Town Council, was appointed on 14th June 2010 Under Minute No. 14/MDSC/2010

Tapac and Katikekile Sub Counties had no substantively appointed Community Development Officers at the time of assessment.

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

Maximum score is 15

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

Moroto LG had 7 LLGs and had substantively appointed Senior Accounts Assistants /Accounts Assistants as below;

1. Angolere Jachinta Alungat, Senior Accounts Assistant - Katikekile Sub County, was appointed on 23rd November 2015 Under Minute No. 69/MDSC/2015(b)
2. Cici Alice, Senior Accounts Assistant - Naduget Sub County, was appointed on 14th June 2010 Under Minute No. 22/MDSC/2010
3. Lokuta Bruno, Senior Accounts Assistant - Lotisan Sub County, was appointed on 23rd November 2015 Under Minute No. 69/MDSC/2015(b)
4. Naramu Moses, Senior Accounts Assistant - Loputuk Sub County, was appointed on 4th May 2022 Under Minute No. 38(11)/MDSC/2022
5. Nayor Moses K. Willcox, Senior Accounts Assistant - Rupa Sub County, was appointed on 14th June 2010 Under Minute No. 22/MDSC/2010
6. Asanu Agnes, Senior Accounts Assistant - Tapac Sub County, was appointed on 7th October 2005 Under Minute No. 56/MDSC/2005
7. Longole Joyce, Senior Accounts Assistant - Naduget Town Council, was appointed on 30th June 2013 Under Minute No. 20/MDSC/2013

Environment and Social Requirements

Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.

Maximum score is 4

If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:

a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0

The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 100% of Natural Resources as per the computation below;

The actual amount received by the LG was UGX 188,794,845.

The actual amount allocated by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 188,794,845 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 16).

(UGX 188,794,845/188,794,845)*100=100%.

3	Evidence that the LG has released all funds allocated for the implementation of environmental and social safeguards in the previous FY.	If the LG has released 100% of funds allocated in the previous FY to:	The evidence derived from the final accounts for FY 2022/23 indicated that the LG released 100% for community-based service as per the computation below;	2
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department.	The actual amount received by the LG was UGX 411,119,718	
		score 2 or else 0.	The actual amount allocated by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 411,119,718 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 16).	
			(UGX 411,119,718/UGX411,411,718)*100=100%	
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	a. If the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening,	Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was done on 8th August, 2022 for the construction of a 2 classroom block at Acherer primary school.	4
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or else 0		
4	Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.	b. If the LG has carried out Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) prior to commencement of all civil works for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG),	The project that was implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because at the screening stage it required simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only required screening and costing for environmental management planning as categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019 for projects that require ESIAs.	4
	Maximum score is 12	score 4 or 0		

4	<p>Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and developed costed Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, prior to commencement of all civil works.</p> <p>Maximum score is 12</p>	<p>c. If the LG has a Costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG);;</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>The LG did not have a costed ESMPs for the constructed 2 classroom block at Acherer primary school that was implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) despite the fact that screening was carried out on 8th August, 2022.</p>	0
---	---	---	---	----------

Financial management and reporting

5	<p>Evidence that the LG does not have an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY.</p> <p>Maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If a LG has a clean audit opinion, score 10;</p> <p>If a LG has a qualified audit opinion, score 5</p> <p>If a LG has an adverse or disclaimer audit opinion for the previous FY, score 0</p>	<p>The LG obtained Unqualified audit opinion on its operations for the previous FY.</p>	10
6	<p>Evidence that the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g). This statement includes issues, recommendations, and actions against all findings where the Internal Auditor and Auditor General recommended the Accounting Officer to act (PFM Act 2015).</p> <p>maximum score is 10</p>	<p>If the LG has provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous financial year by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g),</p> <p>score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>LG provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous FY on 2nd March 2023. The submission date was after the recommended date as required by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g).</p>	0
7	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY</p> <p>Maximum Score 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted an annual performance contract on 27th June 2023 which was before the stipulated deadline of August 31st of the current FY.</p>	4

8	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>maximum score 4 or else 0</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted an online Annual Performance Report for the previous FY 2022/2023 on 27th July 2023 which was within the stipulated timeline of August 31, of the current Financial Year.</p>	4
9	<p>Evidence that the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>If the LG has submitted Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous FY by August 31, of the current Financial Year,</p> <p>score 4 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG submitted the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all the four quarters of the previous as per the dates below;</p> <p>Quarter 1 BPR was submitted on 3rd January 2023</p> <p>Quarter 2 BPR was submitted on 9th February 2023</p> <p>Quarter 3 BPR was submitted on 2nd May 2023</p> <p>Quarter 4 BPR was submitted on 27th July 2023</p> <p>From the above submission dates the LG submitted the 4th quarter report before the mandatory deadline of August 31 of the current Financial Year.</p>	4

**Education Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	a) District Education Officer (district)/ Principal Education Officer (municipal council), score 30 or else 0	There was neither a substantive nor seconded District Education Officer for Moroto DLG at the time of assessment. The previous DEO Oputa Paul passed on 24th August 2023.	0
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District/Municipal Education Office.	b) All District/Municipal Inspector of Schools, score 40 or else 0.	The LG had appointed District Inspector of Schools as below; 1. Aligoyi Hellen Amulen, Senior Inspector of Schools was appointed on 24th June 2023 under Minute No. 12/MDSC/June/2023(5). 2. The LG had neither appointed an Inspector of Schools nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment.	0
<i>The Maximum Score of 70</i>				
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	Evidence that prior to commencement of all civil works for all Education sector projects the LG has carried out: Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	Screening for Environmental, Social and Climate Change was done for the Education sector projects for example, 1. Construction of a 3 classroom block at Aoyareng primary school prepared on 21st September, 2022 2. Construction of seed secondary schools prepared on 6th June, 2022 3. Construcion of 10 cubic litre water tanks at Kakomongole and Naplananya primary schools prepared on 22nd September, 2022 4. Construction of a 2 unit staff house at Kakomongole senior secondary school prepared on 2nd August, 2023 5. Completion of a 3 classroom block at Aoyareng prepared on 2nd August, 2023 6. Construction of a 3 stances drainage pit latrine at Kagata primary school prepared on 21st September, 2022	15
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				

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

If the LG carried out:
b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) ,
score 15 or else 0.

The projects that were implemented in the education sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because at the screening stage they required simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only required screening and costing for environmental management planning as categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019 for projects that require ESIAs.

The Maximum score is 30

**Health Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>a. If the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for: District Health Officer, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Lemkol James was substantively appointed as District Health Officer on 4th May 2022 under Minute No. 39(25)/MDSC/2022.</p>	10
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>The LG had neither substantively appointed an Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>c. Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had neither substantively appointed an Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>d. Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer), score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG had neither appointed a Principal Health Inspector nor was there a seconded staff.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions.</p> <p><i>Applicable to Districts only.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>e. Senior Health Educator, score 10 or else 0.</p>	<p>Omuudu Charles Onyang was substantively appointed as Senior Health Educator on 6th June 2019 under Minute No. 72/MDSC/2019.</p>	10

1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Biostatistician, score 10 or 0.	Lowupa Max Ben Kiwnuka was substantively appointed as Biostatistician on 24th August 2015 under Minute No. 57/MDSC/2015(a).	10
1	New_Evidence that the District has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to Districts only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	g. District Cold Chain Technician, score 10 or else 0.	Onen Oscar was substantively appointed as District Cold Chain Technician on 21st August 2020 under Minute No. 78/MDSC/2020.	10
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	i. Principal Health Inspector, score 20 or else 0.		
1	New_Evidence that the Municipality has substantively recruited or the seconded staff is in place in place for all critical positions. <i>Applicable to MCs only.</i> <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	j. Health Educator, score 20 or else 0		

Environment and Social Requirements

2

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

Maximum score is 30

If the LG carried out:
a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.

The LG did not carry out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the health sector projects for the current FY despite the fact that they were approved and populated in the LG project list for the current FY. Below is the list of projects and their allocated costs;

1. Construction of a Staff House at Kalemungole HCII costed at UGX. 370,000,000
2. Rehabilitation of DHO's Office costed at UGX. 54,177,000
3. Rehabilitation of OPD at Nakiloro HC II costed at UGX. 50,000,000
4. Rehabilitation of a Staff House at Rupa HC II costed at UGX. 32,538,000
5. Rehabilitation of OPD at Lopelipel HC II costed at UGX. 50,000,000

0

2

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

Maximum score is 30

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

The LG did not carry out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) since no screening was done for the projects in the health sector and ascertaining whether they will require ESIAs will be dependent on completion of screening.

0

**Micro-scale
Irrigation
Minimum
Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
-----	-------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------

Human Resource Management and Development

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the District Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 70</i></p>	<p>If the LG has recruited;</p> <p>a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer</p> <p><i>score 70 or else 0.</i></p>	<p>The LG had neither substantively appointed a Senior Agriculture Engineer nor was there a seconded staff at the time of assessment.</p>	0
---	---	---	---	----------

Environment and Social Requirements

2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out for potential investments and where required costed ESMPs developed.</p> <p><i>Maximum score is 30</i></p>	<p>If the LG:</p> <p>Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.</p>	<p>The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the following micro scale irrigation projects;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Irrigation demonstration site at Rainbow primary school on 24th March, 2023 2. Irrigation demonstration site at Namanatou primary school prepared on 28th March, 2023 <p>as well as costed ESMPs prepared as of the list below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Irrigation demonstration site at Nawanatau primary school prepared on 25th August, 2022 at a cost of UGX. 1,000,000 2. Irrigation demonstration site at Rainbow primary school prepared on 4th April, 2023 at a cost of UGX. 1,000,000 <p>However, Environment, Social, Impact Assessment (ESIAs) was not carried out because the projects that were implemented in the micro scale sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because at the screening stage they required simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only required screening and costing for environmental management planning as categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019 for projects that require ESIAs.</p>	30
---	---	---	--	-----------

**Water & Environment
Minimum Conditions**

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
Human Resource Management and Development				
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	a. 1 Civil Engineer (Water), score 15 or else 0.	Owot Musa Wasswa, Civil Engineer (Water) was substantively appointed on 14th June 2010 under Minute No. 14/MDSC/2010.	15
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	From the approved DLG, there is no provision for the role of Assistant Water Officer for mobilization. Likewise, there was no designated officer for this role at the time of assessment.	0
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	c. 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician/Assistant Engineering Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Ayamu Judith, Borehole Maintenance Technician was substantively appointed on 15th February 2015 under Minute No. 16/MDSC/2014.	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	Latyong John was substantively appointed as District Natural Resources Officer on 24 June 2023 under Minute No. 12MDSC/June/2023(1).	15
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Angella Zachary was substantively appointed as Senior Environment Officer on 24th June 2023 under Minute No. 11/MDSC/June/2023(1).	10
1	New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions. <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	There was neither a substantively appointed Forestry Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	0

Environment and Social Requirements

2

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects

If the LG:
a. Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 10 or else 0.

The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the following water infrastructure projects for the previous FY

1. Design of mini pipe water system feasibility study at Bomo North parish prepared on 11th August, 2022
2. Borehole drilling at Naregetomu village, Katikekile parish prepared on 1st February, 2022
3. Borehole drilling at Katikekile seed secondary school prepared on 1st September, 2022
4. Borehole drilling at Notanga village, Nadunget sub county prepared on 24th August, 2022
5. Borehole drilling at Napringoi village, Nadungei prepared on 24th August, 2022
6. Borehole drilling at Nokamuria village, Loputuk Parish prepared on 29th August, 2022
7. Borehole drilling at Rupa seed school prepared on 29th August, 2022
8. Borehole drilling at Mojir village, loputuk sub county prepared on 29th August, 2022

2

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects

b. Carried out Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 10 or else 0.

The projects that were implemented in the water sector did not require Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) because they are categorized under schedule 5 of the National Environment Act 5, 2019, of projects with simple environment and social mitigation measures with minimal level of impacts and only require screening and costing for environmental management planning.

Evidence that the LG has carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment and Social Impact Assessment (ESIAs) (including child protection plans) where applicable, and abstraction permits have been issued to contractors by the Directorate of Water Resources Management (DWRM) prior to commencement of all civil works on all water sector projects

c. Ensured that the LG got abstraction permits for all piped water systems issued by DWRM, score 10 or else 0.

There was no abstraction permit presented for assessment. The District Water Officer also confirmed that there was no abstraction permit issued to them.