



LGMSD 2022/23

Moroto Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 762)

Assessment	Scores
Crosscutting Minimum Conditions	71%
Education Minimum Conditions	30%
Health Minimum Conditions	50%
Water & Environment Minimum Conditions	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions	0%
Crosscutting Performance Measures	61%
Educational Performance Measures	64%
Health Performance Measures	63%
Water & Environment Performance Measures	0%
Micro-scale Irrigation Performance Measures	0%

**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 Municipality had one project implemented using USMID fund and it was partially completed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Upgrade of Jie and Lopeduru roads to Bitumen Standard at Ugx 2,119,622,000, page 12 Approved Budget and ABPR page 39. 2. Renovation of the Main office block at Ushs 40,000,000.(Budget page 20 and Q4 report(page 37). 	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 in the overall LLG performance assessment decreased from 88% in the previous assessment to 76% in 2023</p>	0
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 USMID project implemented in FY 2022/2023 was partially completed as per the quarter four Annual Budget Performance Report (ABPRS).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. - Upgrade of Jie and Lopeduru roads to Bitumen Standard at Ugx 2,119,622,000, page 12 Approved Budget and ABPR page 39 however it was 76% completed. 2. - Renovation of the Main office block at Ushs 40,000,000. (Budget page 20 and Q4 report(page 37)was 100% completed. 	2

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 MC budgeted and spent all the USMID for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities as per the USMID grant, budget and implementation guideline. 1. Upgrade of Jie and Lopeduru roads to Bitumen Standard at Ugx 2,119,622,000 ,page 12 Approved Budget and ABPR page 39. 2. Renovation of the Main office block at Ushs 40,000,000. (Budget page 20 and Q4 report(page 37).	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	The project was reviewed and was +36.96% above the +/- 20% acceptable variation. Project: Completion of construction of an Urban staff house at Moroto Demonstration primary school. Procurement ref: Moro 722/wrks/2022-2023/0000 Project: Estimated cost: Ugx 98,637,000/= Contract cost: Ugx 62,153,130/= Variation: Ugx 36,483,870/= %age variation (36,483,870/98,637,000) x 100% =+36.98%	0

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	The information on the positions filled in LLGs as per minimum staffing standards was accurate. For instance the Northern Division had the following staff; 1. Lomise Florence- Senior Assistant Town Clerk 2. Lomongin Ibrahim Charik- Principal Town Agent 3. Lochoro Charles- Principal Town Agent 4. Lote John Bosco- Division Treasurer 5. Onenchan Joselyn- Health Assistant 6. Longpoli Eric Lokut-Enrolled Nurse 7. Naitiwi Thabita- Clinical Officer 8. Eligu Joseph-Lab Assistant 9. Chegem Catherine- Nursing Assistant 10. Ayeto Salme- Midwife 11. Amongin Betty Faith- Midwife	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>The quarterly progress report for June 2023 dated 7th July 2023 presented by the Engineer shows that the USMID project, Upgrade of Jie and Lopeduru roads to Bitumen Standard was implemented and was at 76% completed as per page 24 of the report.</p>	0
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>There was evidence that the LG conducted a credible assessment of LLGs as verified during the National Local Government Performance Assessment Exercise;</p> <p>South Division- LG Assessors score was 78% against IVA Expert score at 73%</p> <p>Rengen Sub County LG Assessors score was 81% against IVA Expert score 94%</p> <p>North Division was 74% against 60%</p> <p>The total variance was $05+13+14= 10$. It should be noted that the variance between two Divisions is well over +10, therefore LG scores a 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>No evidence was provided at the time of assessment.</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>No evidence was provided at the time of assessment.</p>	0

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for and actual recruitment and deployment of staff Maximum 2 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the LG has consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements for the coming FY to the MoPS by September 30th of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED. Score 2 or else score 0	The LG had consolidated and submitted the staffing requirements dated 26th September 2023 under Ref CR/115/1 for the coming FY to the MoPS on 29th September of the current FY, with copy to the respective MDAs and MoFPED.	2
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI): Score 2 or else score 0	There was no evidence provided by the HR department that the Municipality had conducted a tracking and analysis of staff attendance (as guided by Ministry of Public Service CSI)	0
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	i. Evidence that the LG has conducted an appraisal with the following features: HODs have been appraised as per guidelines issued by MoPS during the previous FY: Score 1 or else 0	The HR department did not provide any appraisal form for a HOD to show that appraisals were conducted for HODs during the previous FY.	0
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	ii. (in addition to "a" above) has also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines: Score 1 or else 0	No evidence was provided by the HR department that the Municipality had also implemented administrative rewards and sanctions on time as provided for in the guidelines:	0
7	Performance management Maximum 5 points on this Performance Measure	iii. Has established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which is functional. Score 1 or else 0	No evidence was provided by the HR department that the Municipality had established a Consultative Committee (CC) for staff grievance redress which was functional	0

8	Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY have accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment: Score 1.	There was evidence that 100% of the staff recruited during the previous FY had accessed the salary payroll not later than two months after appointment. For instance, Kilama Alex, Human Resource Officer, Chelimo Nancy Education Assistant, Angura John Bosco-Education Assistant, Ayaa Vicky-Education assistant, Lonkalany Simon Peter Education Assistant were all appointed on 19th June 2023 and they accessed payroll in July 2023.	1
9	Pension Payroll management Maximum 1 point on this Performance Measure or else score 0	a. Evidence that 100% of staff that retired during the previous FY have accessed the pension payroll not later than two months after retirement: Score 1.	There was one staff that retired during last FY. Amutos Janet a Tutor retired on 28th March 2023 and accessed the payroll in May 2023.	1

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	a. If direct transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY: Score 2 or else score 0	The evidence from the release letters indicated that the transfers (DDEG) to LLGs were executed in accordance with the requirements of the budget in previous FY as per the releases below; 1. North Division received Ushs 20,671,032 2. South Division received Ushs 32,061,192 The evidence provided indicated that the MC did not do timely warranting of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance with the requirements of the budget as follows: In quarter 1: Didn't receive DDEG In quarter 2: Release was 3rd October 2022. In quarter 3: Release was on 2nd January 2023. In quarter 4: Didn't receive DDEG.	2
----	--	--	---	----------

10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	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).	There was evidence that the MC did Not timely warrant of direct DDEG transfers to LLGs for the last FY, in accordance to the requirements of the budget as follows:	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score: 2 or else score 0	Quarter 1: Didn't receive DDEG	
			In quarter 2: Release was 3rd October 2022, warranted on 18th October 2022, warrant was 15 days.	
			In quarter 3: Release was on 2nd January 2023, warranted on 2nd January 2023 which was within the time limit day.	
			In quarter 4: Didn't receive DDEG.	
			As per quarter two the Municipal didn't do timely warranting of DDEG as per the guidelines.	
10	N23_Effective Planning, Budgeting and Transfer of Funds for Service Delivery	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:	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;	0
	Maximum 6 points on this Performance Measure	Score 2 or else score 0	Quarter 1 MC didn't receive DDEG funds,	
			Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 31st October 2022 which was more than 5 days.	
			Quarter 3 funds was released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 5th January 2023 which was within 5 days.	
			In quarter 4: Didn't receive DDEG.	

11	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has supervised or mentored all LLGs in the District /Municipality at least once per quarter consistent with guidelines:</p> <p>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The MC provided evidence of quarterly reports for the supervision and mentoring of LLGs in the District FY 2022/2023.</p> <p>Q 1 supervision and mentoring report was conducted from 24th October to 25th October 2022</p> <p>Q 2 supervision and mentoring was conducted on 14th March 2023</p> <p>Q 3 Supervision and mentoring were conducted from 29th May 2023</p> <p>Q 4 supervision and mentoring was conducted from 14th August 2023 and 16th August 2023 which was past the FY 2022/23.</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 MC availed TPC minutes which showed that results and reports of support supervision and monitoring visits were discussed by the TPC to make recommendations for corrective actions and follow-up. These were signed by the chairperson Okurut Vicentand were as below;</p> <p>Q 1-Discussed on 14th November 2022- MMC/TPC/11/2022/04- Discussion of monitoring report for Q1.</p> <p>Q 2-Discussed on 18th April 2023 - MMC/TPC/04/2023/06-Departmental briefs and monitoring report Q2.</p> <p>Q 3 Discussed on 8th June 2023 - MMC/TPC/06/2023/07-Discussion of monitoring report Q3. However, it was discussed past the FY we are assessing.</p> <p>Q 4 Discussed on 21st August 2023 - MMC/TPC/08/2023-05-Discussion of monitoring report Q4. However, it was discussed late which was past the FY we are assessing.</p>	2

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 Municipal had an assets register formatted as required by the LG Accounting Manual. A printed copy was also availed to the assessment team and the time of assessment.</p> <p>A number of assets sampled during this assessment including land and buildings, computers, furniture and motor vehicles were found in the register.</p> <p>The Municipal had an asset register which is updated and its details and content satisfy this requirement. The items were categorized into Transport Equipment, Office Equipment, Medical Equipment, Machinery, Buildings specialized, among others.</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the District/Municipality has used the Board of Survey Report of the previous FY to make Assets Management decisions including procurement of new assets, maintenance of existing assets and disposal of assets:</p> <p>Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was a Board of Survey Report for FY 2021/2022 in place a copy of which was submitted to the Accountant General on 06th, September 2022 with no reference. The report was acknowledged by the Accountant General on 9th September, 2022. The Board made several recommendations some of which were being acted on and others cleared at the time of the assessment.</p> <p>Examples of recommendations raised by the Board included disposal of district old assets, engraving the district assets, disposal of old computers, key board printer, old furniture etc.</p>	1
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments is conducted effectively</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this Performance Measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that District/Municipality has a functional physical planning committee in place which has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD. If so Score 2. Otherwise Score 0.</p>	<p>At the time of assessment , the Municipal Physical Planner was not at the station and the team failed to access information on composition and functionality of the PPC"</p>	0

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; 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 MC conducted a desk appraisal on the project implemented as per the report availed at the time of assessment. The DDEG/USMID project was desk appraised on 18th July 2022 checking whether the proposed projects were in the MCDP page no 22 and 70 of AWP and availability of funds in the Approved Budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Upgrade of Jie and Lopeduru roads to Bitumen Standard at Ugx 2,119,622,000 and the projects was recommended for funding and implementation. - Renovation of the Main office block at Ushs 40,000,000 and the projects was recommended for funding and implementation. 	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: 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 MC 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 18th July 2022 for the DDEG/USMID projects that were implemented in the previous FY 2022/23 as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. - Upgrade of Jie and Lopeduru roads to Bitumen Standard at Ugx 2,119,622,000 2. - Renovation of the Main office block at Ushs 40,000,000. <p>The project was appraised by the Senior Planner, CDO, 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 the project profiles were discussed by TPC in meeting held on 13rd September 2022 I Town Clerk Office under MIN no 6 MMC/09/2022-06. The minutes were endorsed by the Chairperson Mr Okurut Vicent on 13rd September 2022.</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>Environmental and social risks/impact screening was not carried out for the current FY projects despite the fact that they had been approved and indicated in the LG Approved Budget Estimates 2023/24 as listed below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Library Toilet Building and Facility Maintenance civil works at BOMA SOUTH at UGX. 45,000,000 2. Administrative Block Building and Facility Maintenance civil works at BOMA SOUTH at UGX. 12,000,000 3. Completion of Jie and Lopeduru road works at CAMPSWHALI JUU at UGX. 4,498,663,000 	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 an approved procurement plan dated 27th July, 2023, signed by the TC, Eyaru Richard. The items planned for implementation using DDEG funds were construction of a watchman's house at North division offices and fencing of South Division offices. While for USMID funding was construction of a waterborne toilet at the public library.</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 were contract committee minutes for sitting on 27th September, 2023 in minute 21/CC/SEPT/2023-2024 that approved the prequalification of service providers for USMID/DDEG projects that were to be implemented.</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 evidence that the LG had not properly established the project implementation team (PIT) in a letter dated 17th February, 2023 by, TC, Okuru Vincent where the following persons were named to PIT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Odongo Emmanuel P- Assistant Engineering Officer-Contract supervisor 2. Logir Joshua loumo-Municipal Engineer -Contract supervisor. <p>The labour officer CDO, Environment officer and Clerk of works were left out.</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	There was evidence that the infrastructure projects implemented using DDEG followed the standard technical designs, this was confirmed when the site at Moroto Demonstration primary school was inspected, where it was noted that the internal dimension of the bedrooms as 3 x 2.9m, 2.8m high from ceiling to floor, kitchen room was 3 x 2m with a kitchen single made from stainless steel, single bow double drain. The windows were 8 1.4 x 1.4 m, glazed steel casement.	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 reports dated 3rd March, 2023, 22nd May, 2023 and 23rd May, 2023 written by the project supervisor for the Completion of staff house at Moroto Demonstration primary school. Others were reports on the road's projects for Jie and Lopeduru by the Consultant Ms. Segomu 14 Consults Limited for January, 2023, February, 2023 March, 2023 and April, 2023 among those on file, to show that th LG provided supervision by the relevant technical officers of each infrastructure project.	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 a payment claim raised by the contractor Riwoko Construction company limited on 21st June, 2023 of Ugx 3,852,547/=, it was certified on 22nd June, 2023 by the Municipal Engineer, Environment officer, Principal education officer and CDO, was paid Ugx 3,621,394/= on 28th June, 2023 Voucher no. 6441513.	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

Procurement files reviewed were;

Project 1: Completion of construction of Urban staff house at Moroto Demonstration Primary School

Procurement ref: Moro722/wrks/2022-2023/00001, with these documents;

- Signed works contract dated 17th February, 2023 with Nomak Investments limited

- Evaluation report dated 27th September, 2022

- Contracts Committee minutes dated 28th September, 2022 where the contract was awarded

- PP1, call for bids, best evaluated bidder, bid offer and acceptance letters, completion certificates and records for payment among document on file.

Project 2: Renovation of office at Administration block

Procurement Ref: Moro722/wrks/2022-2023/00002, had the following documents;

- Signed works contract on 9th march, 2023 with Ms. Riwoko construction company limited

- Contracts Committee minutes dated 15th February, 2023 in which the contract was approved in Min25/CC/Feb/2022-2023

- Evaluation report dated 7th February, 2023

- PP1, call for bids, best evaluated bidder, bid offer and acceptance letters, completion certificates and records for payment among document on file

1

Environment and Social Safeguards

14

Grievance redress mechanism operational.

Maximum 5 points on this performance measure

a. Evidence that the District/Municipality has i) designated a person to coordinate response to feedback (grievance /complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), with optional co-option of relevant departmental heads/staff as relevant.

Score: 2 or else score 0

The Municipality i) designated Ms. Akwaso Sarah the Principal CDO with an appointment letter issued on 6th March, 2014 to coordinate response to feedback (grievance/complaints) and ii) established a centralized Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) comprising of Ms. Lomise Florence the Senior Assessment Town Clerk, Mr. Angella Zachary the Environment Officer and Mrs. Debo Annet the Law Enforcement Officer appointment letters issued on 30th May, 2014.

2

14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	b. The LG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a centralized complaints log with clear information and reference for onward action (a defined complaints referral path), and public display of information at district/municipal offices. If so: Score 2 or else 0	There was a complaints log book for recording grievances and a signage public display of the grievances referral information at municipal offices. For example, the log book had records of complaints recorded on 19th December, 2022 by Skystar Boutique located along the Upgraded Jie and Lopeduru roads works from the effects of the dust raised by the trucks carrying debris and it was resolved that the contractor complies to social safeguards by sprinkling water to minimize the dust effect.	2
14	Grievance redress mechanism operational. Maximum 5 points on this performance measure	c. District/Municipality has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress. If so: Score 1 or else 0	The Municipality had a signage public display of the grievances referral information at road leading to the municipal offices that directs the community so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress.	1
15	Safeguards for service delivery of investments effectively handled. Maximum 11 points on this performance measure	a. Evidence that Environment, Social and Climate change interventions have been integrated into LG Development Plans, annual work plans and budgets complied with: Score 1 or else score 0	There was evidence that the Environment, Social and Climate change interventions were integrated into MCDP, AWP and budgets complied with as elaborated below; Municipality Wetland planning regulation and promotion, Tree planting and afforestation, Forestry regulation and inspection, River bank and wetland, Monitoring and evaluation of environment compliance, Land management services as per MCDP III page 74 to 79, Annual work plan page 11, Approved Budget Page 40. .	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 of dissemination to LLGs of enhanced USMID Guidelines. A meeting held on 10th August 2022 in the Town Clerk Office under MIN no MMC/TPC/08/2022/0G. The minutes were endorsed by the Chairperson Longole Gideon on 10th August 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	The Municipality did not prepare costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) despite the fact that screening had been carried out for the following DDEG projects below i) construction of a Council Hall and ii) fencing and beautification of Mayor's gardens. And also for the USMID projects as listed below i) Upgrade of Jie and Lopeduru roads to Bitumen Standard ii) Renovation of Main Office Block	0
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 that had been budgeted for the respective FY 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	The Fencing of North Division Offices funded under DDEG as well as the Renovation of the Main Office Block funded under USMID were located on land with proof of ownership of a certificate of title issued on 21st July, 2017 with Instrument No. 00031659 at Block(Road) IDRO ROAD, Plot 17-23	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	<p>There was evidence of monitoring reports availed as support supervision and monitoring by the Environment Officer and CDO as listed below however, the absence of all the respective ESMPs that provided the basis for the mitigation measures to be monitored to ascertain compliance makes the reports not credible. Below are some of the monitoring reports availed at the time of assessment;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Report on monitoring and evaluation of environment, health and social safeguard measures in the completion of Council hall at South Division offices dated 29th April, 2022, 30th June, 2022 and 31st May, 2022 2. Report on monitoring and evaluation of environment, health and social safeguard measures in the fencing and beautification of Mayor's gardens dated 30th June, 2022, 29th July, 2022 and 31st August, 2022 3. Report on monitoring and evaluation of environment, health and social safeguard measures in the construction of Urban staff house- Phase V at Moroto Demonstration school dated 25th February, 2022, 31st March, 2022 and 29th April, 2022. 	0
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	<p>The Environmental Officer and CDO did not complete and sign the certification forms prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects for example;</p> <p>Interim payment certificate No. 2 issued on 22nd June, 2023 for the Completion of teachers' house at Moroto Demonstration primary school</p> <p>Interim payment certificate No.1 issued on 22nd June, 2023 for the extension of the school fence at Moroto Demonstration primary school</p> <p>Final payment certificate issued on 23 June, 2023 for the completion of teachers' house at Moroto demonstration primary school</p>	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>Score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the MC 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>A/c name: MOROTO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL GE</p> <p>A/c No: 6310500004</p> <p>Bank Name: Centenary Rural Development Bank</p> <p>Reconciled up to 31st October 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 52,564,230.</p> <p>A/c name: MOROTO MC YOUTH LIVELIHOOD</p> <p>A/c No: 6312100002</p> <p>Bank Name: Centenary Rural Development Bank</p> <p>Reconciled up to 31st October 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 487,650.</p> <p>A/c name: MOROTO MUNICIPALITY COUNCIL UWEP RE</p> <p>A/c No: 3100046768</p> <p>Bank Name: Centenary Rural Development Bank Limited</p> <p>Reconciled up to 30th September 2023</p> <p>Amount; Ugx 19,709,315.</p>
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 MC produced all quarterly internal audit (IA) reports for the previous FY as shown below;</p> <p>1st quarter report was produced on 29th October 2022</p> <p>2nd quarter report was produced on 27th January 2023</p> <p>3rd quarter report was produced on 28th April 2023</p> <p>4th quarter report was produced on 27th July 2023</p>

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has provided information to the Council/ chairperson and the LG PAC on the status of implementation of internal audit findings for the previous FY i.e. information on follow up on audit queries from all quarterly audit reports.</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the IA reports for the previous FY were submitted to Town clerk and LG PAC as per the acknowledgment of the reports by the secretaries on the stated date;</p> <p>1st quarter report was received on 29th October 2022.</p> <p>2nd quarter report was received on 27th January 2023.</p> <p>3rd quarter report was received on 28th April 2023.</p> <p>4th quarter report was received on 27th July 2023.</p>	1
----	--	---	--	----------

17	<p>LG executes the Internal Audit function in accordance with the LGA Section 90</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. Evidence that internal audit reports for the previous FY were submitted to LG Accounting Officer, LG PAC and that LG PAC has reviewed them and followed-up:</p> <p>Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no LG PAC minutes presented at the time of assessment showing that the internal audit reports for previous FY were discussed.</p>	0
----	--	--	--	----------

Local Revenues

18	<p>LG has collected local revenues as per budget (collection ratio)</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. If revenue collection ratio (the percentage of local revenue collected against planned for the previous FY (budget realization) is within +/- 10 %: then score 2 or else score 0.</p>	<p>The LG planned revenue collection for the last FY was Ushs 381,298,840 (Final draft Accounts FY 2022/23 page 33) and the Actual Revenue collected was Ushs 259,816,220 which gave a variance of Ushs 121,482,620 this indicates that Municipal over collected local revenue which indicate good performance.</p> <p>$(256,816,220/381,298,840) \times 100\% = 67\%$.</p> <p>The LG managed to correct 67% of its planned revenue, this indicate positive results.</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 33 was;</p> <p>OSR 2021/22</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 163,058,071</p> <p>OSR 2022/23</p> <p>Total revenue = Ushs 259,816,220</p> <p>Therefore</p> <p>Revenue 2022/23 Less revenue 2021/22</p> <p>Ushs 259,816,220- Ushs 163,058,071= Ushs 96,758,149</p> <p>= (96,758,149/259,816,220) x 100= 13%</p> <p>Therefore, the OSR for FY 2022/23 increased by 13%.</p>	2
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 Municipality remitted the mandatory LLG share of local revenue .The shareable revenue of Ugx 100,525,289 was transferred as required to the LLGs as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. South Division received Ushs 32,901,383 2. North Division received Ushs 67,623,906 	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 to show that the LG shares information with citizens one such note read</p> <p>“Best evaluated bidder</p> <p>Procurement reference: Moro722/wrks/2022-2023/00003</p> <p>subject of procurement: Fencing of North Division offices</p> <p>Method of procurement: selective national bidding</p> <p>Best evaluated bidder Glotech Consults International limited</p> <p>Total contract price: Ugx 40,658,850 V.A.T Inclusive</p> <p>Date of display: 15th February, 2023</p> <p>Date of removal: 2nd March, 2023”</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 MC had publicized the USMID results on the notice board on 30th April 2023 and copy was witnessed on municipality notice board.</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>There was no evidence provided at the time of the assessment.</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, ii) collection procedures, and iii) procedures for appeal stamp dated on 23rd June 2023 by the Senior Accountant on the notice board.</p>	1

22

Reporting to IGG

Maximum 1 point on
this Performance
Measure

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

There was no IGG issues reported in the Previous FY 2022/23.

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 was considered because 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= $(793/918) \times 100 = 86.38$</p> <p>% Decline = $86.38 - 89.38 = -3$</p> <p>However the municipality senior education officer could not provide separate results of the municipality from those of the district at the time of assessment.</p>	0

1

Learning Outcomes:
The LG has improved
PLE and USE pass
rates.

Maximum 7 points on
this performance
measure

b) The LG UCE pass rate has
improved between the previous
school year but one and the
previous year

- If improvement by more than
5% score 3
- Between 1 and 5% score 2
- No improvement score 0

School year 2020, was considered
because school year 2021 did not
have PLE results.

Total No. of candidates registered
was=199

Total absentees were =2

Total that sat were (199 - 2) =197

Total Grades (1,2&3) = 8+40
+64=112

% Pass rate = $112/197 \times 100$
=56.85%

School year 2022

Total No. of registered candidates
was = 208

Total absentees were =2

Total that sat were (208 - 2) =206

Total grades (1,2& 3)= 14 +52 +66
=132

% pass rate= $132/206 \times 100$
= 64.07

% improvement = $64.07 -$
 $56.85 = 7.22\%$

1

2

N23_Service Delivery
Performance: Increase
in the average score in
the education LLG
performance
assessment.

Maximum 2 points

a) Average score in the education
LLG performance has improved
between the previous year but
one and the previous year

- By more than 5%, score 2
- Between 1 and 5%, score 1
- No Improvement, score 0

NB: If the previous average score
was 95% and above, Score 2 for
any increase.

The average score of education LLG
performance increased by 1%
compared to the last year as per the
computation below;

The average score for the current
year was 85%.

The average score for the previous
financial year was 84%.

Percentage change = Current
percentage less previous
percentage over old percentage.

= $(0.85 - 0.84/0.84) \times 100\% = 1\%$.

The Education LLG performance
assessment for the current year
increased by 1% from the previous
year's performance.

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	a) If the education development grant has been used on eligible activities as defined in the sector guidelines: score 2; Else score 0	Moroto Municipality did receive SFG for FY Ugx 108,000,000 2022/2023. was used towards;	2
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Phase 5 construction of Urban Staff House at Moroto Demonstration School at Ushs 62,692,485. 2. Extension and Completion of Fence at Moroto Demonstration School at Ushs 37,829,000. 	
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines	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	Certification of works by the DEO, Environment Officer and CDO was not completed and adhered to prior to implementation of the Education construction projects in the previous FY before the Municipality made payments to the contractors for example;	0
	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interim Payment certificate No. 2 issued on 22nd June, 2023 for the Completion of teachers' house at Moroto Demonstration primary school 2. Interim Payment certificate No. 1 issued on 22nd June, 2023 for the extension of the school fence at Moroto Demonstration primary school 3. Final payment certificate issued on 23 June, 2023 for the completion of teachers' house at Moroto Demonstration primary school 	

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
these one was -1.92% which was
within +/- 20% acceptable variance
while the other two where +36.98%

Project 1 Completion of construction
of an Urban staff house at Moroto
Demonstration primary school

Procurement ref: Moro
722/wrks/2022-2023/00001

Project 2: Extension of fence at
Moroto Demonstration primary
school

Procurement ref:
Moro722/wrks/2022-2023/00005

Project 3: Additional works for
extension of the fence at Moroto
Demonstration primary school

Procurement ref: Moro
722/wrks/2022-2023.

Project: 1

Estimated cost: Ugx 98,637,000/=

Contract cost: Ugx 62,153,130/=

Variation: Ugx 36,483,870/=

%age variation (
 $36,483,870/98,637,000$) x 100%
= +36.98%

Project: 2

Estimated cost: Ugx 36,483,870/=

Contract Cost: Ugx 29,087,040/=

Variation cost: Ugx 7,369,830/=

%age variation
 $(7,369,830/36,483,870)$ x100%

20.27%

Project: 3

Estimated cost: Ugx 5,204,100/=

Contract cost: Ugx 5,304,100/=

Variation: Ugx -100,000/=

%age variation $(-100,000/5,204,100)$
x 100%= -1.92%

3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed education projects as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>d) Evidence that education projects (Seed Secondary Schools) were completed as per the work plan in the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>There was no Seed Secondary School implemented in the Municipal, in the year under review.</p>	2
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG has recruited primary school teachers as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100%: score 3 • If 80 - 99%: score 2 • If 70 - 79% score: 1 • Below 70% score 0 	<p>1. Moroto municipal council current primary Teacher's staff list dated 13th August, 2023 indicated a total of 59 teachers posted in the 5 UPE schools which was 98.3% as per the prescribed MoES staffing guidelines.</p> <p>59×100</p> <p>60</p> <p>= 98.3%</p> <p>This implied that the municipality was only 1.7% less of the required UPE teachers</p>	3
4	<p>Achievement of standards: The LG has met prescribed school staffing and infrastructure standards</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Percent of schools in LG that meet basic requirements and minimum standards set out in the DES guidelines,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 70% and above score: 3 • If between 60 - 69%, score: 2 • If between 50 - 59%, score: 1 • Below 50 score: 0 	<p>The Moroto municipality Consolidated Assets register for 2022/2023 that captured assets for the 5 registered primary schools was in place consisting of the following ; 78 classrooms, 70 latrine stances, 798 desks, 66 teachers houses and no laboratories' prepared by Lokiru Andrew Municipal inspector of schools and approved by the Senior education officer Ms. Illukol Rose .</p> <p>This implied that 100% met the DES basic requirements and minimum standards of compiling the assets register in the recommended format</p> <p>5×100</p> <p>5</p> <p>= 100%</p>	3

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>The municipal council deployment list dated 14th July,2023 consisted of 59 primary school teachers. The LG accurately reported on the teachers and the respective schools where they were posted and serving.</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>The MLG teacher's deployment list from the MEO'S office dated 14th July 2023 matched that found at the schools visited for assessment For instance:</p>	
			<p>At Nakapelimen primary school taken as semi -urban had 10 teachers listed and posted inside the head teacher's office and were on ground with Logit Michael as the head teacher which matched clearly with that of the MEO list..</p>	
			<p>Moroto municipal Primary School taken as urban School had 14 teachers with Engwau Daniel Animal as head teacher also matched well with the SEO's list at the MLG..</p>	
			<p>Moroto Prison primary school taken as rural had 8 teachers the head teacher Ms. .Italina Logwe. The list also matched well with that of SEO at the MLG..</p>	
			<p>This implied that the accuracy of teachers deployment as per sampled schools was at $3/3 \times 100 = 100\%$.</p>	
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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the accuracy of information is 100% score 2 • Else score: 0 	<p>Evidence indicated that the municipal council had recorded school assets registers that provided a detailed account of the infrastructure in all 5 UPE schools as captured below;</p>	2
	<p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Moroto municipal primary school taken as urban had 39 classrooms, 300 desks, 37 stances of latrines and 36 teachers houses .</p>	
			<p>Nakapelimen primary school taken as semi- urban had 8 classrooms 7 latrine stances, 125 desks & 4 teacher's houses.</p>	
			<p>Moroto prison primary school taken as rural had the following assets in place 6 classrooms, 74 desks, 10 latrine stances & 2 teachers houses</p>	
			<p>$3/3 \times 100 = 100\%$</p>	

6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% school submission to LG, score: 4 • Between 80 - 99% score: 2 • Below 80% score 0 	<p>There was evidence that Head teachers in the schools visited to complied with the MoES annual budgeting and reporting guidelines;</p> <p>Moroto municipal primary school(urban)</p> <p>Primary school had budgeted for the whole calendar year 2023 dated 27th January, 2023 with clear cash flow statements signed by the Ag SMC chairperson Rev - Logit Emmanuel and an asset register having 39 classrooms, 37 latrine stances, 300 desks and 36 teachers houses.</p> <p>Nakapelimen primary school taken as semi urban primary school had minutes of planning by the SMC dated 8th January, 2023 clearly indicating the annual budget and cash flow .signed by the head teacher and SMC chairperson Ms. Angorerel Mary.</p> <p>Moroto prison primary school equally had the necessary annual budget for only term one of the 2023 calendar year which had been signed by the chairperson SMC Ms. Teko Lilly on 7thFebruary,2023 as per report</p> <p>$3/3 \times 100 = 100\%$</p>	4
6	<p>School compliance and performance improvement:</p> <p>Maximum 12 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) UPE schools supported to prepare and implement SIPs in line with inspection recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 50% score: 4 • Between 30- 49% score: 2 • Below 30% score 0 	<p>There was evidence seen to prove that LG had supported Schools in the preparation and implementation of SIPs.</p> <p>At schools visited, there were inspection feedback reports that pointed out recommendations of inspections signed by the Inspector and Head teachers where the Head teachers were agreeing to implement the recommendations.</p> <p>From the sampled and visited Schools;</p> <p>Moroto municipal primary school</p> <p>In a SIP plan dated 8th February,2023</p> <p>Had achieved the following together with the municipal education office;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -sensitizing parents on the back to school campaigns and EMIS registration. - informing parents of the role of the 	4

SMC and PTA and how they can be utilised.

- Refresher trainings for teachers and paying teachers in time among others.

Nakapelimen primary school the municipal education office supported in implementing SIPS in a report dated 8th February 2023 such as;

- Deployment of more teachers thus beefing up the man power.

- Guiding the school community in setting up demonstration gardens.

- Providing a functional SMC

- Inspecting and guiding teachers in the teaching and learning process.

Moroto Prison primary school SIPS in place involved the following:

- Sensitization of parent abo the advantages of education.

- Improving of hygiene in the school with the help of UNICEF.

- Mentoring teachers and administration in leadership and management.

- This indicated: $3/3 \times 100 = 100$

6

School compliance and performance improvement:

Maximum 12 points on this performance measure

c) If the LG has collected and compiled EMIS return forms for all registered schools from the previous FY year:

- If 100% score: 4:
- Between 90 - 99% score 2
- Below 90% score 0

The education office had submitted 5,309 pupils by 28th February,2023

2

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>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: Score 4 or else, score: 0</p>	<p>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: The budget was 1,756,147,000/=.</p>	4
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
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>b) Evidence that the LG has deployed teachers as per sector guidelines in the current FY, Score 3 else score: 0</p>	<p>The MLG deployed 59 teachers as per sector guidelines according to the staff lists seen at the time of assessment. There was a teacher deployed at least per school as in the examples provided below; Moroto Municipal Primary School taken as urban school had 14 teachers. Head teacher was Engwau Daniel Animal. Nakapelimen primary school taken as semi urban had 10 teachers. head teacher as Logit Michael, and Moroto Prison Primary School taken as -semi urban had 08 teachers. Head teacher as Italina Logwe</p>	3
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			
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>c) If teacher deployment data has been disseminated or publicized on LG and or school notice board, score: 1 else, score: 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of dissemination at the time of assessment both in the schools and at the municipal notice board circular was dated 1st November, 2023 and 6th February, 2023 for the 3 schools visited</p>	1
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>			

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>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>There was no evidence provided by the HR department that primary school headteachers were appraised for the previous school year. The head teachers were;</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Engwau Daniel Animal 2. Ationo Lillian 3. Okiror Charles 4. Echor Ananiahs 	
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>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>No appraisals were provided for secondary school head teachers and there was no evidence of appraisal reports submitted to HRM. The justification provided was that the Secondary school teachers were appraised by MOES.</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>Score: 2 or else, score: 0</p>		
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>c) If all staff in the LG Education department have been appraised against their performance plans</p>	<p>The HR department did not provide any appraisals for the Education Department staff. However,</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>score: 2. Else, score: 0</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr Lokir William Isura Senior Education Officer retired on 2nd July 2022, he was replaced by Ilukol Rose Peggy Nakoru who was appointed on 8th June 2023 and was not yet eligible for appraisal. 2. Mr Okiru Hillary. Inspector of Schools retired on 18th June 2022, he was replaced by Lokir Andrew who was appointed on 8th June 2023 and was not yet eligible for appraisal. 	

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>There was no evidence provided by the HR department that the Municipality had prepared a training plan to address identified staff capacity gaps at the school and LG level</p>	0
---	--	--	--	----------

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>There was no evidence that 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>	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>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>The plan for inspection was seen well prepared as per sector guidelines for all terms. It was dated 20th November 2023 with a budget attached of UGX; 8,828,160 and UGX:7,813,512 as monitoring grant for the municipal education officer From a municipal circular dated 10th August, 2023</p>	2

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

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

The Municipal did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:

- 1st Quarter was released on 2nd July, 2022 and warranted on 8th August, 2022 which was more than 5 days.
- 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 18th October, 2022 after 15 days.
- 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 2nd January, 2023 which was within 5 days.
- 4th Quarter MC didn't receive school capitation.

0

9

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

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

d) Evidence that the LG has invoiced and the DEO/ MEO has communicated/ publicized capitation releases to schools within three working days of release from MoFPED.

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

The Municipal did not do timely invoicing/communication (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:

Quarter 1 funds were released on 2nd July 2022 and the communication was made on 2nd August 2022 which was more than 5 days.

Quarter 2 funds were released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 12 October 2022 which was more than 5 days.

Quarter 3 funds were released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 5th January 2023 which was within 5 days.

0

10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that the LG Education department has prepared an inspection plan and meetings conducted to plan for school inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% compliance, score: 2, else score: 0 	<p>There was evidence that the Municipal Education Department prepared an inspection plan for schools in the municipal council in a letter addressed to the town clerk on 23rd September 2023.</p> <p>Planning meeting had been held on 22nd September,2023 with the following action plans,</p> <p>The inspection for term III 2023 was to take 5 days from 6th October,2023 to 16th October 2023 for UPE and non USE schools.</p> <p>To assess the general conditions in the schools.</p> <p>To assess teacher presence and absenteeism. It was attended by 4 inspectors as for term 2 and 1 there was no evidence seen at the time of assessment.</p>	2
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Percent of registered UPE schools that have been inspected and monitored, and findings compiled in the DEO/MEO's monitoring report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score: 2 • Between 80 - 99% score 1 • Below 80%: score 0 	<p>Evidence indicated that 5 schools had been inspected in a report dated 19th September,2023 prepared by Ms. Illukor Rose the senior education officer and Andrew Lokiru the municipal inspector of schools these were basically inspections for term I2023 planned from 30th march -6th April,2023.</p> <p>Term 11 from 8th June,2023 to 13th June,2023 and term 111 from 26th August,2023 to 4th September 2023.</p> <p>$5/5 \times 100 = 100\%$</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>The assessment team observed that inspection reports were discussed at both the school level and the municipal council level, following the sector guidelines. The inspection team came up with recommendations that were to be implemented as school improvement plans in the schools respectively these were discussed in a meeting that took place on 11thOctober,2023 this was an analysis for all the reports on inspection for all terms.</p>	2

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 no evidence of submission and acknowledgement by the Directorate of Education Standards or receiving the Inspection findings from Moroto Municipal council presented at the time of assessment.</p>	0
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 20th September 2022 at the Public Library where at least 7 members were present. Under Min no MIN 5/WTC/09/2022. Under Education, below were the recommendations by the committee;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The parents to take part in the development and mobilization of students and pupils in schools. 2. The contractor of the teacher's house in demonstration ensures work is properly done. 3. The committee recommended the head of department's t protect the land and properties of the school to avoid encroachment and diversions. 	2

11

Mobilization of parents to attract learners

Maximum 2 points on this performance measure

Evidence that the LG Education department has conducted activities to mobilize, attract and retain children at school,
score: 2 or else score: 0

There was evidence that the municipal council education department conducted activities to mobilise, attract and retain children in school called "Go back to school" campaign in all the 5 schools of the municipality

Evidence of sensitization dissemination conducted were;

- On 24th August,2023 during MDD festivals of Moroto Municipal Primary School Senior Education Officer Mrs. Illukor Rose put a lot of emphasis on education and its benefits to the country and the individual.
- On 5th October,2023 during the teachers day celebration the crowds that had been attracted to the teachers parade were encouraged to take their children to school.
- During sports activities at the division for instance this September 2023, the senior education officer always asks for a platform to emphasize back to school campaigns. There was no evidence presented for term 1& 2 at the time of assessment.

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a) Evidence that there is an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out school facilities and equipment relative to basic standards, <i>score: 2, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>During the assessment, an asset register dated 18th September, 2023 was provided by the Municipal Education Department. This register contained asset data for all the 5 UPE schools in the municipality .</p> <p>Consisting of the following ; 78 classrooms, 70 latrine stances, 798 desks, 66 teachers houses and no laboratories' prepared by Lokiru Andrew municipal inspector of schools and approved by the Senior education officer Ms. Illukol Rose . The visited schools had the following captured as their assets;</p> <p>Moroto municipal primary school taken as urban had 39 classrooms, 300 desks, 37 stances of latrines and 36 teachers houses .</p> <p>Nakapelimen primary school taken as semi- urban had 8 classrooms 7 latrine stances, 125 desks & 4 teacher's houses.</p> <p>Moroto primary school taken as rural had the following assets in place 6 classrooms, 74 desks, 10 latrine stances & 2 teachers houses</p>	2
12	<p>Planning and budgeting for investments</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG has conducted a desk appraisal for all sector projects in the budget to establish whether the prioritized investment is: (i) derived from the LGDP 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></p>	<p>There was evidence of conducting desk appraisal on 18th 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 MCDP III page 64 as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Phase 5 construction of Urban Staff House at Moroto Demonstration School at Ushs 62,692,485 and it was recommended for field appraisal 2. Extension and Completion of Fence at Moroto Demonstration School at Ushs 37,829,000 and it was recommended for field appraisal. <p>The Desk Appraisal report was Endorsed by the Senior Planner.</p>	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 Phase 5 construction of Urban Staff House at Moroto Demonstration School. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 27th August 2021.</p> <p>Field appraisal Extension and Completion of Fence at Moroto Demonstration School. Impacts and mitigation measures identified and recommended for funding as per the form and the project was appraised on 27th August 2021</p> <p>All field appraisal forms were Signed by Municipal Planner, CDO and Municipal Engineer.</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, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>The LG education department had budgeted for and ensured that planned sector infrastructure projects had been approved and incorporated into the procurement plan. The plan was approved on 24th July ,2023 by the,TC, Eyaru Richard. The education item was for renovation of a classroom block at Kakoliye Muslim primary school.</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, score: 1, else score: 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that the school infrastructure was approved by the Contracts Committee before the commencement of construction.</p>	0

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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></p>	<p>There was no evidence that the LG properly established the project implementation team (PIT) for school construction projects constructed within the last FY as per guidelines. The letter written by the Town clerk dated 17th April 2023 only named;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Odongo Emmanuel-Assistant Engineering officer- Contract supervisor 2. Logir Joshua Loumo- Municipal Engineer- contract manager <p>However, the CDO, Environment Officer and Clerk of Works as well as Labour Officer, were not included.</p>	0
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>d) Evidence that the school infrastructure followed the standard technical designs provided by the MoES</p> <p><i>Score: 1, else, score: 0</i></p>	<p>There was evidence that the infrastructure followed standard technical designs, this was confirmed at Moroto Demonstration primary school during inspection of the works from where it was noted that the internal dimension was bedrooms 3 x 2.9 m, 2.8 m high from ceiling to floor, kitchen room was 3 x 2 m with a kitchen single made from stainless steel, single bow double drain. The windows were 8 1.4 x 1.4 m, glazed steel casement.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e) Evidence that monthly site meetings were conducted for all sector infrastructure projects planned in the previous FY <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There were reports dated 22nd May, 2023 and 23rd May, 2023 written by the project supervisor that indicated monthly site meetings were held.</p>	1
13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution</p> <p><i>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>f) If there's evidence that during critical stages of construction of planned sector infrastructure projects in the previous FY, at least 1 monthly joint technical supervision involving engineers, environment officers, CDOs etc .., has been conducted <i>score: 1, else score: 0</i></p>	<p>There were reports dated 3rd March, 2023 and 20th April, 2023 that showed there was joint technical supervisor, involving engineers, environment officers and CDO.</p>	1

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. 6434994 dated 28th June 2023 for the Completion of the construction of Teachers House at Demonstration Primary School by Nomak Investment Ltd was initiated on 20th June 2023 and payments were made on 28th June 2023 which was within 10 working days of processing the payment. 2. Voucher no. 6440070 dated 30th June 2023 for the Extension of the Fence at Moroto Demonstration Primary School at Ushs 31,382,596 by Utokoi Enterprises Limited was initiated on 22nd June 2023 and paid on 30th June 2023 which was within 10 working days of processing the payment. 	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>The education department timely submitted a procurement plan in accordance with the PPDA requirements to the procurement unit by April 30th as this was done on the 24th April, 2023.</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>Procurement files reviewed were;</p> <p>Project 1: Extension of fencing at Moroto Demonstration primary school.</p> <p>Procurement ref: Moro722/wrks/2022-2023/00005, had these documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed works contract dated 17th April, 2023 with Ms Utokoi enterprises limited • Contracts Committee decision which sat on 22nd March, 2023. • PP1, call for bids, best evaluated bidder, bid offer and acceptance letters, among document on file. <p>Project 2: Construction of guard house at Moroto Demonstration Primary School</p> <p>Project Ref: Moro722/wrks/2022-2023/00007, with;</p>	1

- Signed works contract on 8th June, 2023 with Ms. Utokoi Enterprises limited

- Contracts Committee minutes date 6th June, 2023

- Evaluation report dated 5th June, 2023

- PP1, call for bids, best evaluated bidder, bid offer and acceptance letters, completion certificates and records for payment among document on file.

Project 3: Completion of construction of Urban staff house at Moroto demonstration primary school

Procurement ref: Moro722/wrks/2022-2023/00001, with these documents;

- Signed works contract dated 17th February, 2023 with Nomak Investments limited

- Evaluation report dated 27th September, 2022

- Contracts Committee minutes dated 28th September, 2022 were the contract was awarded

- PP1, call for bids, best evaluated bidder, bid offer and acceptance letters, completion certificates and records for payment among document on file.

Environment and Social Safeguards

14

Grievance redress: LG Education grievances have been recorded, investigated, and responded to in line with the LG grievance redress framework.

Maximum 3 points on this performance measure

Evidence that grievances have been recorded, investigated, responded to and recorded in line with the grievance redress framework, score: 3, else score: 0

There was evidence of a log book with records on grievances and handling in line with the grievance redress framework however, the previous FY did not attract records on grievances arising out of project works and or implementation.

3

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>	There was evidence of a guideline on environment management but there was no proof on dissemination the Education guidelines.	0
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 and avail costed ESMPs for all projects within the Education sector however, the reviewed BoQs have provisions of safeguard requirements integrated for example, the priced BoQs for the construction of the urban staff house at Moroto Demonstration primary school -Phase 5 Bill. No.1 under preliminaries item 4, 5, 8 and 10 as environment and social mitigation measures costed at UGX. 3,050,000.	2
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 no proof of land ownership, or access of school construction projects at the time of assessment.	0
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>	There was evidence of monitoring reports availed as support supervision and monitoring by the Environment Officer and CDO as listed below however, the absence of all the respective ESMPs that provided the basis for the mitigation measures to be monitored to ascertain compliance makes the reports not credible. Below are some of the monitoring reports availed at the time of assessment; 1. Report on monitoring and evaluation of environment, health and social safeguard measures in the construction of Urban staff house- Phase V at Moroto Demonstration school dated 25th February, 2022, 31st March, 2022 and 29th April, 2022.	0

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 Environmental Officer and CDO did not complete and sign the certification forms prior to payments of contractors' invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects for example;

Interim payment certificate No. 2 issued on 22nd June, 2023 for the Completion of teachers' house at Moroto Demonstration primary school

Interim payment certificate No.1 issued on 22nd June, 2023 for the extension of the school fence at Moroto Demonstration primary school

Final payment certificate issued on 23 June, 2023 for the completion of teachers' house at Moroto demonstration primary school.

**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>Moroto Municipal Council has no HCIV and HCIII. The Municipal Council has only two Health Centre IIs (DMOS Clinic HCII and Nakapelimen HCII) which provide institution deliveries.</p> <p>From the annual HMIS reports 107 of the 2 Health facilities, the deliveries for DMOS Clinic HCII and Nakapelimen HCII were 65 and 260 respectively for FY 2021/22 and 61 and 179 respectively for FY2022/23. The total delivery attendance during FY2021/22 was 325 and whereas for FY2022/23 was 240.</p> <p>This represented -26.2% decrease in total deliveries.</p> <p>The feedback from MMOH office indicated that the decrease in delivery was as a result of insecurity caused by frequent attack of the community around the health facilities by the warriors in the previous FY.</p>	0
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 60% as per the OPAMS.</p>	1
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 program incorporated into PHC as per MOH 's 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.	No projects were implemented under Health in the previous FY 2022/23.	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	No projects were implemented under Health in the previous FY 2022/23.	2
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	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	There was no project implemented in the district in the FY 2022/2023	2
3	Investment performance: The LG has managed health projects as per guidelines.	d. Evidence that the health sector investment projects implemented in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of the FY • If 100 % Score 2 • Between 80 and 99% score 1 • less than 80 %: Score 0	There was no health facility upgrade in the Municipality that was carried out in the year under review.	2
Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	Maximum 8 points on this performance measure	

4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	a. Evidence that the LG has recruited staff for all HCIIIs and HCIVs as per staffing structure	At the time of assessment, the Municipality had deployed 26 Health workers, however the HR department did not provide a copy of the approved structure for HHealth Facilities.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If above 90% score 2 • If 75% - 90%: score 1 • Below 75 %: score 0 		
4	Achievement of Standards: The LG has met health staffing and infrastructure facility standards	b. Evidence that the LG health infrastructure construction projects meet the approved MoH Facility Infrastructure Designs.	There was no health facility upgrade implemented in the Municipality, during the year under review.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100 % score 2 or else score 0 		

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information	a. Evidence that information on positions of health workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	There was evidence that the information on positions of health workers filled for DMOS Clinic HCII and Nakapelimen HCII was accurate as indicated below.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		<p>DMOS Clinic HCII had 13 staff (MMOH 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>Nakapelimen HCII had 9 staff (MMOH facility staff list). This was corresponding to the actual number of staff on the facility staff list at noticeboard and confirmed staff deployed on site).</p>	
5	Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG maintains and reports accurate information	b. Evidence that information on health facilities upgraded or constructed and functional is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Moroto Municipal Council did not receive any Health facility upgrade in the previous FY.	2
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		<p>Similarly the Municipal Council did not receive any grant to implement construction projects.</p> <p>All the two health facilities (DMOS Clinic HCII and Nakapelimen HCII) were functional at the time of assessment.</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>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 DMOS Clinic HCII and Nakapelimen HCII prepared and submitted annual workplans and budgets to the MMOH for FY 2022/2023. No copies of facility annual work plans and budgets were seen.</p> <p>Therefore, all the 2 health facilities didn't conform to the provided Budget and Grant Guidelines.</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>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 that the two health facilities (DMOS Clinic HCII and Nakapelimen HCII) submitted annual budget performance reports to the MMOH office by July 15th of the current FY as per the required Budget and Grant Guidelines. No copies of Facility Annual Budget Performance Reports were available during 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 implemented Performance Improvement support.</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>There was no evidence to show that the health facilities (DMOS Clinic HCII and Nakapelimen HCII) developed and reported on implementation of facility improvement plans that incorporated performance issues identified in monitoring and assessment reports.</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</p>	<p>d) Evidence that health facilities submitted up to date monthly and quarterly HMIS reports timely (7</p>	<p>The two (2) health facilities (DMOS Clinic HCII and Nakapelimen HCII) submitted all monthly and Quarterly HMIS reports timely. The health facility report submission dates were indicated as prescribed bellow.</p>	2

Performance Improvement: LG has enforced Health Facility Compliance, Result Based Financing and implemented Performance Improvement support.

Maximum 14 points on this performance measure

days following the end of each month and quarter) If 100%,
• score 2 or else score 0

July 2022

DMOS Clinic HCII on 4th August 2022

Nakapelimen HCII on 3rd August 2022

August 2022

DMOS Clinic HCII on 6th September 2022

Nakapelimen HCII on 7th September 2022

September 2022

DMOS Clinic HCII on 6th October 2022

Nakapelimen HCII on 7th October 2022

October 2022

DMOS Clinic HCII on 4th November 2022

Nakapelimen HCII on 7th November 2022

November 2022

DMOS Clinic HCII on 6th December 2022

Nakapelimen HCII on 6th December 2022

December 2022

DMOS Clinic HCII on 5th January 2023

Nakapelimen HCII on 6th January 2023

January 2023

DMOS Clinic HCII on 6th February 2023

Nakapelimen HCII on 7th February 2023

February 2023

DMOS Clinic HCII on 6th March 2023

Nakapelimen HCII on 7th March 2023

March 2023

DMOS Clinic HCII on 5th April 2023

Nakapelimen HCII on 6th April 2023

April 2023

DMOS Clinic HCII on 7th May 2023

Nakapelimen HCII on 5th May 2023

May 2023

DMOS Clinic HCII on 5th June 2023

Nakapelimen HCII on 7th June 2023

June 2023

DMOS Clinic HCII on 6th July 2023

Nakapelimen HCII on 7th July 2023

HMIS 106a (quarterly)

1st Quarter 2022/23

DMOS Clinic HCII on 3rd October 2022

Nakapelimen HCII on 7th October 2022

2nd Quarter 2022/23

DMOS Clinic HCII on 6th January 2023

Nakapelimen HCII on 4th January 2023

3rd Quarter 2022/23

DMOS Clinic HCII on 6th April 2023

Nakapelimen HCII on 6th April 2023

4th Quarter 2022/23

DMOS Clinic HCII on 7th July 2023

Nakapelimen HCII on 6th July 2023

There the two available health facilities (DMOS Clinic HCII and Nakapelimen HCII) submitted monthly and quarterly HMIS reports in accordance to the provided guideline (7 days following the end of every month or the quarter).

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 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

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

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>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 programme was suspended and incorporated with PHC fund</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 Municipal Planner could not track submission date for the QBPRs by the MHO. 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 Municipal Council 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 the LG budgeted for health workers in accordance with staffing norms. The Municipal Council approved wage for health workers for FY2023/24 was Ugx 532,629,000 (Approved budget estimates for Moroto Municipal Council 2023/24-page 26 Vote 722). 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 532,629,134 as indicated on page 98</p> <p>Therefore, Moroto Municipal Council budgeted for health workers as per the guidelines/in accordance with the staffing norms</p>	2
---	---	---	---	---

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>ii. Deployed health workers as per guidelines (all the health facilities to have at least 75% of staff required) in accordance with the staffing norms score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>DMOS Clinic HCII had 13 out of 9 required health workers at HCII, giving over 100% of the required staffing norm for HCII (Confirmed Staff list at DMOS Clinic HCII wall)</p> <p>Nakapelimen HCII had 9 out of 9 required health workers at HCII giving 100% of the required staffing norm for HCII (Confirmed staff list at Nakapelimen HCII noticeboard)</p> <p>Therefore, all the 2 health facilities had over 75% staff deployed at each health at the time of assessment hence Moroto Municipal Council deployed health workers 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

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

There was evidence that the health workers were working in the health facilities they were deployed (as per health staff deployment lists, attendance registers and attendance analysis at the health facilities).

DMOS Clinic HCII: 9 out of 13 health workers deployed to DMOS Clinic HCII were present on duty on the day of assessment. Examples of health workers found working at the health facility on the day of assessment included.

1. Esther Aleper; Enrolled Midwife was present on duty on 13th November 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 16 days in the month of October 2023.

2. Christine Kongai; Enrolled Nurse was present on duty on 13th November 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 20 days in the month of October 2023.

3. Salume Ayeto; Enrolled Midwife was present on duty on 13th November 2023. The facility monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 13 days in the month of October 2023.

(DMOS Clinic HCII staff attendance book 13th November 2023 and Attendance Analysis for health personnel for October 2023).

Nakapelimen HCII: 5 out of 9 staff deployed to the health facility were present on duty on the day of assessment. Examples of health workers found working at the health facility on the day of assessment included;

1. Moses Abura Enrolled Nurse was present on duty on 13th November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 15 days in the month of October 2023

2. Sarah Acen Enrolled Nurse was present on duty on 13th November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 14 days in the month of October 2023

3. Aleper Jesca Enrolled Midwife was present on duty on 13th November 2023 and monthly attendance analysis for health personnel indicated that she was present on duty for 21 days in the month of October 2023

(Nakapelimen HCII staff attendance book 13th November 2023 and Attendance Analysis for health personnel for October 2023).

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 Moroto Municipal Council publicized health worker deployment. Lists of health workers were found displayed on the noticeboard and walls at the two facilities visited.</p> <p>The displayed list of staff at DMOS Clinic HCII on the wall had a total of 13 staff whereas the one displayed at Nakapelimen HCII noticeboard had a total of 9 staff. (DMOS Clinic HCII wall and Nakapelimen HCII noticeboard). These lists were clearly indicated as staff list for FY 2023/24 and were stamped.</p>	2
<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>				
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>The municipality had two HC In-charges and they were appraised as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kongai Christine - Enrolled Nurse, In charge of DMOs HC II was appraised on 10th July 2023 by Lomise Florence Senior Assistant Town Clerk 2. Amoding Salome - Nursing Officer, In charge of Nakapelimen HC II was appraised on 24th June 2023 by Lomise Florence Senior Assistant Town Clerk 	1
<p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>				

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. Longoli Eric Lokuy Enrolled Nurse at Napelimen HC II, was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the In charge
2. Lorot Simon Peter Enrolled Nurse at DMOS Clinic, was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the In charge
3. Onenchan Jozeline Health Assitant at DMOS Clinic, was appraised on 31st July 2023 by Senior Assistant Town Clerk Lomise Florence
4. Natiwi Tibitha Lomongin Clinical Officer at DMOS Clinic, was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the In charge
5. Ayeto Salume Enrolled Midwife at DMOS Clinic, was appraised on 30th June 2023 by the In charge
6. Achen Sarah Enrolled Midwife at Nakapelimen HC II, was appraised on 21st June 2023 by the In charge
7. Aleper Jesca Enrolled Midwife at Nakapelimen HC II, was appraised on 5th July 2023 by the In charge
8. Aleper Esther Enrolled Midwife at Nakapelimen HC II, was appraised on 5th July 2023 by the In charge
9. Akileng Francis Labaratory Technician at Nakapelimen HC II, was appraised on 22nd June 2023 by the In charge
10. Opolot Pius Health Assistant, was appraised on 29th June 2023 by the In charge

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

The Municipality had taken corrective actions based on the appraisal reports. The corrective actions included ART services, and computer skills training.

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b) Evidence that the LG:</p> <p>i. conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at District/MC level, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided by the HR department to show that Moroto Municipal Council conducted training of health workers (Continuous Professional Development) in accordance to the training plans at MLG.</p>	0
---	--	--	---	---

8	<p>Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Health Workers.</p> <p>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>ii. Documented training activities in the training/CPD database, score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided by the HR department to show proof of documented training activities in the training/ Continuous Professional Development database.</p>	0
---	--	---	---	---

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

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>a. Evidence that the CAO/Town Clerk confirmed the list of Health facilities (GoU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants) and notified the MOH in writing by September 30th if a health facility had been listed incorrectly or missed in the previous FY, score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence of the letter written by Town Clerk confirming the list of Health facilities (GOU and PNFP receiving PHC NWR grants was available at the time of assessment</p>	0
---	--	---	--	---

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>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 Approved Budget that on page 27 supervision & monitoring was allocated UGX 19,396,000 and on (page 25) ,PHC non -wage was allocated UGX 33,534,000.</p> <p>As per the computation $19,396,000/33,534,000 \times 100 = 57\%$</p>	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>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 MC did not do timely warranting/verification (within 5 working days) from the date of releases from MoFPED as determined below:</p>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Quarter was released on 2nd July, 2022 and warranted on 8th August, 2022 which was more than 5 days. • 2nd Quarter released on 3rd October, 2022 and warranted on 18th October, 2022 after 15 days. • 3rd Quarter released on 2nd January, 2023 and warranted on 2nd January, 2023 which was within 5 days. • 4th Quarter dates were not prevailed by the Ministry. 	
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>	0
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>		<p>Quarter 1 funds were released on 2nd July 2022 and the communication was made on 2nd August 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 2 funds was released on 3rd October 2022 and the communication was made on 12nd October 2022 which was more than 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 3 funds was released on 2nd January 2023 and the communication was made on 5th January 2023 which was within 5 days.</p> <p>Quarter 4 funds release date was not prevailed by MoFPED however the communication was made by the LG on 18th April 2023 and the time frame could not be established since the date for release of fund is not known.</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>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 Municipal 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
	<p>Maximum 9 points on this performance measure</p>			

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 no evidence that Moroto Municipal Council health department conducted performance review meetings and implemented action (s) recommended by the MHT quarterly performance review meeting(s) held during the previous FY.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. If the LG quarterly performance review meetings involve all health facilities in charges, implementing partners, DHMTs, key LG departments e.g. WASH, Community Development, Education department, score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence provided to show that Moroto Municipal Council conducted quarterly performance review meetings to involve all health facilities in-charges, implementing partners and key LG departments.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.</p> <p>Maximum 7 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>c. If the LG supervised 100% of HC IVs and General hospitals (including PNFPs receiving PHC grant) at least once every quarter in the previous FY (where applicable) : score 1 or else, score 0</p> <p>If not applicable, provide the score</p>	<p>Moroto Municipal Council has no HCIV. The Municipal Council does not supervise General hospital.</p>	1

Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

- If not applicable, provide the score

There was evidence that MHT ensured that Health Sub-Districts (HSDs) carried out support supervision of lower-level health facilities within the previous FY as detailed below.

1st quarter support supervision was conducted on 24th September 2022 to Nakapelimen HCII. (Support supervision Report dated 24th September 2022)

2nd quarter support supervision was carried out on 23rd October 2022 to Nakapelimen HCII and DMOS Clinic HCII (Support Supervision Report dated 2nd October 2023)

3rd quarter support supervision was conducted on 29th January 2023 to Nakapelimen HCII and DMOS Clinic HCII. (Support supervision report dated 29th January 2023)

4th quarter support supervision was conducted on 18th May 2023 to Nakapelimen HCII.(Support supervision report dated 18th May 2023)

Examples of issues raised at DMOS Clinic HCII during 3rd quarter support supervision included no staff appraisals, no display of health facility work plans and PHC utilization. It was recommended that the Incharge should ensure that staff appraisal forms are completed. Secondly the facility Incharge was to ensure display of workplans, budgets and PHC utilization.

Similarly, during 3rd quarter support supervision, the findings at Nakapelimen HCII included absence of TB manual, Standard operating Procedure (SOPS), no TB Screening service in all entry points, underutilization of Gen Expert among others.

10

Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

There was evidence that the MLG used 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.

The 3rd and 4th quarter support supervision reports highlighted poor performances in provision of TB services at Nakapelimen HCII. The key findings detailed in 3rd quarter support supervision report included absence of TB manual, no standard operating procedure (SOPS), no TB Screening service in all entry points, underutilization of Gen Expert among others. Similarly, the 4th quarter support supervision report indicated low TB case detection, no sputum monitoring, no screening of TB in all service entry points.

It was recommended that Nakapelimen HCII intensifies quality screening at all service entry points, do sputum monitoring at 2nd and 6th months, open Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) project at the health facility.

It was observed that Nakapelimen HCII opened up Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) project which started on 18th May 2023 to 30th September 2023 with the objective of increasing the percentage of pulmonary bacteriologically confirmed (PBC) tuberculosis, improve sputum monitoring at 2nd and 6th months from 75% to 100%. The key interventions implemented included follow up on missed appointments, line listing patients due for sputum monitoring among others. (Nakapelimen HCII CQI project Report for 18th May 2023 to 30th September 2023)

1

10

Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands -on support supervision to health facilities.

Maximum 7 points on this performance measure

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

No evidence were seen to show that Moroto Municipal Council provided support to all health facilities in the management of medicines and health supplies, during the previous FY

0

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	A review of the performance report showed that MHO received UGX 183,332,000. A review of the report showed that there was no clear allocation for Health promotion. However, a summary from the payment vouches showed that was 32,999,760 was spent on Health promotion.	0
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		Expressed as a % = $32,999,760 / 183,332,000 \times 100$. This was 18%	
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 Moroto Municipal Council Health Team (MHT) led health promotion, disease prevention and social mobilization activities. The MHT conducted sensitization of caregivers and children on hand washing and hygiene on 29th October 2022 at Moroto CDC in Kakoliye Cell. The <i>activity report dated 31st October 2022</i> was compiled by Opolot Pius, Health Assistant, Southern Division. Similarly, sensitization of caregivers was conducted on food hygiene and sanitation at Moroto CDC in Kakoliye Cell. The <i>activity report dated 19th August 2022</i> was compiled by Opolot Pius, Health Assistant, Southern Division. Additionally, hygiene and sanitation assessment and sensitizations were carried out. The <i>activity report dated 7th June 2023</i> by Opolot Pius, Health Assistant, Southern Division was available.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure			
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 evidence that Moroto Municipal Council MHT followed up on hygiene and sanitation assessments by conducting sensitization of 150 identified households with targeted messages on issues of proper hygiene and sanitation.	1
	Maximum 4 points on this performance measure		The <i>report dated 27th June 2023</i> on hygiene and Sanitation assessment and sensitizations by Opolot Pius, Health Assistant, Southern Division was available.	

Investment Management

12	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments: The LG has carried out Planning and Budgeting for health investments as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the LG has an updated Asset register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards: Score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that Moroto Municipal Council has updated assets register which sets out health facilities and equipment relative to basic standards. Example of assets captured in the register include.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refrigerator for Vaccine engraved MOH/UNEPI/GAVI/HSSII/1441 located at Nakapelimen HCII was in good condition. 2. HP Laptop engraved MOH/UNEPI/UNICEF/607 located at Nakapelimen HCII and was being used by Acen Sarah (Health facility Incharge). 	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 MC did not implement any Health in the last FY 2022/23.</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>c. Evidence that the LG has conducted field Appraisal to check for: (i) technical feasibility; (ii) environment and social acceptability; and (iii) customized designs to site conditions: score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>The MC did not implement any Health in the last FY 2022/23.</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>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>There were no projects in the health sector that had been budgeted for therefore environmental and social risks were no carried out.</p>	1
	<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>The LG department timely by 30th April for 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. This was done on 19th April,2023, it had office stationery, ICT, cleaning materials, maintenance ooffice equipment.</p>	1
	<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 no procurement request, form PP1, submitted by the LG health department to PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY.</p>	0
	<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>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 was no health infrastructure investment implemented in the district in the previous FY.</p>	0
	<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>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 no PIT established in the previous FY, as there was no project implemented.</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 were no project implemented in the district in the year under assessment FY 2022/2023.</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 projects implemented in the year under assesment FY 2022/2023.</p>	1

13	<p>Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed health contracts as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>g. Evidence that the LG held monthly site meetings by project site committee: chaired by the CAO/Town Clerk and comprised of the Sub-county Chief (SAS), the designated contract and project managers, chairperson of the HUMC, in-charge for beneficiary facility , the Community Development and Environmental officers: score 1 or else score 0</p> <p>If there is no project, provide the score</p>	<p>There was no project implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023.</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>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>There was no technical supervision required as there were no projects implemented.</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>i. Evidence that the DHO/MMOH verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes (within 2 weeks or 10 working days), score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no works verified as there were no projects implemented.</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>j. Evidence that the LG has a complete procurement file for each health infrastructure contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were no files to review as there was no project implemented in the previous FY 2022/2023.</p>	1
----	--	---	--	---

Environment and Social Safeguards

14	<p>Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing health sector grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework</p> <p>Maximum 2 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that the Local Government has recorded, investigated, responded and reported in line with the LG grievance redress framework score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence of a log book with records on grievances and handling in line with the grievance redress framework however, the respective financial years of assessment did not attract records on grievances arising out of project works and or implementation within the health sector because no projects had been budgeted or implemented.</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>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 guideline on health care/medical waste management titled "National Micro Planning Handbook for Water, Sanitation and hygiene (WASH) in Healthcare Facilities (HCFs) in Uganda dated June, 2022" that was availed. And a report dated 7th July, 2022 on dissemination of the guidelines on medical waste and healthcare carried out at Nakapelimen HCII and DMOS clinic HCII.</p>	2
15	<p>Safeguards for service delivery: LG Health Department ensures safeguards for service delivery</p> <p>Maximum 5 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>b. Evidence that the LG has in place a functional system for Medical waste management or central infrastructures for managing medical waste (either an incinerator or Registered waste management service provider): score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>The LG had functional system for medical waste management which comprised of incinerators, coded bins for segregating waste in all health units, placenta pits and waste dumping and burning pits for non-wet generated waste.</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 evidence of a report dated 27th June, 2023 on hygiene and sanitation assessment and sensitization that was conducted at at Katanga, Acholi inn, Kakoliye, Natumkaskou, Campswalili chini, Singilla Nakapelimen and Kanakomol zones.</p>	1
16	<p>Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments</p> <p>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</p>	<p>a. Evidence that a costed ESMP was incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents for health infrastructure projects of the previous FY: score 2 or else score 0</p>	<p>There were projects no in the health sector that were implemented and therefore no costed ESMPs prepared for the respective financial years of assessment.</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>Since there were no health sector projects implemented therefore there was no requirement to ascertain land ownership.</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>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>Since there were no health sector projects implemented therefore there was no requirement to ascertain whether the Environment Officer and CDO conducted support supervision and monitoring of health projects.</p>	2

Safeguards in the Delivery of Investment Management: LG Health infrastructure projects incorporate Environment and Social Safeguards in the delivery of the investments

Maximum 8 points on this performance measure

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

There were no projects implemented in the health sector and therefore no certifications were carried out.

**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 water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
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 water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</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 water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</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>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 water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0

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 water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
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>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. If there is an increase in the % of water supply facilities that are functioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If there is an increase: score 2 o If no increase: score 0. 	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
3	<p>New_Achievement of Standards:</p> <p>The LG has met WSS infrastructure facility standards</p> <p><i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. If there is an Increase in % of facilities with functional water & sanitation committees (with documented water user fee collection records and utilization with the approval of the WSCs).</p> <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>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

4	<p>Accuracy of Reported Information: The LG has accurately reported on constructed WSS infrastructure projects and service performance</p> <p><i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>The DWO has accurately reported on WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY and performance of the facilities is as reported: Score: 3</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
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 water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
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>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
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 water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0

Human Resource Management and Development

6	Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that the DWO has budgeted for the following Water & Sanitation staff: 1 Civil Engineer(Water); 2 Assistant Water Officers (1 for mobilization and 1 for sanitation & hygiene); 1 Engineering Assistant (Water) & 1 Borehole Maintenance Technician: Score 2	Not Applicable.	0
6	Budgeting for Water & Sanitation and Environment & Natural Resources: The Local Government has budgeted for staff <i>Maximum 4 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Not Applicable.	0
7	Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans. <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a. The DWO has appraised District Water Office staff against the agreed performance plans during the previous FY: Score 3	The municipality did not have water positions on the structure.	0
7	Performance Management: The LG appraised staff and conducted trainings in line with the district training plans. <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Not Applicable	0

Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services.

8	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. <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	<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 	The water management for the Municipality is done by National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, hence this assessment is not applicable here.	0
---	--	--	---	---

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>The water management for the Municipality is done by National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, hence this assessment is not applicable here.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the district Water Office has monitored each of WSS facilities at least quarterly (key areas to include functionality of Water supply and public sanitation facilities, environment, and social safeguards, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 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 	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>b. Evidence that the DWO conducted quarterly DWSCC meetings and among other agenda items, key issues identified from quarterly monitoring of WSS facilities were discussed and remedial actions incorporated in the current FY AWP. Score 2</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
9	<p>Routine Oversight and Monitoring: The LG has monitored WSS facilities and provided follow up support.</p> <p><i>Maximum 8 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. The District Water Officer publicizes budget allocations for the current FY to LLGs with safe water coverage below the LG average to all sub-counties: Score 2</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0

10	Mobilization for WSS is conducted <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	a. For previous FY, the DWO allocated a minimum of 40% of the NWR rural water and sanitation budget as per sector guidelines towards mobilization activities: • If funds were allocated score 3 • If not score 0	The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.	0
10	Mobilization for WSS is conducted <i>Maximum 6 points on this performance measure</i>	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.	The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.	0

Investment Management

11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Existence of an up-to-date LG asset register which sets out water supply and sanitation facilities by location and LLG: Score 4 or else 0	The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.	0
11	Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	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 (LGDPIII) 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.	The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.	0

11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>c. All budgeted investments for current FY have completed applications from beneficiary communities: Score 2</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>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>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
11	<p>Planning and Budgeting for Investments is conducted effectively</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>e. Evidence that all water infrastructure projects for the current FY were screened for environmental and social risks/ impacts and ESIA/ESMPs prepared before being approved for construction - costed ESMPs incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contract documents. Score 2</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0
12	<p>Procurement and Contract Management/execution: 0 The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements</p> <p><i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i></p>	<p>a. Evidence that the water infrastructure investments were incorporated in the LG approved: Score 2 or else</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</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>b. Evidence that the water supply and public sanitation infrastructure for the previous FY was approved by the Contracts Committee before commencement of construction Score 2:</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</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>c. Evidence that the District Water Officer properly established the Project Implementation team as specified in the Water sector guidelines Score 2:</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</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>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</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>e. Evidence that the relevant technical officers carry out monthly technical supervision of WSS infrastructure projects: Score 2</p>	<p>The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.</p>	0

12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	f. For the sampled contracts, there is evidence that the DWO has verified works and initiated payments of contractors within specified timeframes in the contracts o If 100 % contracts paid on time: Score 2 o If not score 0	The water management for the Municipality was under the National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, management hence this indicator not applicable.	0
----	--	--	--	---

12	Procurement and Contract Management/execution: The LG has effectively managed the WSS procurements <i>Maximum 14 points on this performance measure</i>	g. Evidence that a complete procurement file for water infrastructure investments is in place for each contract with all records as required by the PPDA Law: Score 2, If not score 0	The Municipality was not assessed in this area in the year under review.	0
----	--	--	--	---

Environment and Social Requirements

13	Grievance Redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing WSS related grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework <i>Maximum 3 points this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO in liaison with the District Grievances Redress Committee recorded, investigated, responded to and reported on water and environment grievances as per the LG grievance redress framework: Score 3, If not score 0	Not applicable	0
----	--	---	----------------	---

14	Safeguards for service delivery <i>Maximum 3 points on this performance measure</i>	Evidence that the DWO and the Environment Officer have disseminated guidelines on water source & catchment protection and natural resource management to CDOs: Score 3, If not score 0	Not applicable	0
----	--	---	----------------	---

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	a. Evidence that water source protection plans & natural resource management plans for WSS facilities constructed in the previous FY were prepared and implemented: Score 3, If not score 0	Not applicable	0
----	---	---	----------------	---

15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	b. Evidence that all WSS projects are implemented on land where the LG has proof of consent (e.g. a land title, agreement; Formal Consent, MoUs, etc.), without any encumbrances: Score 3, If not score 0	The water management for the Municipality is done by National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, hence this assessment is not applicable here.	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	c. Evidence that E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer and CDO prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects: Score 2, If not score 0	Not applicable	0
15	Safeguards in the Delivery of Investments <i>Maximum 10 points on this performance measure</i>	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	Not applicable	0

**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>No evidence was presented. Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.</p>	0
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>Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.</p>	0
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>Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.</p>	0
3	<p>Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 6</p>	<p>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>Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.</p>	0

3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	Evidence that the variations in the contract price are within +/-20% of the Agriculture Engineers estimates: Score 1 or else score 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
3	Investment Performance: The LG has managed the supply and installation of micro-scale irrigations equipment as per guidelines Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that micro-scale irrigation equipment where contracts were signed during the previous FY were installed/completed within the previous FY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • Between 80 – 99% score 1 • Below 80% score 0 	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the LG has recruited LLG extension workers as per staffing structure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 • If 75 – 99% score 1 • If below 75% score 0 	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the micro-scale irrigation equipment meets standards as defined by MAAIF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% score 2 or else score 0 	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0

4	Achievement of standards: The LG has met staffing and micro-scale irrigation standards Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the installed micro-scale irrigation systems during last FY are functional • If 100% are functional score 2 or else score 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
---	---	---	--	---

Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that information on position of extension workers filled is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
---	---	---	--	---

5	Accuracy of reported information: The LG has reported accurate information Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that information on micro-scale irrigation system installed and functioning is accurate: Score 2 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
---	---	--	--	---

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that information is collected quarterly on newly irrigated land, functionality of irrigation equipment installed; provision of complementary services and farmer Expression of Interest: Score 2 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
---	--	--	--	---

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that the LG has entered up to-date LLG information into MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
---	--	--	--	---

6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	c. Evidence that the LG has prepared a quarterly report using information compiled from LLGs in the MIS: Score 1 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	d) Evidence that the LG has: i. Developed an approved Performance Improvement Plan for the lowest performing LLGs score 1 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
6	Reporting and Performance Improvement: The LG has collected and entered information into MIS, and developed and implemented performance improvement plans Maximum score 6	ii. Implemented Performance Improvement Plan for lowest performing LLGs: Score 1 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
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 Maximum score 6	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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0

7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	ii Deployed extension workers as per guidelines score 1 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that extension workers are working in LLGs where they are deployed: Score 2 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
7	Budgeting for, actual recruitment and deployment of staff: The Local Government has budgeted, actually recruited and deployed staff as per guidelines Maximum score 6	c) Evidence that extension workers' deployment has been publicized and disseminated to LLGs by among others displaying staff list on the LLG notice board. Score 2 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has: 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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	a) Evidence that the District Production Coordinator has; Taken corrective actions: Score 1 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0

8	Performance management: The LG has appraised, taken corrective action and trained Extension Workers Maximum score 4	b) Evidence that: i. Training activities were conducted in accordance to the training plans at District level: Score 1 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	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 was no evidence that training activities were documented in the training database for the extension worker. Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
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	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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0

9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>c) Evidence that the co-funding is reflected in the LG Budget and allocated as per guidelines: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>d) Evidence that the LG has used the farmer co-funding following the same rules applicable to the micro scale irrigation grant: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.</p>	0
9	<p>Planning, budgeting and transfer of funds for service delivery: The Local Government has budgeted, used and disseminated funds for service delivery as per guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score 10</p>	<p>e) Evidence that the LG has disseminated information on use of the farmer co-funding: Score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.</p>	0
10	<p>Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 8</p>	<p>a) Evidence that the DPO has monitored on a monthly basis installed micro-scale irrigation equipment (key areas to include functionality of equipment, environment and social safeguards including adequacy of water source, efficiency of micro irrigation equipment in terms of water conservation, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than 90% of the micro-irrigation equipment monitored: Score 2 • 70-89% monitored score 1 <p>Less than 70% score 0</p>	<p>Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.</p>	0

10	Routine oversight and monitoring: The LG monitored, provided hands-on support and ran farmer field schools as per guidelines Maximum score 8	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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0
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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0

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>Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.</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>Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.</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>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>Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.</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>This indicator was not applicable in the MC</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 Municipality does not implement MIS program and therefore could not be assessed.</p>	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	b) Evidence that the LG requested for quotation from irrigation equipment suppliers pre-qualified by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF): Score 2 or else 0	The Municipality does not implement MIS program and therefore could not be assessed.	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	The Municipality does not implement MIS program and therefore could not be assessed.	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	The Municipality does not implement MIS program and therefore could not be assessed.	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 Municipality does not implement MIS program and therefore could not be assessed.	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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality.	0

13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	g) Evidence that the LG have conducted regular technical supervision of micro-scale irrigation projects by the relevant technical officers (District Senior Agricultural Engineer or Contracted staff): Score 2 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assesment was done.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	h) Evidence that the LG has overseen the irrigation equipment supplier during: i. Testing the functionality of the installed equipment: Score 1 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	0
13	Procurement, contract management/execution: The LG procured and managed micro-scale irrigation contracts as per guidelines Maximum score 18	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 Municipality does not implement MIS program and therefore could not be assessed.	0

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 Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that the Local Government has displayed details of the nature and avenues to address grievance prominently in multiple public areas: Score 2 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: 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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: ii. Investigated score 1 or else 0 iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	0
14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iii. Responded to score 1 or else 0 iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	0

14	Grievance redress: The LG has established a mechanism of addressing micro-scale irrigation grievances in line with the LG grievance redress framework Maximum score 6	b) Micro-scale irrigation grievances have been: iv. Reported on in line with LG grievance redress framework score 1 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	0
----	--	--	---	---

Environment and Social Requirements

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	a) Evidence that LGs have disseminated Micro-irrigation guidelines to provide for proper siting, land access (without encumbrance), proper use of agrochemicals and safe disposal of chemical waste containers etc. score 2 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	b) Evidence that Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening have been carried out and where required, ESMPs developed, prior to installation of irrigation equipment. i. Costed ESMP were incorporated into designs, BoQs, bidding and contractual documents score 1 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	0
15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	ii. Monitoring of irrigation impacts e.g. adequacy of water source (quality & quantity), efficiency of system in terms of water conservation, use of agro-chemicals & management of resultant chemical waste containers score 1 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	0

15	Safeguards in the delivery of investments Maximum score 6	iii. E&S Certification forms are completed and signed by Environmental Officer prior to payments of contractor invoices/certificates at interim and final stages of projects score 1 or else 0	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	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	Micro-Scale Irrigation (MSI) program was not applicable in the Municipality and therefore no assessment was done.	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	Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed a Chief Finance Officer nor was there as seconded staff.	0
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	Moroto Municipal Council had substantively appointed Angolere Pauline as a Municipal Planner on 24th June 2019 under Minute No. 124/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	Moroto Municipal Council had substantively appointed Logir Joshua Loumo as a Municipal Engineer on 19th November, 2018 under Minute No. 37/MDSC/2018.	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	Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed a Senior Environment Officer nor was there as seconded staff.	0
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	Moroto Municipal Council had substantively appointed Wabwire Barasa Denis as a Municipal Senior Veterinary Officer on 21st August, 2020 under Minute No. 61/MDSC/2020.	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>Moroto Municipal Council had substantively appointed Akwaso Sarah as a Municipal Community Development Officer on 31st May, 2010 under Minute No. 14/DSC/MTO/2010.</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>Moroto Municipal Council had substantively appointed Akeno Irene as a Municipal Commercial Officer on 18th January 2023 under Minute No. 8/MDSC/2022</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>Moroto Municipal Council had substantively appointed Koli Sylvia as a Municipal Procurement Officer on 26th June, 2015 under Minute No. 47/MDSC/2015.</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>Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed an Assistant Procurement Officer nor was there as seconded staff.</p>	0
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>Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed a Principal Human Resource Officer nor was there as seconded staff.</p>	0

1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>j. A Senior Environment Officer, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed a Senior Environment Officer nor was there a seconded staff.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>k. Senior Land Management Officer /Physical Planner, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Moroto Municipal Council had substantively appointed Adyaka Alfred Manderfield as a Physical Planner on 30th May, 2018 under Minute No. 24/MDSC/2018.</p>	2
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>l. A Senior Accountant, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed a Senior Accountant nor was there as seconded staff.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>District/Municipal Council departments. Maximum score is 37.</p>	<p>m. Principal Internal Auditor /Senior Internal Auditor, score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed Senior Internal Auditor nor was there a seconded staff.</p>	0
1	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all critical positions in the</p> <p>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

2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>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).</p>	<p>Moroto Municipal Council had substantively appointed a Senior Assistant Secretary (Sub-Counties) /Town Clerk (Town Councils) / Senior Assistant Town Clerk (Municipal Divisions) in all LLGS as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lomise Florence, Senior Assistant Town Clerk was substantively appointed on 11th July 2012 under Minute No. 26/MDSC/2012 2. Lolem Samuel Loguti, Senior Assistant Town Clerk was substantively appointed on 18th January 2023 under Minute No. 5/MDSC/2022(4) 	5
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>b. A Community Development Officer / Senior CDO in case of Town Councils, in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>Moroto Municipal Council had not substantively appointed a Senior Community Development Officer nether was there a seconded staff from MoPs for the two Divisions.</p>	0
2	<p>New_Evidence that the LG has recruited or the seconded staff is in place for all essential positions in every LLG</p> <p>Maximum score is 15</p>	<p>c. A Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS, score 5 or else 0.</p>	<p>Moroto Municipal Council had substantively appointed a Senior Accounts Assistant /an Accounts Assistant in all LLGS as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ngorok Suzan Senior Accounts Assistant - Moroto Municipal Council was appointed on 11th July 2012 under Minute no. 25/MDSC/2012 2. Ayoo Rose Senior Accounts Assistant - Moroto Municipal Council was appointed on 10th September 2008 under Minute no. 28/MDSC/2008 3. Achom Blandina Senior Accounts Assistant - Moroto Municipal Council was appointed on 28th June 2000 under Minute no. 72/DSC/2000 	5

Environment and Social Requirements

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 MC released 95% for Natural Resources as per the computation below;	0
	Maximum score is 4	a. Natural Resources department, score 2 or else 0	The Warranted amount was UGX 64,284,485 Actual received by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 61,297,100 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 13). (UGX 61,297,100 /64,284,485)*100=95%.	
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 MC released 98% for community-based service as per the computation below;	0
	Maximum score is 4	b. Community Based Services department. score 2 or else 0.	The warranted amount was UGX 67,736,777 The actual received by the LG by 30th June 2023 was UGX 66,327,749 (Draft Final Accounts 2022/23 page 13). (UGX 66,327,749 /UGX 67,736,777)*100=98% This gives a variance of UGX 1,409,028. Therefore, the released was 98%.	
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, score 4 or else 0	The Municipality carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening for the respective DDEG projects i) construction of a Council hall prepared on 22nd February, 2022 and ii) fencing and beautification of Mayor's gardens prepared 26th May, 2022.	4
	Maximum score is 12			

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>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),</p> <p>score 4 or 0</p>	<p>The projects that were 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.</p>	4
---	---	--	---	----------

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 prepare costed ESMPs for all projects implemented using the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) despite the fact that screening had been carried out for the following DDEG projects below i) construction of a Council Hall and ii) fencing and beautification of Mayor's gardens.</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	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).	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),	MC provided information to the PS/ST on the status of implementation of Internal Auditor General and Auditor General findings for the previous FY on 12nd January 2023. The submission date was before the recommended date as required by end of February (PFMA s. 11 2g).	10
	maximum score is 10	score 10 or else 0.		
7	Evidence that the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY	If the LG has submitted an annual performance contract by August 31st of the current FY,	The MC submitted an annual performance contract on 20th June 2023 which was before the stipulated deadline of August 31st of the current FY.	4
	Maximum Score 4	score 4 or else 0.		
8	Evidence that the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year	If the LG has submitted the Annual Performance Report for the previous FY on or before August 31, of the current Financial Year,	The MC submitted an online Annual Performance Report for the previous FY 2022/2023 on 11st August 2023 which was within the stipulated timeline of August 31, of the current Financial Year.	4
	maximum score 4 or else 0	score 4 or else 0.		
9	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	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>Moroto Municipal submitted the Quarterly Budget Performance Reports (QBPRs) for all four quarters of the previous as per the dates below;</p> <p>Quarter 1 BPR was submitted on 22nd December 2023</p> <p>Quarter 2 BPR was submitted on 28th February 2023</p> <p>Quarter 3 BPR was submitted on 2nd May 2023</p> <p>Quarter 4 BPR was submitted on 11st August 2023</p>	4
	Maximum score is 4	score 4 or else 0.	From the above submission dates the MC submitted the 4th quarter report before the mandatory deadline of August 31 of the current Financial Year.	

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	Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed a Principal Education Officer (municipal council) nor was there as seconded staff..	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.	Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed a Municipal Inspector of Schools nor was there as seconded staff.	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.	The LG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening on 7th January, 2022 for the construction of Urban Staff House at Moroto Demonstration School.	15
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				
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: b. Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) , score 15 or else 0.	The project that was implemented in the education sector 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.	15
<i>The Maximum score is 30</i>				

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>Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed a District Health Officer nor was there a seconded staff from MOH.</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>b. Assistant District Health Officer Maternal, Child Health and Nursing, score 10 or else 0</p>	<p>Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed an Assistant District Health Officer nor was there a seconded staff from MOH.</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>Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed an Assistant District Health Officer Environmental Health nor was there a seconded staff from MOH.</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>Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed a Principal Health Inspector (Senior Environment Officer) nor was there a seconded staff from MOH.</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>Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed a Senior Health Educator nor was there a seconded staff from MOH.</p>	0

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.	Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed a Biostatistician nor was there a seconded staff from MOH.	0
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.	Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed a District Cold Chain Technician nor was there a seconded staff from MOH.	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>	h. Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer, score 30 or else 0.	Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed a Medical Officer of Health Services /Principal Medical Officer nor was there a seconded staff.	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.	Moroto Municipal Council had neither substantively appointed a Principal Health Inspector nor was there a seconded staff.	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	Moroto Municipal Council had substantively appointed Napeyok Akwii Mary as a Health Educator on 7 April 2008 under Minute No. 05/MDSC/2008.	20

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) <i>Maximum score is 30</i>	If the LG carried out: a. Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening/Environment, score 15 or else 0.	There were no projects in the current FY that had been budgeted for therefore Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening was no carried out.	15
---	---	--	--	-----------

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.

There were no projects that were implemented in the current FY for the health sector and therefore no requirement for Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs).

**Micro-scale Irrigation 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 Production Office responsible for Micro-Scale Irrigation <i>Maximum score is 70</i>	If the LG has recruited; a. the Senior Agriculture Engineer <i>score 70 or else 0.</i>	Not Applicable.	0
Environment and Social Requirements				
2	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. <i>Maximum score is 30</i>	If the LG: Carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change screening score 30 or else 0.	Not applicable	0

**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.	Not Applicable.	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>	b. 1 Assistant Water Officer for mobilization, score 10 or else 0.	Not Applicable.	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.	Not Applicable.	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>	d. 1 Natural Resources Officer, score 15 or else 0.	Not Applicable.	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>	e. 1 Environment Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Not Applicable.	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>	f. Forestry Officer, score 10 or else 0.	Not Applicable.	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.	Not applicable	0
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.	Not applicable	0

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.

The water management for the Municipality is done by National Water and Sewerage Cooperation, hence this assessment is not applicable here.