An abandoned borehole in Obongi county, Moyo district. Locals say this water source was not producing water prompting them to dig a pond next to it from which they fetch dirty water.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the Local Government Councils’ Scorecard Initiative assessment report for Moyo District for Financial Year 2012/13. The scorecard assessed the performance the Local Government Council, the Chairperson, the Speaker and individual Councilors who are vested with powers and responsibilities to ensure effective governance of the respective local governments as stipulated in the Local Governments Act (Cap 243). The scorecard is intended to build the capacities of leaders to deliver on their mandates and empower citizens to demand for accountability from elected leaders. The objective of this report is to provide information and analysis based on the assessment conducted during FY 2012/13. The assessment reviewed documents on planning and budgeting, service delivery monitoring, and Moyo District Local Government performance reports. In addition, a review of minutes of sectoral committees and council sittings was undertaken to inform the report about the performance of the business of council, the chairperson and individual councilors. Face-to-face interviews with the targeted community leaders, key informant interviews at service delivery points, and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) further enriched the fact-finding and assessment process.

Moyo District was found to be heavily dependent on Central Government transfers that account for over 96 per cent of district revenue. Moyo District was among the 26 districts that were assessed for FY 2012/13. The assessment in the district covered 19 councilors, 8 of whom were female and 11 male. Moyo District Council scored a total of 63 out of possible 100 points – an improvement from 55 in the 2011/12 assessment. The best performance was exhibited under monitoring (25 out of 30), planning and budgeting (16 out of 20) and accountability to citizens (20 out of 25). The Chairman, Jimmy Vukoni, scored 62 out of the possible 100 points, an improvement from 52 points in FY 2011/12. The chairman exhibited commendable performance in political leadership where he scored 20 out of 20 points for that parameter. Overall; the Speaker, Hon. Martin Chiaga scored 63 out of the possible 100 points. This shows an improvement from 44 points scored in FY 2011/12. The speaker’s best performance was registered under contact with the electorate (20 out of 20 points). He performed fairly in presiding and conservation of order in the council. The best performing male councilor in the district was Hon. Terry Silton Anyanzo, representing Dufile Sub-county, who scored 72 out of the possible 100 points, while the best female councilor was Hon. Martina Aziero from Moyo Sub-county with 67 points. The best performed parameter was legislative role where, on average, councilors scored 16 out of 25 points.
The major service delivery challenges in Moyo District included: cross border conflict, delays in procurement; poor record keeping, weather vagaries and inadequate monitoring; limited participation in sub-county council meetings; and failure to follow up on service delivery concerns raised in monitoring reports, among others. To enable the district improve service delivery and accountability to citizens, there is need for political leaders to work as a team; develop standard M&E framework; need for prudent management of contracts; recruit more staff; increase local revenue sources; and, councilors should increase contact with electorate.
1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction
This report highlights the assessment findings on Moyo District during the financial year 2012/2013. This is the third time Moyo District is being assessed under the Uganda Local Government Councils' Scorecard Initiative (LGCSCI), a partnership initiative between the Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment (ACODE) and the Uganda Local Governments Association (ULGA). The overall objective of the initiative is strengthening citizens' demand side for good governance and effectiveness in the delivery of public services. It further seeks to boost and bolster the professional capability and skills of the individual district councilors in order to meet the needs of their electorates. The initiative was launched in 2009 with assessment covering 10 district councils. The second assessment which included Moyo covered 20 districts and the third and fourth assessment expanded to 26 districts.

1.2 Moyo District Profile
Moyo District is located in West Nile, bordering Southern Sudan to the north, Adjuman District to the south, and Yumbe district to the west.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics for Moyo District Local Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79,381</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>194,775</td>
<td>382,400</td>
<td>412,500</td>
<td>71,240</td>
<td>76,890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Uganda Bureau of Statistics 2011

The national population census of 2002 estimated the population of the district at 194,775 and the 2011 midyear projection is 382,400 (Males 201,300 and Females 181,100). The average annual growth rate between 1991 and 2002 of the district was 7.7%. Table 2 shows key demographic indicators for Moyo District.
Table 2: Summary of Key District Demographic Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1000)</td>
<td>81/10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-five Mortality Rate</td>
<td>111/10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total fertility rate</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td>76,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrine coverage</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage urban population</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex ratio (males per females)</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of individuals below poverty line</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Mortality Rate</td>
<td>600/100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy</td>
<td>42 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe water coverage</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school enrolment</td>
<td>34,411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1.3 Moyo District Leadership

During the year under review, Moyo District Local Government comprised 8 subcounties and one town council. It was headed by the District Chairperson, Mr. Vukoni Jimmy Okudi working with 20 elected councilors, including the district speaker. In terms of gender, 11 of the councilors were male while 9 were female. The district council business was conducted by the District Speaker, who presided over all lawful council business. The civil servants in the district local government were headed by the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) who was the chief accounting officer of the district supported, by a number of heads of department as shown in Table 3

Table 3: Moyo District Leadership 2012/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political leaders</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Vukoni Jimmy Okudi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Hon. Andrew Kajoyingi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Speaker</td>
<td>Hon. Chaiga Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Speaker</td>
<td>Hon. Kairo Lily Duku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary for Education, Gender and Social Development</td>
<td>Hon. Luluu Kanta Leri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary for Health and Children affairs</td>
<td>Hon. Martin Izaruku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary for Production, Marketing and Natural Resources</td>
<td>Hon. Paul Maiku Didi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident District Commissioner</td>
<td>John Abingwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil servants</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Administrative Officer</td>
<td>Aloysius Aloka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chief Administrative Officer</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Sub-counties include: Dufile, Itula, Gimara, Lefori, Metu, Aliba, Laropi, Moyo and Moyo Town Council.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Finance Officer</td>
<td>Henry Drichi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson District Service Commission</td>
<td>Samuel Tako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson Public Accounts Committee</td>
<td>Noah Taba-Tabe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson District Land Board</td>
<td>ConsolateUaeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Production Officer</td>
<td>Ajavu Alabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Health Officer</td>
<td>Dr. Jimmy Opigo (Ag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Education Officer</td>
<td>Michael Mali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Engineer</td>
<td>Fred Ijjo (Ag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Natural Resources Officer</td>
<td>Maurice Edema (Ag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Community Development Officer</td>
<td>Albert Izale Omen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Planner</td>
<td>Johnny Zaaniago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Internal Auditor</td>
<td>George Amori</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: District Council Minutes (2012/13)

Moyo District Local Government is composed of three Standing Committees headed by their respective secretaries. These committees support the planning process and undertake monitoring of service delivery on behalf of the council. The district council has four fully fledged statutory bodies, i.e. the Local Government Public Accounts Committee (LG PAC), the District Service Commission (DSC), District Contracts Committee (DCC) and District Land Board (DLB), duly appointed by the chairperson and approved by the council. The LG-PAC handles all financial management compliance by the district; the DSC addresses recruitment and personnel issues while the DCC handles procurement related activities and the DLB oversees land registration, land dispute and other land-related matters within the district. The sub-counties, parishes and villages have councils and executive committees, which coordinate the various functions of government at lowest service delivery points.

1.4 Methodology

The process of conducting the assessment used a variety of methods consistent with the goals and the theory of change\(^2\) of the scorecard. The approaches in the sub-sections below were used in the process.

1.4.1 The Score-card Tool

The scorecard is premised on a set of parameters which assess the extent to which local government council organs and councilors perform their responsibilities.\(^3\) These parameters are based on the responsibilities of the

\(^2\) See G. Tumushabe, et.al. (2010). Monitoring and Assessing the Performance of Local Government Councils in Uganda

\(^3\) See Third Schedule of the Local Governments Act, Section 8.
local government councils. The organs annually assessed include; the district council, district chairperson, district speaker and the individual councilors. The parameters assessed include: legislation, contact with the electorate, planning and budgeting, participation in lower local governments, and monitoring of service delivery.\(^4\)

The scorecard is reviewed and ratified annually by internal and external teams. The internal team comprises of ACODE researchers and local partners. The Expert Task Group, which is the external team, comprises individual experts and professionals from local governments, the public sector, civil society, and the academia

1.4.2 Score-card Administration

Before commencement of the assessment exercise, an inception meeting was organized on 13 February 2013 for councilors, technical staff and selected participants from civil society and the general public. This meeting was designed as a training workshop on the purpose of the scorecard, nature of assessment, and to orient councilors for the assessment.

a) Literature Review. The assessment involved comprehensive review of documents and reports on Moyo District Local Government. Box 1 shows the different types of documents and reports reviewed.

b) Key Informant Interviews. Key informants were purposively selected for the interviews owing to their centrality and role in service delivery in the

district. Interviews were conducted with the district technical and political leaders. The interviews focused on the state of services, level of funding, and their individual contribution to service delivery in the district. For the political leaders, these interviews are the first point of contact with the researchers and they generate assessment values that feed into the scorecard. They also offer an opportunity for civic education on roles and responsibilities of political leaders. Interviews with the technical leaders provide an independent voice and an opportunity to verify information.

c) **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs).** Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were conducted based on the criteria set in the scorecard FGD guide. A total of 16 FGDs were organized in 8 sub-counties in the district. FGDs were platforms for civic education and empowerment about the roles of councilors and other political leaders. They were mainly organized to enable voters verify information provided by their respective councilors. Altogether, 142 people, of whom 73 were women and 69 men, participated in the FGDs.

![Figure 1: FGD Participants by Gender](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) **Service Delivery Unit Visits.** Field visits to service delivery units (SDUs) were undertaken in each sub-county by the research team. Visits were made to primary schools, health centres, water source points, demonstration sites, FAL centres, and roads. Field visits were mainly observatory and, where possible, interviews were conducted with the personnel at the SDUs. These visits were also meant to verify the accuracy of the information provided by the political leaders.

### 1.4.3 Data Management and Analysis

Some of the data collected during the assessment was both qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative data was categorized thematically for purposes of content analysis. Thematic categorization helped in the identification of the salient issues in service delivery. Quantitative data was generated through assigning values based on individual performance on given indicators. This data was used to generate frequency and correlation matrices that helped make inferences and draw conclusions on individual and general performance.
2. BUDGET PERFORMANCE AND THE STATUS OF SERVICE DELIVERY

Article 190 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995 specifies that the district council shall prepare comprehensive and integrated plans incorporating those of lower level local governments and execution of the budget proposals shall be done by the same council. Therefore, the budget is a very important tool for the district council to take appropriate decisions regarding delivery of services. The structuring of the budget therefore determines the way resources are allocated and used in order to meet set district service delivery goals and targets. This section presents information on the district budget and assesses the state of services delivered through expenditure on implementing government programmes.

2.1 Moyo District Resource Envelope

The Central Government is mandated to put in place a framework for financing the decentralized entities. In this regard, Articles 176(2) (e) and 193(1) of the Constitution require that central government ensures that appropriate measures to enable local government units to plan, initiate and execute policies and to provide funding to local governments in form of unconditional, conditional and equalization grants. The unconditional and conditional grants fund decentralized functions and programmes as agreed upon in the Budget Framework Paper. Equalization grants, on the other hand, are supposed to be given to local governments lagging behind the national standard for service delivery.

Moyo District continues to depend on central government transfers for funding which accounts for over 96% of its revenue base. The central government fund transfers are mostly conditional grants with predetermined sector guidelines for expenditure. Locally-generated revenue and donor contributions were at 2.1% and 1.9% respectively. The total income for Moyo District during the year under review was Shs. 16,237,787,000. However; the actual expenditure
during the year was Shs 15,306,782,000 leaving unspent balances of Shs 930,005,000.

**Figure 2: Composition of the Resource Envelope for Moyo District**

![Composition of the Resource Envelope for Moyo District](image)

Source: Moyo District Annual work plans 2012/13 and 2013/14.

### 2.1.1. Budget Expenditure and Intra-sectoral Allocations

Local governments are responsible for administration and management of the delivery of services to citizens, such as primary education, health, roads, agriculture extension, and water and sanitation. In Moyo District, during financial year 2012/2013, the education sector was allocated the highest portion of the district budget (36.3%). It was followed by health (25%), production and marketing (8.4%) and administration (6.6%) in that order. However, planning and internal audit got very minimal allocations of (1.0% and 0.5%) respectively.

**Table 4: Moyo District Sectoral Allocations FY 2012/2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Amount (Ush) allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1,136,563,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>458,051,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Bodies</td>
<td>589,720,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production and Marketing</td>
<td>1,434,587,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4,273,690,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6,222,311,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and Engineering</td>
<td>974,182,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>912,869,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Natural Resources | 334,691,000
Community based Services | 462,785,000
Planning | 175,218,000
Internal Audit | 92,472,000

\textbf{Source:} Moyo District Approved Budget 2012/2013

It is important to note that, the low capacity of Moyo District Local Government to generate adequate local revenue greatly affects the prioritization of key social services for the district. While the district council allocates these resources, this is largely based on the Indicative Planning Figures (IPFs) that are provided by the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development. The IPFs have stringent conditions regarding priorities for such funding. Whereas Moyo District executes such a lumpsum budget for the specified financial year, very little goes to the development of the district (service delivery). A huge portion of the budget (63%) covers wage and non-wage recurrent costs. This means that less than 40% of the budget is committed to service delivery. Similarly, for any meaningful engagement with government to raise budgetary allocations to local governments, stakeholders need to understand the budget formulation processes and explore spaces and opportunities to influence their outcomes.

\subsection*{2.2 State of Service Delivery in Moyo District}

The coming in force of decentralization policy in 1992, brought with it a range of powers and authorities conferred upon the district local governments to ensure that services are taken closer to the beneficiaries. Some of the key services targeted by the decentralization policy include: education, roads, water, health, agriculture extension services, among others. In addition, the local government is entrusted with both financial and technical support services to ensure that its mandate is executed. It is therefore on the basis of this assessment that analysis of major trends in growth of the different indicators is done to establish service delivery gaps and proposed remedies to address them. Table 5 shows the service delivery indicators.
### Table 5: Service Delivery Indicators in Moyo District (2012/2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>National standard/ NDP target</th>
<th>District Achievement 2011/12</th>
<th>District Target 2012/13</th>
<th>Level of achievement 2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education - Primary Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of primary school-going age (6-12)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31,280</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Classroom Ratio (PCR)</td>
<td>55:1</td>
<td>48:1</td>
<td>55:1</td>
<td>54:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Teacher Ratio (PTR)</td>
<td>55:1</td>
<td>45:1</td>
<td>55:1</td>
<td>47:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil to Desk Ratio (PDR)</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>5:1</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Div I: 117</td>
<td>Div II: 1090</td>
<td>Div III: 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Div IV: 97</td>
<td>Div U: 28</td>
<td>Div X: 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Care Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC 4th Visit</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliveries in Health Centres</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total beds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Maternity services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMR</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>450/100,000</td>
<td>600/100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMR</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>81/1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road Sub-sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Km of roads under routine maintenance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Km of roads rehabilitated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Km of roads under periodic maintenance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of roads in good condition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of bridges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening up new community roads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water and Sanitation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water coverage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of boreholes sunk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of boreholes rehabilitated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functionality of water sources</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of the population within 1km of an improved water source</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine coverage</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of extension workers per S/county</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of service points</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of demonstration farms</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical back-up visits</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of instructors</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>1,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of service centres</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of coverage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environment and Natural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Natural Resources</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Environmental monitoring and assessment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production and update District State of the Environment Report (DSOER)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Environment Action Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of District Wetland Ordinance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor wetland systems in the district</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Moyo District Departmental Statistical Reports

### 2.2.1 Primary Education

The quality of primary education is an antecedent to healthy and informed citizens. Besides, the MDGs also commit Government of Uganda to ensure that by 2015, children of school going age should be able to enrol, remain and complete the primary cycle.\(^5\) In terms of PLE performance, the district had 117 pupils in Division One and 1,090 in Division Two in 2012. Despite some of these achievements; meeting infrastructural needs of some schools has remained a big challenge for the district and some schools continued to record high enrolment rates, outstripping available school infrastructure. For instance, in Aliba Primary School, the Teacher-Pupil Ratio (PTR) was at 1:74, whereas in Lefori Primary School, PTR was at 1:79. Teachers, especially in lower classes, were found to be teaching in congested classes due to inadequate teachers and classroom structures. Poor sanitation facilities were common in most of the primary schools. Most schools in the district had inadequate and poor latrine structures which affected the sanitary and hygiene status of the district. Safe drinking water facilities were inadequate for the most part or even lacking in some cases. The assessment noted failure to provide

\(^5\) Goal 2, Target 2.A, Millennium Development Goals, 2000 (Adapted from Tumushabe et al)
mid-day meals in almost all schools in the district, which was responsible for high pupil dropout and irregular attendance.

**Figure 3: A congested P.4 classroom of Lefori Primary School**

![Image of a crowded classroom](image.png)

**Source:** ACODE Digital Library, August 2013

### 2.2.2 Functional Adult Literacy

Functional Adult Literacy (FAL) is intended to improve the reading; writing and arithmetic skills of the individuals who failed or due to one reason or the other could not go through or complete formal education. The FAL programme has been running in Moyo District since 1993 and close to 200 FAL centres have been established in the district. However, the programme faces challenges of poor facilitation community development officers and the learning instructors and this has completely derailed the performance of this initiative. The district has failed to concentrate on the programme and it is a bit hard to effectively locate any FAL centre within the district. Despite this, there has been no strategic response from the council to try to address the challenges.

### 2.2.3 Health Sector

The delivery of effective health services is one of the contemporary local government challenges facing Moyo District. Under the Local Government Act, medical and health services are generally considered decentralized services.
There are 42 functional health centres in Moyo District, serving a population of 412,500. While major investments have been made by the district towards physical infrastructure, especially construction of health centres, major problems such as staffing, drugs stockout and delays in drug delivery, lack of transport facilities especially for referral purposes, absenteeism of health workers at health stations, inactive health unit management committees continue to undermine the quality of health service delivery in Moyo District.

**Figure 4: Patients waiting for treatment at Dufille HCIII and Metu HCII in Moyo District**

![Image of patients waiting for treatment](image)

*Source: ACODE Digital Library, August 2013*

### 2.2.4 Agriculture

Agriculture is the mainstay of Moyo District employing an estimated 80% of the population in the district. Most households directly or indirectly derive their livelihood from agriculture. The crops grown are cassava, sorghum, simsim, maize, groundnuts. There is also rearing of domestic animals and small ruminants on subsistence basis. Fish farming and other fishing activities take place along the Nile basins, especially areas of Dufille, Laropi and parts of Aliba sub-counties.

Agricultural activities in Moyo District have continued to be boosted by the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) which is the main framework through which the government, using the public and private sector, provides agricultural extension support services to local farmers. However, a number of challenges have continued to constrain the efforts towards effective agricultural service delivery in the district. Chief among them are: climate variations that cause floods and drought (which have continued to affect the agricultural sector severely and reduced agricultural outputs in the district); and increased food prices due low productivity. Increased demand for food in Southern
Sudan has also contributed to the surge in food prices. Strigaparasitic weed is also threatening to wipe out some cereal farms in Moyo District.\textsuperscript{6} At local government level, the interactions with the local people revealed that, service delivery through NAADS were not meeting the priority needs and aspirations of the people. For instance, farmers in Moyo Town Council repeatedly claimed that, they were left out of the programme. Participants across the district complained of discrimination in the way the farmer groups were selected and the same groups benefitting repeatedly. Hiking of prices for goods procured were seen to be affecting the sub-sector. It was reported that a goat which would cost Shs 80,000 on the open market would be supplied at Shs 150,000 under the NAADs programme even when they are of the same quality. There was also reported supply of sub-standards inputs which did not reflect the real value for money. Finally; veterinary services seemed not to be reaching farmers in most communities. For instance, discussions with the communities revealed that only one veterinary officer served three sub-counties of Metu, Dufile and Laropi.

**Figure 5: Maize and cassava plantations submerged by floods in Dufile sub-county**

\textbf{Source:} ACODE Digital Library, August 2013

\textbf{2.2.5 Water and Sanitation}

The right to safe and clean water is enshrined in the Uganda Constitution (1995). Findings from the field indicate that Moyo District needs to make tremendous efforts to improve on water coverage. Though water coverage rose from 47.0\% in March 2011 to 65\% during the year under review,

\textsuperscript{6} The weed locally known as the witch weed, the striga weed, is a major constraint to sorghum production and other cereal production, especially in semi-arid regions. In moyo, the weed has raided cereal farms in Lefori, Aliba and Dufile sub-counties.
assessment findings revealed that Gimara Sub-county, for instance still had a challenge of the population accessing relatively clean water. However, in some places like Laropi, Metu, Lefori, there were scaled up efforts towards improving water access through setting up gravity water schemes and piped water. Discussion with community members revealed that the unit charges were very high and many complained of failing to access piped water due to the high costs. Challenges of shoddy work and low water yields in some instances were reported. For instance, the gravity water scheme at Ojjo in Chinyi West village, Pamoyi West Parish, Metu Sub-county was abandoned immediately it developed a major technical problem after its completion in March 2012. There was no report of efforts by the district leadership to make monitoring visits to the sites, and hence the project had been left to stall as the community suffered water scarcity. Overall, during the year under review, 35% of the district population had no access to clean and safe water.

2.2.6 Roads Sector
The growth of tourist centres and other service industries in the district is attributed to the existence of an improved road network and access within the district and the tourist sites. The length of feeder roads network in the district is 166.5 Km, with an estimated 115 Km being motorable throughout the year while 51.1 Km is not motorable.

Among the challenges facing Moyo District road sector is poor workmanship/shoddy work by the contracted firms; floods destroying road surface -- for instance, Waka-Gborokonyo, Metu-Gbari and Laropi-Paanjala are prone to floods annually. Undoubtedly, the poor road condition is linked to the high cost of living in the district due to high transport costs.

2.2.7 Environment and Natural Resources
Moyo District has a high natural resource potential such as fertile soils, forests, wildlife, water resources, wetlands and a favourable climate ranging from 1,145 mm to 1,165 mm per year. The district has 28,365 Hectares of central forest reserve and 156,933 Hectares of community forest reserve. Important to note is that over 94% of the district population lives in rural areas and depends on natural resources for their livelihoods since 80% are agriculture-based, and 99% of the households rely on wood fuel for their domestic needs. This has exerted pressure on the environment on daily basis through reduction of the wood cover in the district. Though there are efforts by the district council to regulate environmental exploitation activities

---

7 In Liwa, Delo, Lomunga and Maduga people compete with animals for running water due to absence of clean water.
as enshrined in many of the district’s framework papers including district environmental action plans. Clearly, the dismal allocation of 2% during the year under review affected enforcement of actions by the department.

In summary, a critical analysis of Moyo District Local Government Council debates and deliberations for 2012/2013 revealed a sharp contrast in the status in service delivery as reiterated in the five-year district development plan. While a lot of issues were highlighted in the different district documents to be brought to the attention of the council, a number of them remained just as paper work and were hence not debated in council.
3. THE SCORECARD FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

The district local council and the sub-county council are established as corporate legal entities under the Local Government Act. At their respective levels, the councils are vested with powers and responsibilities to (i) enact local laws necessary for the effective governance of the areas within their jurisdiction; (ii) ensure accountability and transparency in the conduct of council business and utilization of council funds; (iii) ensure effective planning and budgeting to spur development and the delivery of public services to the local population; and (iv) monitor the delivery of public services on national priority programmes. The parameters in the scorecard are based on these key responsibilities of the local government councils and assess the political organs which include: the district chairperson, the district speaker, the district council and the individual councilors.

3.1 Moyo District Council Scorecard

The Local Government Council is the highest authority in a local government with political, legislative, administrative and executive powers. The scorecard for the council is derived from the functions of the local government councils as stipulated under the Local Government Act. The assessment of the local government councils is aimed at establishing the extent to which a council uses its political, legislative, administrative and planning powers to address the issues that affect the electorate within its jurisdiction. The council is the platform where councilors are supposed to debate and pass appropriate decisions that address development needs of the district and the citizens in particular.
Table 6: Moyo District Council Scorecard 2012/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Actual Score</th>
<th>Maximum Scores</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LEGISLATIVE ROLE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>• No evidence of adoption of rules of procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted model rules of Procedure with/without</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>• DEC sat 12 times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debate (amendments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion on bills on natural resources continued in the council with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership to ULGA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>committee scrutinizing the provisions. Payments to ULGA was effected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functionality of the Committees of Council</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>and there are evidence of availability of legislative resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawful Motions passed by the council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinances passed by the council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution Initiatives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of legislative resources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building initiatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ACCOUNTABILITY TO CITIZENS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>• There are provisions for citizens to observe council sessions and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Accountability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>issues of corruption discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Accountability</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>• PAC, DSC, and DCC are all in place and functional. All standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Accountability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>committees fully constituted and there exists a Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of CSOs, CBOs, Citizens private</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Officer. CSOs are fully involved with prominent organizations like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sector, professionals, and other non-state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEPORD, DRC Moyo NGO-Forum, CEPAP, YAASA, MAHA activities being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actors in service delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fully integrated in the district plans and budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to principles of accountability and</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transparency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PLANNING &amp; BUDGETING</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>• Vision and Mission Statements were displayed in departmental offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of Plans, Vision and Mission Statement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>• Local Revenue: No clear plan by the district to enhance increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of the District Budget</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Local Revenue collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Revenue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MONITORING SERVICE DELIVERY ON NPPAs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>• Monitoring is mostly done by the District Executive Committee (DEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>and they take decisions on behalf of the whole council; in addition to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>the councilors’ monitoring reports. However, FAL is not paid keen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sanitation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>attention compared to NPPAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Extension</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional adult Literacy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Natural Resources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moyo District Council scored a total of 63 out of possible 100 points -- an improvement from 55 in the 2011/12 assessment. The best performance was exhibited under monitoring (25 out of 30), planning and budgeting (11 out of 20) and accountability to citizens (19 out of 25) as shown in Table 6. A comparison of all district councils’ performance in the 26 districts is presented in Annex 1.
3.2 District Chairperson

The chairperson of Moyo District Local Government during the financial year under review was Mr. Jimmy Vukoni Okudi. The chairman does not subscribe to any political party. At the time of this assessment, he was serving the second year of his five-year term of office. Table 7 provides the details of the performance of the chairman across the assessed parameters.

Table 7: Chairperson’s Scorecard 2012/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Jimmy Vukoni Okudi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Moyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Party</td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Terms</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSESSMENT PARAMETER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Score</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. POLITICAL LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>20 (20)</td>
<td>• Chaired 8 DEC meetings, and delegated twice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding over meetings of Executive Committee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report made to council on the state of affairs of the district</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseeing performance of civil servants</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseeing the functioning of the DSC and other statutory boards/committees (land board, PAC)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with central government and national institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. LEGISLATIVE ROLE | 8 (15) | Participated in all the six council sessions during the year and continued to spearhead motion to resolve Natural resource Policy in the council |
| Regular attendance of council sessions | 2 | 2 |
| Motions presented by the Executive | 6 | 6 |
| Bills presented by the Executive | 0 | 7 |
3. CONTACT WITH ELECTORATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7</th>
<th>(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme of meetings with Electorate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling of issues raised and feedback to the electorate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Had programme of meeting groups and also appeared over local media (Trans Nile Broadcasting FM); in order to reach communities in all the sub-counties within the district. Shared with them a number of development programme of the district and handled public outcry such as mistreatment by South Sudan people.

4. INITIATION AND PARTICIPATION IN projects in electoral area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects initiated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to communal Projects/activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking the community to Development Partners/ NGOs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Strengthened efforts of sorghum growing for brewery industry.
- No evidence of new MOU signed.

5. MONITORING SERVICE DELIVERY ON NATIONAL PRIORITY PROGRAMME AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>23</th>
<th>(45)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitored Agricultural services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitored Health Service delivery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitored schools in every sub-county</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitored road works in the district</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitored water sources in every sub-county</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitored functional Adult literacy session</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitored Environment and Natural Resources protection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Monitored agriculture, health, roads and water sources but there were no evidence of concrete steps being taken as follow up actions.
- Also monitored and intervened in Lobbying for support for Dufille flood victims; he effectively collaborated with Red Cross Society to support them.

The Chairman, Jimmy Vukoni, scored 62 out of the possible 100 marks -- an improvement from 52 points in FY 2011/12. Under projects initiated; he mainly concentrated on promoting the sorghum production. The chairman exhibited commendable performance in political leadership where he scored 20 out of 20 mainly due to ensuring that the sectoral committees, statutory bodies and their functionality improved through meetings and other oversight roles. A comparison of all district chairpersons’ performance in the 26 districts is presented in Annex 2.

3.3 District Speaker

The effective functioning and output of a District Local Government Council is highly dependent on the expertise of the district speaker. Hon Martin Chiaga was the speaker during the year under review. Table 8, provides his performance as per the different assessment parameters.

Table 8: Speaker’s Performance in 2012/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Martin Chiaga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Moyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituency</td>
<td>Moyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Terms</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Political Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRM</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Actual Score</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ASSESSMENT PARAMETER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Actual Score</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. PRESIDING AND PRESERVATION OF ORDER IN COUNCIL** | 19 | 25 | • Chaired more than 4 council sessions, and delegated once to the vice on 9/8/2012  
• No evidence of adoption of rules of procedure by council but are being enforced  
• There was evidence of a records book of issues/petitions presented to the office |
| Chairing lawful council/meetings | 3 | 3 | •  
| Rules of procedure | 9 | 9 | •  
| Business Committee | 2 | 3 | •  
| Records book with Issues/petitions presented to the office | 2 | 2 | •  
| Record of motions/bills presented in council | 3 | 3 | •  
| Provided special skills/knowledge to the Council or committees | 0 | 5 | •  |
| **2. CONTACT WITH ELECTORATE** | 20 | 20 | • Records of letters sent to his office were filed. Also met electorates on different dates (22/4/2013, 29/5/2013, 23/8/2012 etc) and chaired issues on government programme like proposal of taking a branch on Muni University to the district; shoddy work etc. Has a coordinating centre in his home and no evidence of electorates visiting. |
| Meetings with Electorate | 11 | 11 | •  
| Office or coordinating centre in the constituency | 9 | 9 | •  |
| **3. PARTICIPATION IN LOWER LOCAL GOVERNMENT** | 0 | 10 | • No evidence to ascertain his participation |
| Attendance in sub-county Council sessions | 0 | 10 | •  |
| **4. MONITORING SERVICE DELIVERY ON NATIONAL PRIORITY PROGRAMME AREAS** | 24 | 45 | • Monitored Health, Education, roads and environment and made follow up on actions to be undertaken. Did not make attempt to monitor agriculture, water services and FAL |
| Monitoring Health Service delivery | 7 | 7 | •  
| Monitoring Education services | 7 | 7 | •  
| Monitoring Agricultural projects | 0 | 7 | •  
| Monitoring Water service | 1 | 7 | •  
| Monitoring Road works | 3 | 7 | •  
| Monitoring Functional Adult Literacy | 1 | 5 | •  
| Monitoring Environment and Natural Resources | 5 | 5 | •  |
| **TOTAL** | **63** | **100** | •  |

Overall, the speaker scored 63 out of the possible 100 points. This shows an improvement from 44 points scored in FY 2011/12. The speaker’s best performance was registered under contact with the electorate (20 out of 20 points). He performed fairly on presiding and preservation of order in the council.

### 3.4 District Councilors

District councils are vested with wide-ranging powers and responsibilities as stipulated in the Local Government Act. The performance of a district council, therefore, may as well be directly related to the quality and performance of the individual councilors. During the fiscal year under evaluation, councilors were assessed on the four performance parameters, namely: (i) legislation role; (ii) contact with electorate; (iii) participation in the lower local government;
and (iv) monitoring of service delivery on National Priority Programme Areas (NPPAs). Moyo District Local Government Council had a total of 19\(^{8}\) councilors, all of whom were assessed.

The best performing councilor in the district was Hon. Terry Silton Anyanzo, representing Dufile Sub-county, who scored 72 out of the possible 100 points, while the best female councilor was Hon. Martina Aziero from Moyo Sub-county with 67 points. The best performed parameter was legislative role where, on average, councilors scored 16 out of 25 points. Majority of councilors had debated in council at least four times on issues related to service delivery on National Programme Priority Areas. On the other hand, councilors scored poorly on the monitoring role, with an average score of 27 out of 45 possible marks. The reason for this poor performance was mainly the lack of documentation for the activities they had undertaken on behalf of council during 2012/13. In addition, concerns relating to limited financial resources to traverse the large constituencies were reported to be impeding the fulfilment of this role. Table 9, provides detailed analysis of all the assessed councilors and their performance.

\(^{8}\) This total excludes the chairperson and speaker who have been assessed separately in accordance with their unique roles and responsibilities under the LGA.
Table 9: Moyo District Councillors’ Scorecard 2012/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sub-county</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Plenary</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Special skill</th>
<th>Sub total</th>
<th>Meeting electorate</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Sub county meetings</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Roads</th>
<th>Delivery on NPPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terry Silton Anyanzo</td>
<td>Dufile</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zubair A. Asiku</td>
<td>Aliba</td>
<td>FDC</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Izaruku</td>
<td>West Moyo</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Makru Didi</td>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martina Aziree</td>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nusura Odea</td>
<td>West Moyo</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Gia Drami</td>
<td>Itula</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Tiedibaku</td>
<td>Laropi</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Draciri</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Karemoku</td>
<td>Itula</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mubarak H. Yunusaleh</td>
<td>Gimara</td>
<td>UFA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Asienzo</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam JI Asusi</td>
<td>Metu</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luba Kanta Leri</td>
<td>Metu</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Mazapkwe</td>
<td>Dufu/Laropi</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice Eleo</td>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamurah Maneno</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apolonisia Bako</td>
<td>Alibai Gimara</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Kajoingi</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Interpretation of Findings

The performance of Moyo District Council and the general political leadership have a bearing on service delivery in the district. The report highlights key important issues that affect the operational capacity of the district council. These are categorized as internal and external factors.

3.5.1 Internal Factors

- **Poor Record Keeping:** Despite the fact that each Moyo District councilor had been provided with a diary during the year under review in order to improve on their record keeping, the assessment revealed a unique case whereby most councilors claimed that they were not able to record their activities in the diaries provided or personal notebooks and files. This made triangulation of information a bit difficult since only few could show the required evidence.

- **Failure of the district council to pass appropriate actions on raising local revenue:** The assessment revealed that there was little effort towards improving on the local revenue base of the district. The district is endowed with various economic activities, most of which have not been taxed.

- **Monitoring of service delivery on national priority programme areas has continued to be a challenge for the district:** In cases where monitoring was done, no reports were produced or follow-up actions taken to have the identified issues addressed.

- **Delay in submission of PAC reports and eventual discussion by council:** In practice, the District PAC is the accountability statutory body of the district local government and is expected to prepare quarterly reports to be debated and approved by council. In Moyo District, this has remained a challenge and has heavily impacted on the district’s financial management discipline, evidenced by rampant cases of unaccounted for funds; loss of public funds and failure to raise the expected local revenue due to poor strategic focus of the department.

3.5.2 External Factors

- **Overdependence on the Central Government for Financing:** Moyo District has continued to finance most of her activities with funds from the Central Government. However; considering the conditionality of the grants and unpredictable budget cuts by the centre; a number of activities are affected in terms of delays in implementation; rolling of
implementation to the next financial year and total failure to implement some planned activities.

- **Border conflicts:** There has been continued border conflicts with the Southern Sudan government and Yumbe Local Government over boundaries. These conflict have affected a number of development programmes particularly in the disputed areas.

- **Staffing gap:** This remains a big blow both at the district and sub-county levels especially in a situation where government has put recruitment ceiling for the different staff, and yet a number of departments continued to be ill-staffed.

- **Delays in the procurement process:** There have been unnecessary delays in procurement of works in the district. Some contractors in the road sector are awarded contracts late into the implementation period which affects the quality and status of implementation. Such late award of contracts also has severe consequences for the financial absorption capacity of the district.

- **Unpredictable weather conditions of floods and severe sunshine in the district:** During the year, Dufile Sub-county, for instance, suffered the blunt of floods as a number of acres of gardens were destroyed by stormy water and floods. Crops worth hundreds of millions of shillings were lost.

- **Low civic awareness among citizens:** For the community members to hold their leaders accountable, they should be knowledgeable about their roles and responsibilities. However, the citizens still have low level of awareness and this partially explains the laxity on the part of the political leaders. They could also not demand accountability from their leaders given that they did not know parameters and avenues through which to hold them to account.
4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Conclusion
The findings from the scorecard of the district council, chairperson and individual councillors leave a lot to be desired. While many of the above principals were aware of their duties, roles, and obligations as enshrined in the Local Government Act, commitment to executing them remains problematic. This is mainly manifested by the continued poor record keeping and documentation on the part of the political leaders, and a discernable detachment from the electorate, poor monitoring of services and follow-up, among others. The assessment specifies key recommendations that can be undertaken to address some of the identified challenges.

4.2 Recommendations

4.2.1 Advocacy for a Changed Budget Architecture
A critical analysis of Moyo District Budget reveals its high dependency on the central government and very dismal locally generated revenue. This dependency makes the district a mere agent of the central government rather than a fully-fledged local government as envisaged under Article 178 of the Constitution. Moyo District should work with other district local governments through the available fora to advocate for a change in the current budget architecture.

4.2.2 Adopt Minimum Qualifications for Council Members
Although the current legal framework does not require minimum academic qualifications for council members, Moyo District Local Government Council in partnership with other district local governments should pass a resolution to cause amendment of the Local Government Act to set minimum qualifications for councillors.
4.2.3 Formulation of a Comprehensive and Integrated Long-term Development Plan

Moyo District should be managed on the basis of a more long-term development plan of ten to fifteen years. Such a plan should be able to outlive regimes and their leaders. The current five-year development plan which is presented in form of annual work plans, does not address the strategic long-term development interests of the district. A longer-term plan will enable the district council set long-term development targets and periodic performance benchmarks on the basis of which it can evaluate its progress.

4.2.4 Continued Orientation of Councilors and Citizens on their roles

Though the orientation of councilors on their roles was carried out by the Ministry of Local Government on councilors’ assumption of their duties; ideally such orientations and backstopping support should be carried out on an annual basis on the role and functions of the council in the delivery of public services; the strategic focus of the district council; and mechanism of accountability to the electorate. Platforms like public barazas should be strengthened for the citizens to be able to hold the leaders accountable while also providing platform for civic awareness on their roles and obligations and the roles of the district councilors.

4.2.5 Strengthen Monitoring of Government programme

Political leaders (district chairperson and councilors) in Moyo should strengthen their monitoring in order to ensure that the right quality and quantity of services are delivered to the electorate, because they are the people’s representatives and their monitoring roles should be taken seriously. The district council should ensure that a framework for councilors is put in place to monitor programme inputs, processes and results, required for the provision of quality services. Monitoring indicators at all these levels should be identified to guide councilors in their monitoring process.
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## Annex 1: Summary of Councils’ Performance (FY 2012/13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Roads</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Local Revenue</th>
<th>District Budget</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Budgeting</th>
<th>Accountability to Citizens</th>
<th>Monitoring &amp; NPPAs</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>P&amp;L</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mbale</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>142.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukono</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>136.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lira</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>133.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbarara</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>133.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buliisa</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>131.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tororo</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>131.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agago</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>133.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amuru</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>131.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>132.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### % Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mbale</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukono</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lira</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbarara</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buliisa</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tororo</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agago</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amuru</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table above shows the performance of councils in various sectors, including water, agriculture, roads, education, local revenue, district budget, planning & budgeting, accountability to citizens, monitoring & NPPAs, environment, P&L, and total. The % change column indicates the percentage change in performance from 2011/12 to 2012/13.
### Annex 2: Summary of the Chairpersons’ Performance (FY 2012/13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Political Party</th>
<th>Number of Terms</th>
<th>Performance 2012/13</th>
<th>Political Leadership 2012/13</th>
<th>Legislative Role Sub Total</th>
<th>Contact Electorate Sub Total</th>
<th>With Electorate Sub Total</th>
<th>Development Projects Sub Total</th>
<th>Monitoring Service Delivery On NPPAs Sub Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Rwabuhinga</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kabarole</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80 89 11</td>
<td>3 5 2 3 2 4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 4 5 11</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>3 2 5</td>
<td>7 7 7 7 7 7 7 1 3 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prscovia Salaam Musumba</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kamuli</td>
<td>FDC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1 5 2 2 2 4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0 6 7 13</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>3 2 5</td>
<td>7 7 6 6 7 5 5 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Ojara Mapendu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Gulu</td>
<td>FDC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91 88 -3</td>
<td>3 5 2 4 2 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 4 5 11</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>3 2 5</td>
<td>5 7 5 7 5 3 5 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredrick Ngobi Gume</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Jinja</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66 87 32</td>
<td>3 5 2 4 1 4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 6 7 15</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>3 2 5</td>
<td>5 5 5 5 5 5 5 3 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matia Lwanga Bwanka</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70 82 21</td>
<td>3 5 2 4 2 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 3 7</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>3 2 1 6</td>
<td>7 7 7 5 7 1 5 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Osuna</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tororo</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78 82 5</td>
<td>3 5 2 4 2 3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 4 5 11</td>
<td>4 5 9</td>
<td>3 1 5 9</td>
<td>5 7 6 5 5 2 5 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mary Luwakanya</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mpigi</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80 80 0</td>
<td>3 5 2 2 2 4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2 6 0 8</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>1 1 5</td>
<td>7 7 7 7 7 0 2 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles K. Byabakama</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Rukungiri</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44 80 82</td>
<td>3 3 2 3 0 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2 4 3 9</td>
<td>4 5 9</td>
<td>3 1 5 9</td>
<td>7 6 6 7 7 3 3 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Lukooya M.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80 80 0</td>
<td>2 5 2 3 1 4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 6 3 11</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>3 1 5 9</td>
<td>3 7 7 7 4 0 5 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Aol Musooka</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Moroto</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76 78 3</td>
<td>3 5 2 2 2 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 4 0 6</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>3 1 5 9</td>
<td>6 7 7 6 6 0 5 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Omach Atube</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Amuru</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54 78 44</td>
<td>3 4 2 4 1 4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2 2 0 4</td>
<td>4 5 9</td>
<td>3 2 5 10</td>
<td>5 6 5 6 5 5 5 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Michael Egyuny</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Soroti</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82 78 -5</td>
<td>3 5 2 4 2 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0 4 0 4</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>3 2 5 10</td>
<td>7 7 7 7 7 3 0 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Oluma</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Amuria</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74 78 5</td>
<td>3 5 2 3 2 4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 6 3 11</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>3 1 5 9</td>
<td>3 7 7 7 5 0 3 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Tinkamanyire</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hoima</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65 76 17</td>
<td>3 4 2 4 2 4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 2 3 7</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>3 2 0 5</td>
<td>5 7 5 7 5 3 3 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Oromo Aloy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lira</td>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40 76 90</td>
<td>3 4 2 4 2 4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 6 0 8</td>
<td>4 5 9</td>
<td>3 2 5 10</td>
<td>6 6 6 6 6 0 6 0 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deoduditi Tumusiime</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mbarara</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70 75 7</td>
<td>3 5 2 3 2 4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 0 0 2</td>
<td>3 5 8</td>
<td>3 0 5 8</td>
<td>6 6 6 6 6 4 4 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lorot</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nakapirip</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69 75 9</td>
<td>3 3 2 3 2 4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 4 3 9</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>3 1 5 9</td>
<td>5 7 1 7 5 2 3 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Okumu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nebbi</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65 74 14</td>
<td>3 5 2 4 2 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 4 0 6</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>1 2 3 6</td>
<td>0 7 7 7 7 2 2 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis Singahake</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ntungamo</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69 74 7</td>
<td>3 5 2 4 1 4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 4 5 11</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>3 2 3 8</td>
<td>4 3 5 7 2 2 3 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard M. Muyisi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mbale</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70 74 6</td>
<td>3 3 2 4 2 3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 4 3 9</td>
<td>4 5 9</td>
<td>2 1 5 8</td>
<td>6 3 7 3 7 0 5 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine Kasya</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kanungu</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53 74 40</td>
<td>3 4 2 4 2 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 2 0 4</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>3 2 5 10</td>
<td>7 3 7 7 3 3 3 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Baptist Nambeshe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bududa</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62 71 16</td>
<td>3 5 2 4 2 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 2 3 7</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>3 2 5 10</td>
<td>7 3 3 3 3 2 3 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Lukumu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bulisa</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56 70 25</td>
<td>3 4 1 2 2 4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 6 0 8</td>
<td>5 5 0 5</td>
<td>3 2 5 10</td>
<td>6 7 7 7 3 0 1 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdul Nadduli</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Luweero</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63 69 10</td>
<td>3 5 2 4 2 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 2 0 4</td>
<td>5 5 10</td>
<td>3 2 0 5</td>
<td>5 5 5 7 5 0 3 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Okudi Yukoni</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mayo</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52 62 19</td>
<td>3 5 2 4 2 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 6 0 8</td>
<td>5 2 7</td>
<td>3 1 0 4</td>
<td>7 2 2 6 2 2 2 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Odok W.Oteng</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Agago</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47 11 2</td>
<td>5 5 2 3 2 3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 3 0 3</td>
<td>3 2 5 10</td>
<td>2 2 2 6 2 2 2 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 67 77 19</td>
<td>3 5 2 3 2 4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2 4 2 8</td>
<td>5 4 9</td>
<td>3 2 4 9</td>
<td>5 6 6 6 6 5 2 3 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Policy Area</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Contacts with Electorates</td>
<td>Prejudging and Preservation of Order in Council</td>
<td>Coordination Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mubende</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soroti</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebbi</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibale</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasese</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annex 3: Summary of District Speakers’ Performance FY 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker Code</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Political Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nakapiripiri</td>
<td>Samuel Banneke</td>
<td>NRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Gulu</td>
<td>Peter Douglas Ocholla</td>
<td>NRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>James Kizzaa Kandibwa</td>
<td>NRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nakapiripiri</td>
<td>Julius Kebeme</td>
<td>NRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nebbi</td>
<td>Mohammed Mubiru</td>
<td>NRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nebbi</td>
<td>Martin Ocen Odyek</td>
<td>NRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nebbi</td>
<td>Henry Ndyabahika</td>
<td>NRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nebbi</td>
<td>Proscovia Namansa</td>
<td>NRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nebbi</td>
<td>Daudi Byekwaso Mukiibi</td>
<td>NRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nebbi</td>
<td>Christopher Odongkara</td>
<td>NRM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Monitoring NPPAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub County</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Contact with Electorates</th>
<th>Prejudging and Preservation of Order in Council</th>
<th>Coordination Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakapiripiri</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulu</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebbi</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part of Form 1: District Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Contacts with Electorates</th>
<th>Prejudging and Preservation of Order in Council</th>
<th>Coordination Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakapiripiri</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulu</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebbi</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Participation in LG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Contacts with Electorates</th>
<th>Prejudging and Preservation of Order in Council</th>
<th>Coordination Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakapiripiri</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulu</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebbi</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Score-Card Report 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Contacts with Electorates</th>
<th>Prejudging and Preservation of Order in Council</th>
<th>Coordination Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakapiripiri</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulu</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebbi</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Contacts with Electorates</th>
<th>Prejudging and Preservation of Order in Council</th>
<th>Coordination Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakapiripiri</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulu</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebbi</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contacts with Electorates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Contacts with Electorates</th>
<th>Prejudging and Preservation of Order in Council</th>
<th>Coordination Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakapiripiri</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulu</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebbi</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prejudging and Preservation of Order in Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Contacts with Electorates</th>
<th>Prejudging and Preservation of Order in Council</th>
<th>Coordination Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakapiripiri</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulu</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyo</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebbi</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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