



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Bugambe Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236430)

Score 76/100 (76%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: A. Functionality of Parish Administrative Structures				
1	The LLG has ensured that there are functional PDCs/WDCs in all their respective Parishes/Wards Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the LLG has duly constituted PDCs/WDCs with composition in accordance with the PDM Guidelines, and that PDCs are fully functional as evidenced by mobilization of beneficiaries within a parish/ward, appraisal of all proposals submitted for the revolving funds during the previous FY for all parishes, score 2, else score 0.	0	There was evidence that PDCs were established in all Parishes Minutes of PDCs were submitted to the LLG as per the dates. However there was no evidence of PDCs appraisal of all projects
2	LLG has ensured that all Parish Chiefs/Town Agents have collected, compiled, and analyzed data on Parish/community profiling as stipulated in the PDM Guidelines. Maximum score is 2	Evidence that all the Parishes/Wards in a LLG have compiled, updated, and analyzed data on community profiling disaggregated by village, gender, age, economic activity among others as stipulated in the PDM Guidelines, score 2 else score 0.	0	There was NO evidence of community profiling by other parishes apart from Katanga.
3	The LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and PDCs on strategies for the development of the parish Maximum score is 6	Evidence that the LLG: i. Has mapped NGOs, CBOs & CSO operating in the LLG and involved them in raising awareness about the PDM and planning cycle: score 2, or else 0 ii. Approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY score 2, else score 0 iii. Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0	2 2 2	Mapping report on NGOs like Baylor, HOCADEO AVIS on file There was evidence that the SAS provided guidance to PDCs and Village Executives Committees were provided guidance on Priority enterprises
Assessment area: B. Planning and Budgeting				
4	The LLG conducted Annual	Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council		

<p>Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p>	<p>approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:</p> <p>i. Is consistent with the LLG approved development plan III; score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>AWPB is consistent with the LLG approved development plan III</p>
	<p>Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:</p> <p>ii. Incorporates ranked priorities from all its respective parish submissions which are duly signed by the Parish Chief and PDC Chairperson score 1 or else 0.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>No evidence of submission on file at the time of assessment</p>
	<p>Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:</p> <p>iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The AWPB was based on the Budget Conference held on 29th October 2021 as per the Budget Conference report.</p>
	<p>iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The following investments to be financed are included in budget.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Procurement of desks for Katanga & Ruguse Primary Schools 2. Opening & shaping of Nyabuhere - Kyabakahuna - Bujugu road 3. Titling of public land (Nyamulima, Nyabale-Rukede and Ruguse market <p>Etc</p>
	<p>v. Evidence that the LLG developed project profiles for all capital investments in the AWP and Budget as per format in NDP III Score 1 or else score 0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>Project profiles were in place but did not follow prescribed format</p>
	<p>vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the</p>		<p>LLG submitted the</p>

		District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0	1	AWPB on 12/5/2022
5	Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the LLG prepared and submitted inputs into the procurement plan for all the procurements to be done in a LLG for the current FY) to the CAO/TC by the 30th April of the previous FY, Score 2 or else score 0	2	The Procurement plan was submitted on 14/4/2022
6	Compliance of the LLG budget to DDEG investment menu for the current FY Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the investments in the approved LLG Budget for the current FY comply with the investment menu in the DDEG Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines, score 2 or else score 0	2	Prioritized investment comply to the DDEG Grant Implementation Guidelines
Assessment area: C. Own Source Revenue Mobilization and Administration				
7	LLG collected local revenue as per budget (Budget realization) Maximum score is 1	Evidence that the LLG collected OSR for the previous FY within +/- 10% of the budget score 1 or else score 0.	0	Local revenue in FY 2021/2022 increased by more than +10% i.e 68.7%
8	Increase in LLG own source revenues from last financial year but one to last financial year. Maximum score 1	Evidence that the OSR collected increased from previous FY but one to previous FY by more than 5 %, score 1 or else score 0	1	OSR increased by more than 5%
9	The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY Maximum score 4	Evidence that the LLG: i. Has remitted OSR to the administrative units, score 1 or else score 0.	0	There was no evidence of remittances to administrative units
		Evidence that the LLG: ii. Did not use more than 20% of the OSR on councilors allowances in the previous FY (unless authority was granted by the Minister), score 1, else score 0	0	The LLG used more than 20% of OSR on councilors allowances
		Evidence that the LLG: iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0	1	The LLG used 1.1 million on maintenance of motor cycle

Evidence that the LLG:

iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.

1

OSR was Publicised the on the LLG noticeboard

Assessment area: D. Financial Management

10

The LLG submitted annual financial statements for the previous FY on time

Maximum score is 4

Evidence that the LLG submitted its Annual Financial Statement to the Auditor General (AG) on time (i.e., by August 31), score 4 or else score 0

4

Annual Financial Statement to the Auditor General (AG) on 31st August 2022

11

The LLG has submitted all 4 quarterly financial and physical progress reports including finances for the Parish Development Model (PDM), for the previous FY on time and in the prescribed format

Maximum score is 6

Evidence that the LLG submitted all four quarterly financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time:

1

Q1 submitted on 13/10/2021

i. Q1 by 15th October score 1 or else 0

Evidence that the LLG submitted all four quarterly financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time:

1

Q2 submitted on 13/1/2022

ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0

Evidence that the LLG submitted all four quarterly financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time:

1

Q3 submitted on 14/4/2022

iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0

Evidence that the LLG submitted all four quarterly financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time:

3

Q4 submitted on 14/7/2022

iv. Q4 by 30th July score 3 or else 0

Assessment area: E. Human Resources Management for Improved Service Delivery

12

Appraisal of all staff in the LLG in the previous FY

Maximum score is 6

Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:

(i) All staff in the LLG including extension workers in the previous FY (by 30th June): score 2 or else 0

2

All staff were appraised

Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:

• no evidence of appraisals for

	(ii) Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0	0	head teachers	
	Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG: (iii) HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else	0	No evidence of appraised HCIII & II in charges (though they are supposed to be appraised by sub district in charge)	
13	Staff duty attendance Maximum score is 6	Evidence that the LLG has (i) Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 3 or else 0	3	The list of LLG staff was found on the noticeboard date 30/6/2021
	Evidence that the LLG has (ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0	3	Staff attendance analysis in place	
Assessment area: F. Implementation and Execution				
14	The LLG has spent all the DDEG funds for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the LLG 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	2	LLG budgeted and spent all the DDEG on eligible projects E.g renovation of the community hall, administration block and procurement of desks
15	The LLG spent the funds as per budget Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the execution of budget in the previous FY does not deviate for any of the sectors/main programs by more than +/-10%: Score 2	0	Budget execution deviated more than 10%
16	Completion of investments as per annual work plan and budget Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the investment projects planned in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of FY (quarter four) : If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3 If 70% -90%: Score 2 If less than 70 %: Score 0.	3	More than 90% of all the project were completed

Assessment area: G. Environmental and Social Safeguards

	The LLG has implemented environmental and social safeguards during the previous FY Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the LLG carried out environmental, social and climate change screening where required, prior to implementation of all planned investments/ projects, score 2 or else score 0	0	Certification of Environment and social safeguards was not done.
18	The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling System Maximum score is 2	(i) If the LLG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back, complaints log book with clear information and reference for onward action, a defined complaints referral path, and public display of information at LLG offices score 1 or else 0 (ii) If the LLG has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress score 1 or else 0	1	LLG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances e.g the LLG has a complaints log book. LLG has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms
19	The LLG has a functional land management system Maximum score 1	If the LLG has a functional Area Land committee in place to assist the LG Land board in an advisory capacity on matters relating to land, including ascertaining rights on the land score 1 or else 0	1	Area land committee was fully constituted
Assessment area: H. Basic (Pre & Primary) Education services Management (in public and private schools)				
20	Awareness campaigns and mobilization on education services conducted in last FY Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery score 3, else score 0	3	Reports on awareness campaigns and parents' mobilization in place
21	Monitoring of service delivery in basic schools Maximum score is 4	Evidence that the LLG has monitored schools at least once per term in the previous 3 terms and produced a list of issues requiring attention of the committee responsible for education of the LLG council in the previous FY: If all schools (100%) - score 4 If 80 – 99% – score 2 If 60 to 79% score 1 Below 60% score 0	2	Only government aided schools were monitored
22	Existence and functionality of School Management Committees			LLG have functional school management

Maximum score is 3

committees in all schools

Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools; score 3, else score 0

3

as per minutes dated

13/2/2022 for katanga, 1/2/2022 bugambe BCS P/s

18/3/2022 for bugambe SSS

Assessment area: I. Primary Health Care Services Management

23

Awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY

Maximum score is 3

Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery score 3, else score 0

3

Reports on awareness campaigns and community mobilization

in place

24

The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY

Maximum score is 4

Evidence that LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY , score 4 or else score 0

4

LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery, reports on file

25

Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee

Maximum score is 3

Evidence that the LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG; score 3, else score 0

3

LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities

minutes on file

Assessment area: J. Water & Environment Services Management

26

Evidence that the LLGs submitted requests to the DWO for consideration in the current FY budgets

Maximum score is 3

Evidence that the SAS submitted in writing requests to the DWO for consideration in the planning of the current FY score 3, else score 0

0

No evidence of submission of written water requests to the DWO

27

The LLG has monitored water and environment services delivery during the previous FY

Maximum score is 3

Evidence that SAS/ATC monitored/supervised aspects of water and environment services during the previous FY including review of water points and facilities, score 3 or else score 0

3

Reports on water and environment monitoring

seen on file

28	Existence and functionality of Water and Sanitation Committees Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the LLG have functional Water and Sanitation Committees (including collection and proper use of community contributions) score 2, else score 0	0	Water and Sanitation Committees not operational ,monitoring report not seen
29	Functionality of investments in water and sanitation facilities Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the SAS has an updated lists on all its water and sanitation facilities (public latrines) and functionality status. Score 2 else 0	2	Report on water facilities on file

Assessment area: L. Production Services Management

34	Up to date data on agriculture and irrigation collected, analyzed and reported Maximum score is 2	If the LLG extension staff have collected, analyzed and reported data on agriculture (i.e., crop, animal and fisheries) and irrigation activities including production statistics for key commodities, data on irrigated land, farmer applications, farm visits etc. as per formats, the reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0.	2	LLG extension staff have collected, analyzed and reported data on agriculture
35	Farmer awareness and mobilization campaigns carried out through farmer field days and awareness meetings Maximum score is 2	If the LLG has carried out awareness and mobilization campaigns on all aspects of agriculture through farmer field days and awareness meetings, exchange visits, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0	2	Reports on awareness on file Attendance lists
36	The LLG has carried out monitoring activities on production activities for crops, animals and fisheries Maximum score is 2	If the LLG extension staff has implemented monitoring activities on agricultural production for crops, animal and fisheries covering among others irrigation, environmental safeguards, agricultural mechanization, postharvest handling, pests and disease surveillance, equipment installations, farmers implementing knowledge from trainings, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0	2	Monthly monitoring reports by extension staff on file Supervision reports on file
37	Farmer trainings through training farmer field schools and demonstrations organized and carried out Maximum score is 2	If the LLG extension staff has carried out farmer trainings on irrigated agriculture, agronomy, pests and diseases management, operation and maintenance of equipment, linkage to markets etc. through for example farmer field schools, demonstrations, and field training sessions, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0.	2	Attendance sheets on file Training reports in place
38	The LLG has provided hands-on extension support to farmers and farmer	If the LLG extension staff have provided extension support to farmers and farmer groups on crop management, aquaculture,		Field reports on

organizations / groups	animal husbandry, irrigation, Operation and Maintenance of equipment, postharvest handling, value addition, marketing etc. reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office	2	extension support on file
Maximum score is 2	score 2 or else 0		