



## **LLG Performance Assessment**

LLG Performance Assessment

Kyangwali Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236425)

**Score** 93/100 (93%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
<b>Assessment area: A. Functionality of Parish Administrative Structures</b>				
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.	2	Evidence of minutes dated 22/06/22 for various Parishes were on file.
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.	2	Evidence of community profiling seen from all the four parishes
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	2	Mapping of NGOs, CSOs was done and were involved in planning. (however, local CBOs were neglected during mapping)
		Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on:  ii. Approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY score 2, else score 0	2	On file there was a letter from SACAO on approved projects for parishes for the current FY.
		Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on:  iii. Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0	2	Evidence of the LLG guiding PDCs on enterprises that can be implemented in parish was on file.
<b>Assessment area: B. Planning and Budgeting</b>				
4	The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines	Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:  i. Is consistent with the LLG approved development plan III;	1	Prioritized investments in the AWP & Budget are consistent with those in the development

Maximum score is 6

score 1 or else 0

plan. E.g  
Construction of  
Butoole Parish  
Headquarters

Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:

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.

1

Evidence of Parish chief submissions were on file

Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:

iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0

1

Inclusion of the Budget Conference outcomes in the AWPB were evidenced in the Budget Conference Report e.g Road maintenance of Mahamba - Kasoga Road 3km

iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0

1

Construction of 2 stance drainage VIP latrine at Kasoga

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

1

Project profiles prepared according to the prescribed format

vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May; score 1 or else 0

1

Evidence of submission was in place as per the submission dates.

Q1 on 12/10/2021  
Q2 on 11/1/2021  
Q3 om 12/4/2022  
Q4 on 13/7/2022

The Approved Budget and workplan were submitted to the District Planner on 14/05/2022

5

Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement

Evidence that the LLG prepared and submitted inputs into the procurement plan for all the procurements to be done in a LLG

The LLG submitted

	Maximum score is 2	for the current FY) to the CAO/TC by the 30th April of the previous FY, Score 2 or else score 0	2	procurement plan to PDU on 20/04/2022
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	The investment menu in the budget is as per DDEG guidelines
<b>Assessment area: C. Own Source Revenue Mobilization and Administration</b>				
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.	1	OSR collection was within 10%
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 collected increased 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.	1	Remitted OSR to the 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	1	Did not use more than 20% of the OSR on councilors allowances in the previous FY
		Evidence that the LLG:  iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0	1	Budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY
		Evidence that the LLG:  iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.	1	Publicised OSR on the Sub County Notice board

**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	There was evidence that the LLG submitted all the 4 quarterly reports.  Q1 on 12/10/2021  Q2 on 11/1/2021  Q3 on 12/4/2022  Q4 on 13/7/2022
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:  i. Q1 by 15th October score 1 or else 0	1	Q1 on 12/10/2021
		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:  ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0	1	Q2 on 11/1/2021
		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:  iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0	1	Q3 on 12/4/2022
		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:  iv. Q4 by 30th July score 3 or else 0	3	submission done on time  Q4 on 13/7/2022

**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 in the LLG were appraised
		Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:  (ii) Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score	2	There was evidence that all Primary School Head teachers

	2 or else 0		were appraised
	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	HCIII & II In charges were not appraised
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  Publicized the list of LLG staff on the Sub County noticeboard
	Evidence that the LLG has  (ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0	3	Monthly analysis of staff attendance was on file
<b>Assessment area: F. Implementation and Execution</b>			
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  All the DDEG grant was spent on eligible activities e.g  1. Opening and grading of Wairagaza streets  2. Opening and grading of Rwemiseke-Kimbigamba road 4km  3. Opening and grading of Butoole – Ngogoli 4km  4. Renovation of Community Hall  5. Supply of Bore hole spare parts
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	2  Expenditure in the previous FY was within +/-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	3  All projects were

If 70% -90%: Score 2	2	completed (100%) as per the budget
If less than 70 %: Score 0.		

**Assessment area: G. Environmental and Social Safeguards**

17	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	Environment and social safeguards certification were not done by CDO and S/Environment FP
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	1	LLG has A specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances
		(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	The LLG grievance redress mechanisms was displayed on the noticeboard
19	The LLG has a functional land management system Maximum score 1			LLG has fully constituted Area Land Committee with the following members as per the appointment letters:
		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	1. Mwakali Dorothy 2. Businge John 3. Abigaba Alington 4. Nsungwa Flora 5. Barongo Wilson Chairperson

**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	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education	3	Awareness campaigns were conducted as
----	---	--	---	---------------------------------------

	Maximum score is 3	service delivery score 3, else score 0		evidenced by the report on file
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		There was evidence of monitoring schools as per the reports on file
22	Existence and functionality of School Management Committees  Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools; score 3, else score 0	3	LLG have functional school management committees in all schools
<b>Assessment area: I. Primary Health Care Services Management</b>				
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 were on file
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 as per 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	Health unit Management Committees were functional in all health facilities and minutes of meetings were on file
<b>Assessment area: J. Water &amp; Environment Services Management</b>				
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	3	Water requests made to DWO For consideration in the current FY
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 in place as per the report dated 22/03/2022
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	2	Water and Sanitation Committees are operational operational as per minutes seen on file
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	SAS has an updated lists on all its water and sanitation facilities as per the report dated 22/03/2022
<b>Assessment area: L. Production Services Management</b>				
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	Reports on production statistics in place
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 creation in place Materials distribution lists in place Attendance lists in place
36	The LLG has carried out monitoring activities on production activities for crops, animals and fisheries	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,	2	Monthly monitoring reports by extension staff in place

	Maximum score is 2	farmers implementing knowledge from trainings, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0		Supervision reports by SAS seen
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	Training reports on file  Attendance sheets seen
38	The LLG has provided hands-on extension support to farmers and farmer organizations / groups  Maximum score is 2	If the LLG extension staff have provided extension support to farmers and farmer groups on crop management, aquaculture, animal husbandry, irrigation, Operation and Maintenance of equipment, postharvest handling, value addition, marketing etc. reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0	2	Field reports on extension support in place