



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Baitambogwe Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236740)

Score 45/100 (45%)

Assessment area: B. Planning and Budgeting

4

The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines

Maximum score is 6

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; score 1 or else 0

0

The LLG had no current development plan IV and still the the priorities in the approved budget for FY 2025/26 do not reflect in the sub county DP III

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.

0

With exceptions of Mulingilile and Wainha parishes whose PDC submissions were not produced by the time of assessment, the other 6 parishes had the PDC submissions but unfortunately out of the 6 only 1 parish of katonte had one of its priority captured in the sub county's approved budget for FY 2025/26 and that is a road maintenance of Buwaga road

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

0

The sub county produced town council budget conference presentation and communication of the chairperson of the conference and not Budget Conference Report or minutes

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

1

Page 15 of the budget booklet had investments to be undertaken by the sub county and among them was road maintenances of Mbirizi-Lugolole B, Musita A- Musita B, Buwanga A- Buwanga B

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

0

There was no evidence provided by the sub county on whether the sub county developed project profiles for all capital investments in the AWP and Budget as per format in NDP III

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

1

The LLG budget was submitted its budget to the District on 12th May 2025

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

0

The LLG submitted its procurement plan on 14th July 2025

6	<p>Compliance of the LLG budget to DDEG investment menu for the current FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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</p>	2	<p>The prioritized investments as evidenced in the sub county budget booklet do comply to the DDEG Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines investment menu.</p>
---	--	---	---	---

Assessment area: C. Own Source Revenue Mobilization and Administration

7	<p>LLG collected local revenue as per budget (Budget realization)</p> <p>Maximum score is 1</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG collected OSR for the previous FY within +/- 10% of the budget score 1 or else score 0.</p>	0	<p>On page 11 of the approved annual workplan FY 2024/25, shows that the sub county budgeted for Ug shs 17,440,000 as OSR while on page 41 of the final accounts 2024/25, shows that the sub county collected 27,509,574 being a 57% over and above the original budget. The increment was due to the SLAC Project</p>
8	<p>Increase in LLG own source revenues from last financial year but one to last financial year.</p> <p>Maximum score 1</p>	<p>Evidence that the OSR collected increased from previous FY but one to previous FY by more than 5 %, score 1 or else score 0</p>	1	<p>Page 38 of the final accounts 2023/24, Ug shs 18,227,150 was collected and on page 41 of the final accounts 2024/25 Ug shs 27,509,574 was collected beings a 66.3% increment</p>
9	<p>The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG:</p> <p>i. Has remitted OSR to the administrative units, score 1 or else score 0.</p>	0	<p>Payment Vouchers number 07/6/2025 and 01/6/2025 shows requisition of Ug shs 340,000 and 1,930,000 respectively but there is no acknowledgement of receipt of these quoted funds by the intended beneficiaries</p>

		Payment Voucher numbers listed below show disbursements of OSR on councilors allowances in the previous FY
		17/10/2024 = 360,000
		12/2/2025 = 850,000
		03/2/2025 = 1,185,000
		17/8/2024 = 360,000
		27/8/2024 = 1,185,000
		04/5/2025 = 360,000
		03/5/2025 = 1,185,000
		14/10/2024 = 490,000
		Total = 5,975,000.
		This total divided by the actual OSR collection of Ug shs 27,509,574 as per FY 2024/25 final accounts, shows that 21.7% was spent on councilors allowances
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	
Evidence that the LLG:		
iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0	1	Voucher number 04/3/2025 shows a request on operational and maintenance in previous FY as it was evidenced in the budget of FY 2024/25.
Evidence that the LLG:		
iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.	0	No evidence of publications made on OSR usage

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	LLG submissions of AFS to Auditor General was on 28th/08/2025
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	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	Submitted on 15th/10/2024

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	Submitted on 7th/01/2025
	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	Submitted on 15th/04/2025
	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	Submitted on 14th/7/2025
	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	Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:		
	Maximum score is 6	(i) All staff in the LLG including extension workers in the previous FY (by 30th June): score 2 or else 0	2	All the 14 sub county staffs were appraised
		Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:		Out of the 17 Head teachers only 8 were appraised and signed agreement with the SAS and these were:-
		(ii) Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0	0	Nabalongo, Bute, Mulingilire, Katonte, Musita Moslem, Buluba, Mbirizi and Baitambogwe primary schools. The other 9 had no evidence of appraisal by the SAS
		Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:		The LLG has 3 health centers and these are Baitambogwe HC III, Bute HC II, and Namusenwa HC II and evidence for their appraisal by the SAS was evidenced
		(iii) HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else	2	
13	Staff duty attendance	Evidence that the LLG has		
	Maximum score is 6	(i) Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 3 or else 0	3	Publications of staff lists evidenced

Evidence that the LLG has

(ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0

3

Staff analysis for the 21 months produced

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

As evidenced from the approved budget of FY 2024/25, budget and expenditures was on eligible projects/ activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines. among them it included road maintenances of mukuta, Wainha A, environmental management

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

All Payment vouchers were inline with the budget and from the sampled ones dated 12/02/25, 11/02/2025, 02/2/2025 and 07/11/2024

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

Completion certificates for completed projects were evidenced and these were Wainha A- Bugodi A and Mukuta to Estate all dated 30th/10/2024 and signed by the District Engineer Engineer Wanjusi Febiano

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

No evidence record of environment and social screening forms and climate change for the subcounty projects implemented in the previous financial year.

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

The sub county has a functional grievance handling system in place.

	(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 subcounty has a record of grievance or complaint logbook in place used to record the various grievances as they are reported. with all the sectors indicated to handle the various grievance areas as reflected on the notice board.
19	<p>The LLG has a functional land management system</p> <p>Maximum score 1</p>	<p>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</p> <p>1</p>	<p>The sub county has a functional land board that was appointed in September 2022 . Its displayed on the notice board for reference.</p>

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	0	The sub county have no awareness campaigns and reports on mobilisation for improvement of education services.
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	0	The sub county has no record of evidence for having monitored the schools in the 3 terms.

22	Existence and functionality of School Management Committees				The sub county has 17 primary schools, but only 8 have functional SMC though they never held the required number of SMC meetings to discuss the implementation of the agreed upon actions for improvement
	Maximum score is 3				
		Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools; score 3, else score 0	0		<p>Butte mixed p/s on 18/02/2025, 01/10/2024</p> <p>Katonte P/S on 22/05/2025,</p> <p>Mulingilire P/S on 25/10/24, 6/3/2025, 27/5/2025</p> <p>Musita P/S on 5/6/2025,</p> <p>Buluba p/s 8/7/2024, 2/10/2024, 18/2/2025, 28/5/2025</p> <p>Mbirizi P/S on 8/7/20254, 2/10/2024</p> <p>Baitambogwe on p/s, on 11/10/2025, 20/2/2025</p> <p>Mugeya p/s on 1/10/2024, 30/4/2025, 19/2/2025</p>

Assessment area: I. Primary Health Care Services Management

23	Awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery score 3, else score 0	0		The sub county has no reports of awareness campaigns and community mobilization reports on improvement in primary health care.
	Maximum score is 3				
24	The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY	Evidence that LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY , score 4 or else score 0	0		The sub county SAS never conducted any monitoring on service delivery in the health sector.
	Maximum score is 4				

25	Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee			The sub county has 3 health centers with have functional HUMC.
	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	Baitambogwe HCIII, held their meetings on 30/9/2024, 31/12/2024, 31/03/2025, 30/6/2025 Butte HC II held on 14/8/24, 27/11/24, 25/01/2025, 23/5/2025 Namusenwa HC II held in quarter 1 and 2 though not dated, Qtr 3 dated on the 22/2/2025 , Qtr 4 on 17th /6/2025

Assessment area: J. Water & Environment Services Management

26	Evidence that the LLGs submitted requests to the DWO for consideration in the current FY budgets	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	The sub county has no request to the DWO about water sources allocation.
	Maximum score is 3			
27	The LLG has monitored water and environment services delivery during the previous FY	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	0	The SAS has no monitoring or supervision reports on water and environment services and facilities.
	Maximum score is 3			
28	Existence and functionality of Water and Sanitation Committees	Evidence that the LLG have functional Water and Sanitation Committees (including collection and proper use of community contributions) score 2, else score 0	0	The sub county has no evidence reports of functionality of water user committees.
	Maximum score is 2			
29	Functionality of investments in water and sanitation facilities	Evidence that the SAS has an updated lists on all its water and sanitation facilities (public latrines) and functionality status. Score 2 else 0	0	The sub county has no evidenced record of updated lists on water and sanitation facilities and their functionality.
	Maximum score is 2			

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.	0	Only evidenced reports from the Animal Production Officer. Reports from the Fisheries and Agricultural officers were not presented
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	0	Only evidenced reports from the Animal Production Officer dated 10th/04/2025. Reports from the Fisheries and Agricultural officers were not presented
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	0	Only evidenced Monitoring report was from the Animal Production Officer dated 30th/06/2025. Reports from the Fisheries and Agricultural officers were not presented
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.	0	Only evidenced reports from the Animal Production Officer. Reports from the Fisheries and Agricultural officers were not presented
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	0	Only evidenced reports from the Animal Production Officer. Reports from the Fisheries and Agricultural officers were not presented