



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Bugadde Town Council

(Vote Code: 273639)

Score 79/100 (79%)

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.	2	The LLG has established and operational Parish Development Committees (PDCs) in accordance with the Parish Development Model (PDM) guidelines. This was confirmed by the availability of PDC meeting minutes and a list of 7 members for each parish. For example, Bugadde Ward PDC minutes dated 23/2/2025, discussing the approval of PDM beneficiaries.
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	The wards within the LLG collected, categorized, and analyzed data on community profiling. This was evidenced by the community profiling data for all the wards extracted from the PDMIS system which was disaggregated by gender, age, economic activity, etc for all parishes provided to the assessment team.
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	2 2	The LLG Mapped NGOs, CBOs, and CSOs operating within the LLG and involved them in raising awareness about the Parish Development Model (PDM). This was evidenced by the list of NGOs operating in the LLG and the PDM awareness report prepared by CDO Kawanguzi Abudallah on March 25, 2025, which indicated the involvement of Somero coordinator Kayihura Dan in the sensitization meetings. The LLG provided guidance to Village Executive Committees (VECs) and Parish Development Committees (PDCs) on the programs and activities to be implemented within their respective parishes. This was confirmed by the approved parish priorities shared with the assessment team, such as the Nakibengo Ward activities planned for implementation, dated 10, march 2025.

Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on:

2

iii. Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0

The LLG shared with the assessment team a list of enterprises being implemented in the parishes. It was found that the LLG provided guidance to the Parish Development Committees (PDCs) through field visits and training sessions evidenced in the Enterprise trainings in cost best analysis conducted dated 30/6/2024

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

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

0

i. Is consistent with the LLG approved development plan III; score 1 or else 0

The LLG's Current FY 2025/2026 budget lacked evidence of consistency with the TCDP IV, this was concluded by the assessment team not being in position to be availed with the updated Development Plan IV despite the Town council providing the Third Town council development plan III (TC DP III) for FY2020/2021-2024/2025.

Maximum score is 6

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

The LLG AWPB for the current FY incorporated prioritized investments identified by the individual parishes. This was reflected in the comprehensive parish priorities provided by all four wards, which were fully endorsed by their respective LC II chairpersons which were shared to the assessment team. For example, Bugadde Ward priorities dated 13th/10/ 2024 signed by both the Town Agent, Kirya David and the LC II chairperson, Kirya David included need for desks at Bugadde ps, and Garbage containers, which appears in the LLG AWPB of DDEG. Likewise, Kityerera Ward submitted its priorities on the same date, signed by the Town Agent waiswa peter.

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

1

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

The 2025/26 AWPB is based on the investment priorities established in Budget conference report dated 25/20/2024. The report proves that community-suggested resolution to procure garbage containers for Buggade Town. This was not only highlighted in the report but is also explicitly budgeted and funded within the AWPB via the DDEG program.

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

1

The LLG current FY Budget includes investments to be financed by the LLG this was evidenced by the LLG budgeting for supply and procurement of office carpets and prorates of shs.500,000 funded by OSR seen in the works AWPB for current FY24/25 under Administration Managment workplan.

	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	The LLG developed project profile as per NDPIII format for the planned investments to be implemented in the current FY, the projects whose profiles were developed includes; procurement of Garbage containers costed 4800,000 under DDEG, Distribution of 30 three seater desks to schools also under DDEG as per the NDP III format.
	vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0	0	The LLG Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current financial year, 2025/26, was submitted to the district and its receipt was confirmed by the District Central Registry on 2/07/2025. However, this submission date violates the established deadline of no later than May 15th.
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 LLG submitted the procurement plan for the inputs to be procured for the current financial year, 2025/26, to the district and its receipt was confirmed by the District Central Registry on 14th/4/ 2025. This submission date confirms the established deadline of no later than 30th April.
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 LLG AWPB for the current FY meets the investment criteria specified in the DDEG grant guidelines. This evident was observed in the Current FY Budget where the total DDEG budget of shs. 17,133,488 includes shs. 13,706,790 for infrastructure investments, which amounts to 80% of the total DDEG Funds. This suits the minimum investment requirement of not less than 80% of DDEG funds.
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. 1	The LLG's AFS for FY2024/2025 shows that the revised budgeted OSR was shs.30,217,750 while actual revenue collection amounted to shs.30,217,750. This translates to a 100% revenue collection rate, which satisfies the +/-10% criterion.

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>The LLG's own source revenue (OSR) collection increased from shs.8,771,000 in FY2023-2024 to shs. 30,217,750 in FY2024-2025, resulting in an increment of shs. 21,446,750 . This represents a 244% increase, which meets the required increase of over 5%.</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>	1	<p>The LLG remitted 30% of OSR funds to LCI and LCII administrative units, totaling 2,520,000. This was supported by voucher payments examined by the assessment team, such as voucher no. 7/5/25 dated May 21st, 2025, for shs. 2,520,000.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LLG:</p> <p>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</p>	0	<p>The LLG's expenditure on councilor allowances amounted to shs.8,330,000, representing 27% of the total revenue collected (30,217,750). This violates the acceptable limit of 20% OSR usage for councilor allowances. This was seen in the AFS trial balance on page 48 under Council.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LLG:</p> <p>iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0</p>	0	<p>The LLG budgeted 800,000 for Operational and Maintenance (O&M) in the previous FY2024/2025, as recorded in the AWPB. Expenditure of which shs.700,000 was confirmed via Payment Voucher 7/2/2025 (dated 19/2/2025), which included 500,000 for motorcycle repairs and 200,000 for compound cleaning. However, this budget was placed under Non-Wage funding, which violates the requirement that the LLG have budgeted and used OSR funds on O&M. Furthermore, sh.700,000 O&M expenditure is insufficient, as it fails to meet the minimum requirement of spending at least 5% of OSR on O&M.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LLG:</p> <p>iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.</p>	1	<p>The LLG publicly disclosed the OSR collected in FY2024/2025. This was confirmed by the revenue collection sources verified by the Town Clerk and posted on the Town Council notice board, along with the disbursement of funds to various departments</p>

Assessment area: D. Financial Management

10	<p>The LLG submitted annual financial statements for the previous FY on time</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>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</p>	4	<p>The LLG submitted its AFS for FY2024/2025 to the Auditor General on August 28, 2025. This submission falls within the acceptable timeframe of not exceeding August 31st.</p>
11	<p>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</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>i. Q1 by 15th October score 1 or else 0</p> <p>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:</p> <p>ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0</p> <p>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:</p> <p>iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0</p> <p>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:</p> <p>iv. Q4 by 30th July score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>3</p>	<p>The LLG submitted the previous FY's Q1 PBS financial and physical progress reports, including PDM funding, to the Accounting Officer. This was confirmed by the Q1 progress report provided to the assessment team, with submission acknowledgments dated 8th/10/2024. This suits within the acceptable submission timeframe of by 15th October.</p> <p>The LLG submitted the previous FY's Q2 PBS financial and physical progress reports, including PDM funding, to the Accounting Officer. This was confirmed by the Q2 progress report provided to the assessment team, with submission acknowledgments dated 7th/01/2025. This suits within the acceptable submission timeframe of by 15th January.</p> <p>The LLG submitted the previous FY's Q3 PBS financial and physical progress reports, including PDM funding, to the Accounting Officer. This was confirmed by the Q3 progress report provided to the assessment team, with submission acknowledgments dated 14th/04/2025. This suits within the acceptable submission timeframe of by 15th April.</p> <p>The LLG submitted the previous FY's Q4 PBS financial and physical progress reports, including PDM funding, to the Accounting Officer. This was confirmed by the Q4 progress report provided to the assessment team, with submission acknowledgments dated 2th/07/2025. This suits within the acceptable submission timeframe of by 30th July.</p>

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

12	<p>Appraisal of all staff in the LLG in the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p>	<p>Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:</p> <p>(i) All staff in the LLG including extension workers in the previous FY (by 30th June): score 2 or else 0</p> <p>(ii) Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0</p> <p>(iii) HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else</p>	<p>2</p> <p>0</p> <p>2</p>	<p>The LLG provided a staff list containing 11 staff members, including extension workers. All staff members were appraised by Ag.Town Clerk Wabailewa Abdallah by June 30, 2025. This was confirmed by staff appraisal reports such as the one for Bateganya Ivan, who was appraised on June 30, 2025. Other examples include Mulabi Bakali, the Agricultural officer, and Kasadha eric, Health inspector etc of whom were appraised on June 30, 2025.</p> <p>The assessment team found no evidence to support the claim that the LLG Town Clerk appraised primary school head teachers by December 31st. This conclusion was reached due to the LLG's failure to provide the head teachers appraisal reports for the available government schools in the LLGs to the assessment team.</p> <p>The assessment team found no evidence that the LLG (Town Clerk) appraised the Health Incharges of HC IIIs and IIs by the June 30th deadline. This conclusion was based on the LLG's failure to provide the appraisal reports. However, the team identified that the LLG only has an HC IV, which is not the Town Clerk's responsibility to appraise, thereby invalidating the scoring criteria.</p>
13	<p>Staff duty attendance</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG has</p> <p>(i) Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 3 or else 0</p> <p>(ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>3</p> <p>3</p>	<p>The LLG publicized the staff list of staffs working in the LLG this was evidenced by the list of 11 staff members pinned on the Town Council notice board i.e Community Development Officer Kawanguzi Abudal.ahl on no.8 of the pinned staff list.</p> <p>The LLG submitted monthly staff attendance analysis reports to the CAO. This was confirmed by the receipt of these reports by the District Central Registry on a monthly basis. For example, the attendance report for April 2025 was submitted on May 3, 2025, and it indicated that Bateganya Ivan, the Town Agent chief, attended work for 22 days during that month.</p>

Assessment area: F. Implementation and Execution

14	<p>The LLG has spent all the DDEG funds for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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</p>	2	<p>The LLG utilized DDEG funds for eligible activities in the previous FY. This is evident in the FY2024/2025 AWPB, which outlines budgeted and implemented road maintenance and rehabilitation projects, such as the opening and shaping of kityerera B-Busenda C- Busenda A 0.5km of shs.4,870,605, road maintenance of Kityerera Main-Kyeyago road 0.5km of shs. 4,870,605.</p>
15	<p>The LLG spent the funds as per budget</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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</p>	0	<p>The Annual Financial Statements (AFS) provided to the assessment team indicated that the LLG's budget execution deviated within a +/-10% threshold for any of the sectors/programs. This was evident by comparing the budgeted amounts to the actual expenditures in the AFS. For example, the roads sector had a total budget of shs. 9,741,210 and spent shs. 8,600,000, resulting in a budget absorption of -11.7% exceeding the required +/-10%.</p>
16	<p>Completion of investments as per annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>Evidence that the investment projects planned in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of FY (quarter four) :</p> <p>If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3</p> <p>If 70% -90%: Score 2</p> <p>If less than 70 %: Score 0.</p>	0	<p>There was no proof provided to the assessment team that the planned investments for the previous financial year were finished by the end of the year. No completion certificates or project progress reports were presented to the team.</p>

Assessment area: G. Environmental and Social Safeguards

17	<p>The LLG has implemented environmental and social safeguards during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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</p>	0	<p>The LLG failed to provide evidence on the environmental, social, and climate change screening of the planned projects implemented in previous FY24/25. This was confirmed by the LLG not having environmental screening forms in place for the implemented projects.</p>
----	---	---	---	---

18	<p>The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling System</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>(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</p> <p>(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</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>The LLG had adequate information regarding its grievance response mechanism and the designated person responsible for handling grievances. This was confirmed by the a grievance case book, in place, grievance reporting mechanism pinned on the notice board, and designated the SCDO Kawanguzi Abudallah as grievance contact person in the LLG.</p> <p>There was grievance redress mechanism posted on the notice board, and names of contact persons designated for grievance handling.such as, Kawanguzi Abudallah (SCDO) was for GBV and child abuse etc</p>
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>0</p>	<p>The LLG did not have an active Area Land Committee in place, which serves as an advisory body on land-related matters. This was confirmed by the assessment team's inability to access the Area land minutes and its Membership composition.</p>
Assessment area: H. Basic (Pre & Primary) Education services Management (in public and private schools)				
20	<p>Awareness campaigns and mobilization on education services conducted in last FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery score 3, else score 0</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>The LLG conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized parents regarding education services. This conclusion was reached by the assessment team after the LLG provided the Education Awareness minutes for general parents meetings and Education awareness report in Bugadde A and Bugadde B village.where school dropout report dated 16/10/2024</p>
21	<p>Monitoring of service delivery in basic schools</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>If all schools (100%) - score 4</p> <p>If 80 – 99% – score 2</p> <p>If 60 to 79% score 1</p> <p>Below 60% score 0</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>The LLG conducted monitoring of schools per term evidenced by 3 Termly reports monitoring reports by the Town Clerk provided to the assessment team.</p>

22	Existence and functionality of School Management Committees	Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools; score 3, else score 0	3	The LLG has functional School Management Committees (SMCs) in the schools operating in the LLG. This was evidenced by the Schools SMC minutes of all 2 schools provided to the assessment team foreexample Bugadde ps SMC minutes dated 27/7/2024, and St. Joseph Bukoba ps SMC minutes dated 4/7/24.
	Maximum score is 3			

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	3	The LLG conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities regarding primary health services. This was evidenced by the examining food handlers report dated 30/3/2025, sensitization/Awareness reports on hygiene dated 23/6/2025 by the health inspector Khasadha Eric.
	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	4	The LLG conducted monitoring visits to health centers in previous FY. This was evidenced by the quarterly monitoring reports of kityerera HC IV done by Health inspector Khasadha Eric dated 6/7/2025, and 4/4/2025 among others.
	Maximum score is 4			

25	Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee	Evidence that the LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG; score 3, else score 0	3	The LLG has functional Health Management Committees (HMCs) in its health centers, as evidenced by a review of the Kityerera HC IV Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC). The HUMC's composition of eight members, including Dr. Eboga Haji, Nawatere Malia, Muyo Denis, and Kasadha Eric, among others was confirmed, and its minutes from November 25, 2024, September 4, 2024, and April 4, 2025, were provided to the assessment team
	Maximum score is 3			

Assessment area: K. Urban Planning and Management (Applicable to Town Councils and Divisions only)

30	Development of the Physical Development Plans as per guidelines	(i) If the LLG has a functional Physical Planning Committee in place that: (i) is properly and fully constituted; (ii) considers new investments/ application for development permission on time; and (iii) has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD Score 1 or else 0	0	The LLG provided evidence on the existence of the Physical Planning Committee by providing the committee's member list and the building plan registration book to the assessment team. However, the LLG failed to provide at least four sets of physical planning committee minutes, leaving a gap in the functionality of the committee and its actual involvement in approving the registered building plan seen in the Building plan register book.
	Maximum score 2			

	<p>(i) If the LLG has detailed physical development plan(s) or/and area action plan(s) approved by the Council covering at least the percentage below Score 1 or else 0:</p> <p>20% in 2022/23</p> <p>30% in 2023/24</p> <p>40% in 2024/25</p>	1	<p>The LLG provided evidence to the assessment team on the availability of the approved development plan, this was proved by the provision of the Approved Bugadde TC physical development plan 2024-2034 to the assessment team.</p>	
31	<p>Implementation of the physical planning and building control measures as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 3</p>	<p>(i) If all infrastructure investments implemented by the LLG in the previous FY: (i) are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan; and (ii) have a planning compliance certificate issued by MoLHUD. Score 1 or else 0</p> <p>(ii) Evidence that the LLG has named streets, numbered plots, surveyed and demarcated roads as planned (90% or more implemented) in the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p> <p>(iii) Evidence that the LLG has a functional Development Control Team score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>There was inconsistency between the LLG's previous FY (2024/2025) implemented infrastructure investments and the approved physical development plan. The assessment team could not confirm compliance because the LLG did not produce the required planning compliance certificate submitted to MoLHUD by 30th october, nor did they provide Physical Planning Committee minutes documenting the approval of these infrastructures that were existing in the LLG.</p> <p>The assessment team confirmed that the LLG met or exceeded the 90% implementation goal for identifying physical infrastructure during the previous FY. The comprehensive road inventory condition survey report for Bugadde TC prepared by Town Engineer Batuli Charles, which details the names and numbers of all 48 roads, proved that streets are named, and plots and roads are surveyed and demarcated.</p> <p>The LLG failed to prove it has a functional Development Control Team. The assessment team could not verify its existence because the LLG did not provide evidence of its required composition (at least one physical planner, engineer, and building inspector). Furthermore, there was no evidence of its functionality, as documentation such as meeting minutes, the Annual Work Plan, and the Annual Progress Report (covering activities like identifying illegal developments, post-approval inspections, or issuing penalties) was missing.</p>
32	<p>The LLG has developed and implemented a solid waste management plan</p> <p>Maximum score 2</p>	<p>(i) If the LLG has prepared status report on the implementation of the approved solid waste management plan during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>	0	<p>The assessment team could not verify whether the LLG prepared a status report on the solid waste management plan's implementation in the previous FY2024/2025. This was due to the absence of both the approved Solid Waste Management Plan and any corresponding status reports detailing its execution within the LLG.</p>

33	Operation and Maintenance of infrastructure Maximum score is 3	(ii) If the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns on the management of solid waste during the previous FY score 1 or else 0	0	The LLG failed to prove that it conducted awareness campaigns on solid waste management during FY 2024/2025, as the assessment team was not provided with the necessary solid waste monitoring progress reports.
		(i) If the LLG has prepared Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey report score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG prepared an Annual Infrastructure Inventory and Condition Survey Report for the previous FY 2024/2025. This was confirmed by the existing road inventory and condition survey report, which was prepared by the Town Council Engineer, Batuli Charles.
		(ii) If the LLG has prepared an O&M Annual Plan which is based on the Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey score 1 or else 0	0	The LLG Budgeted for O&M in the AWPB of current FY2025/2026, How ever as seen by the assessment team, The Inventory survey report of previous FY 2024/2025 displayed O&M of 71million in roads required to be implemented of which in the AWPB for current FY2025/2026 does not include any O&M on road rehabilitations and maintenance violating the findings of the previous FY (2024/2025) Inventory Survey Report.
		(iii) If the LLG has spent own source revenues of not less than 20% on O&M score 1 or else 0	0	The LLG failed to meet the requirement to budget and spend not less than 20% of its Own Source Revenue (OSR) on Operational and Maintenance (O&M). A review of the Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) and Final Accounts showed the LLG only budgeted and spent shs.800,000 for O&M, and critically, this amount was incorrectly allocated under Non-Wage funding rather than OSR, nullifying its compliance with the 20% OSR spending criterion.

Assessment area: L. Production Services Management

Up to date data on agriculture and irrigation collected, analyzed and reported	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	The LLG collected data and provided statistics on agriculture (crop, animal, fisheries) and were submitted to DPO, this was evidenced by the training reports for mashaga village under VAM showing number of farmers captured submitted to DPO prepared by Animal Officer Bamudambire moses on 30th/06/2025,
--	--	---	---

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	The LLG conducted agricultural awareness and mobilization campaigns by organizing farmer field days and awareness meetings. These activities were reported to the production office. This was evidenced by the sensitization reports of farmers on UCSATP dated 30th June 2025 available to the assessment team which included attendance lists and attached field photos.
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	The LLG monitored agricultural activities related to crops, animals. This was evidenced by the Animal monitoring reports available to the assessment team. The Animal Officer monitored farmers in Mashaga village under the poverty eradication program in the report dated 30th/6/2025,
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	The LLG extension staff conducted training and sensitization sessions for farmers on topics including irrigated agriculture, pest management, and disease control. Evidence was provided to the assessment team through specific reports, such as Animal Officer Bamudambire Moses's and crop officer Muwanika Francis report (dated 30/6/2025) to the DPO detailing a farmers trainings at Mayuge presidential farm on coffee, mushroom, poultry, piggery, and dairy, towards pests and diseases control with photos attached in the report.
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	The LLG extension staff provided extension support to farmers and farm groups on crop management, aquaculture, animal husbandry, irrigation, post harvesting, value addition etc. Evidence was provided to the assessment team through specific reports, such as Animal Officer Bamudambire Moses's report (dated 11/8/2024) to the DPO detailing a Cost-Benefit Analysis training on poultry, piggery, and dairy under the Parish Development Model (PDM) in Nakibengo and Ituba. Furthermore, Crop Officer Muwanika Francis documented an out-farm visit to coffee extension farmers, Charles Malimu and Mulabi Bakali, on 30/6/2025.