



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Bukabooli Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236731)

Score 60/100 (60%)

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 of the 6 parishes. For example, Buyungu Parish PDC minutes dated June 27, 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 parishes within the LLG collected, categorized, and analyzed data on community profiling. This was evidenced by the community profiling data 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 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	0 2	There was no evidence that showed that the LLG had mapped NGOs, CBOs & CSO operating in the LLG and involved them in raising awareness about the PDM and planning cycle since no minutes or reports were availed to the team 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 Bugoto parish activities planned for implementation, dated May 21, 2024.

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 20/6/2024

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:

1

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

The AWPB for current FY and SCDPIV both included road maintenance projects to be implemented in the current FY. This alignment is evident in the SCDPIV, which among includes maintenance of Kalagala road, 1.6km at shs.17,079,250 which is also included in the current AWPB of the works department pointing out consistence.

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 6 individual parishes. This was reflected in the comprehensive parish priorities provided by all the 6 parishes, which were fully endorsed by their respective LC II chairpersons which were shared to the assessment team. As an example, Mayirinya parish submitted its priorities on March 2, 2025, signed by both the parish chief, Kintu Paul, and the LC II chairperson, Subaha Nkwanga. Likewise, Buyugu parish submitted its priorities on the same date, signed by Tabingwa Lawrence, the parish chief, and Okumu Jackson, the LC II chairperson among other parishes

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 prioritizes investments outlined in the budget conference report dated 30th, October 2024. One such investment is the road maintenance of Kalagala-Namululi, a 2km project suggested by the community of Matovu parish as seen in the Budget conference report and funded by the DDEG program in the AWPB.

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

0

The AWPB for the current FY did not show any evidence of capital investments being funded by the LG's own source revenue, suggesting that the LLG did not plan to finance any investments using these funds.

	<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>	1	<p>The LLG developed project profile as per NDPIV format for all the 3 planned investments to be implemented in the current FY including projects like road maintenance of Kalagala-Namululi road costing shs.17,079,250 funded under URF, completion of sub county admin block at shs.13,200,000 under DDEG among others.</p>
	<p>vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0</p>	1	<p>The LLG AWPB for the current FY25/26 was delivered to the district and its receipt was acknowledged by the District central registry on May 14th, 2025. This suits within the agreed submission dates of 15th may</p>
5	<p>Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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</p> <p>2</p>	<p>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 15th April, 2025. This submission date violates the established deadline of no later than 30th April.</p>
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> <p>0</p>	<p>The LLG AWPB for the current FY does not meet 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. 60,000,000 includes shs. 47,279,250 for infrastructure investments, which amounts to 78.8% of the total DDEG Funds. This is below the minimum investment requirement of 80%.</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> <p>0</p>	<p>The LLG's AFS for FY2024/2025 shows that budgeted OSR was shs.16,000,000, while actual revenue collection amounted to shs.18,255,362. This translates to a 114.1% revenue collection rate, which does not satisfy the +/-10% criterion.</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> <p>0</p>	<p>The LLG's own source revenue (OSR) collection decreased from shs.20,406,384 in FY2023-2024 to shs. 18,251,362 in FY2024-2025, resulting in a deficit of shs.2,155,022 . This represents 11.8% decline, which does not meet 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> <p>1</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> <p>0</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> <p>1</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> <p>1</p>	<p>The LLG remitted OSR funds to LCI and LCII administrative units, since this was supported by voucher payments examined by the assessment team, such as voucher no. 22/11/24 dated 10th,12 2024, for shs. 2,700,000</p> <p>The LLG's expenditure on councilor allowances amounted to shs.4,920,000, representing 27% of the total revenue collected (18,255,362 Uganda Shillings). This does not fall within the acceptable limit of 20% OSR usage for councilor allowances. This was evidenced with Payment vouchers expenditure such as voucher no. 4/2/2025 dated February 19, 2025 among others.</p> <p>The LLG budgeted and used OSR for Operational and maintenance(O&M) in previous FY as evidenced by the O&M payment vouchers such as Voucher no. 7/2/2025 dated 19/2/2025 worth 2,200,000 among other vouchers that were availed.</p> <p>The LLG publicly disclosed the OSR collected in the previous financial year. This was confirmed by the revenue collection sources verified by the Senior Assistant Secretary and posted on the sub-county 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> <p>4</p>	<p>The LLG submitted its AFS for FY2024/2025 to the Auditor General on August 29, 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: 1</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: 1</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: 1</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: 3</p> <p>iv. Q4 by 30th July score 3 or else 0</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 15th, Oct, 2024</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 13th, January 2025</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 15th, April 2025</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 14th July 2025</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 0</p>	<p>There was no evidence that was availed to the team to show that the SAS appraised staff in the LLG including extension workers in the previous FY (by 30th June)</p>
----	---	--	---

	Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:			The assessment team found no evidence to support the claim that the LLG (SAS) evaluated primary school head teachers by December 31st. This conclusion was reached due to the LLG's failure to provide the head teacher appraisal reports for the available schools to the assessment team.
	(ii) Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0	0		
	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		There was no evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) since there were no appraisals availed to the team
13	Staff duty attendance			
	Maximum score is 6			
	Evidence that the LLG has			The LLG publicized the staff list of staffs working in the sub county since this was evidenced by the list of 11 staff members pinned on the sub county notice board for example Lule Xavier who is the Fisheries Officer, Kagodo Geoffrey who is the Parish Chief among others.
	(i) Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 3 or else 0	3		
	Evidence that the LLG has			
	(ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0	0		The LLG did not provide any evidence to the assessment team that monthly staff attendance analysis had been submitted to the Accounting Officer.
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		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 completion of sub county administration block at shs.13,200,000 and the grading of the sub-county office compound (shs.5,800,000) among others.
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		The AFS provided to the assessment team revealed that the LLG deviated from budget execution in certain sectors, exceeding or falling short of the +/-10% threshold. The production sector underspent by 82.4%, with a budget of shs.2,500,000 and spending of shs. 440,000. In contrast, the finance and works sectors overspent. Finance overspent by 16%, with a budget of shs.19,273,636 and spending of shs. 22,519,417 among other sectors. These deviations violate the budget execution guideline of +/-10%.

16	Completion of investments as per annual work plan and budget	Evidence that the investment projects planned in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of FY (quarter four) :		
	Maximum score is 3	If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3	3	The investments projects planned in the previous FY were finished by the end of the year. This was evidenced by the Q4 completion report for the works FY24/25 dated 1/8/2025 by Eng. Wanjusi Febiano
		If 70% -90%: Score 2		
		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	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	The LLG failed to provide evidence on the environmental, social, and climate change screening of the planned project implemented in previous FY24/25. This was confirmed by the LLG not having environmental screening forms in place for the implemented projects.
	Maximum score is 2			
18	The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling System	(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 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 CDO Mahoka Grace as grievance contact person in the LLG.
	Maximum score is 2			
		(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	There was grievance redress mechanism posted on the notice board, and names of contact persons designated for grievance handling. such as lukungu james (Area land committee chairpeson) was for land issues, Makoha Grace (CDO) was for GBV and child abuse etc
19	The LLG has a functional land management system	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	0	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.
	Maximum score 1			

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 LLG failed to conduct awareness campaigns and mobilize parents regarding education services. This conclusion was reached by the assessment team due to the LLG's inability to provide any Education awareness report to the team.
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 LLG failed to conduct at least one monitoring visit to education services per term. The assessment team concluded this due to the LLG's inability to provide any education service monitoring reports, citing a lack of funding for such activities.
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	0	The LLG was unable to prove the existence of functional School Management Committees (SMCs) in the operating schools within the Sub county. This conclusion was reached by the assessment team due to the LLG's inability to provide the minutes of each SMC for the available schools.

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	The LLG conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities regarding primary health services. This was evidenced by the awareness report of family planning in Buyugu parish dated 27/June/2025,, sensitization reports on hygiene at Bugoto trading center dated 25/July/2024, and Community sensitization on malaria and mosquito net usage dated 22/12/2024 all by the Health Assistant.
----	--	---	---	--

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 LLG failed to conduct at least one monitoring visit to health services in previous FY. The assessment team concluded this due to the LLG's inability to provide any PHC service delivery monitoring reports.
	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 the health centers functional in the LLG. This was evidenced by the HMC minutes of the Health centers provided to the assessment team forexample Buyugu HC II HMC minutes dated 13/12/2024 among other minutes.
	Maximum score is 3			

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	3	The LLG submitted water requests to DWO for consideration in current FY and was evidenced by water requests letter submitted to DWO asking for borehole in Malongo sub county dated 9/07/2025.
	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	3	The LLG monitored water and environment services in the previous FY including water points and was evidenced by the monitoring report by the health assistant dated 14/10/2024, 20/01/2024,9/04/2025,28/06/2025 among other reports that were availed to the team.
	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	2	The LLG have functional water user committees (WUCs) for all its water sources. This was evidenced by the list of WUCs for all water sources provided in tabular form with the respective water sources.
	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	2	The LLG have updated list of all its water and sanitation facilities. This was evidenced by the list of WUCs for all water sources provided in tabular form with the respective water sources provided to the assessment team.
	Maximum score is 2			

Assessment area: L. Production Services Management

34	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.	0	The LLG extension staffs did not avail the LLG Reports on production statistics to ascertain whether it was compiled, comprehensive and submitted to LG Production Office
	Maximum score is 2			
35	Farmer awareness and mobilization campaigns carried out through farmer field days and awareness meetings	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 crop sensitization reports dated December 9th, 2024 , animal production sensitization reports and pelagic fishes and fishing methods sensitization reports that were availed to the assessment team which included attendance lists and attached field photos.
	Maximum score is 2			
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, farmers implementing knowledge from trainings, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0	0	The LLG extension staffs did not monitor activities on agricultural productions. this was concluded by the LLGs inability to provide provide monthly/quarterly farmer monitoring reports to the assessment team
	Maximum score is 2			

37	Farmer trainings through training farmer field schools and demonstrations organized and carried out	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 sessions for farmers on irrigated agriculture, pest and disease management. This was evidenced by the training and sensitization reports provided to the assessment team. For example, The fisheries officer submitted a sensitization report to DPO on pelagic fishes and fishing methods trainings dated February 5, 2025. Additionally, Waigumba Mutwalibi prepared an activity report on a cost-benefit analysis training for tomato enterprise farmers on November 4, 2024 among other reports .
	Maximum score is 2			
38	The LLG has provided hands-on extension support to farmers and farmer organizations / groups	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 assistance to farmer groups in areas such as crop management, aquaculture, and animal husbandry. This was evidenced by the fisheries farm visit report dated May10, 2024, the crop field visit report dated May 26, 2025, and the monitoring report of PDM beneficiaries by the veterinary officer dated June 30, 2025 provided to the assessors.
	Maximum score is 2			