



## **LLG Performance Assessment**

LLG Performance Assessment

Bukatube Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236732)

**Score** 44/100 (44%)

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	The LLG has duly constituted PDCs 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 as evidenced by minutes dated 27/07/2024,13/01/2024, and others in mbairabira by sajjabi aggrey, 5/12/2024,10/6/2025, and others in Mautua , by nakagole peace, 16/06/2025,27/03/2025 and others
2	LLG has ensured that all Parish Chiefs/Town Agents have collected, compiled, and analyzed data on Parish/community profiling as stipulated in the PDM Guidelines.  Maximum score is 2	Evidence that all the Parishes/Wards in a LLG have compiled, updated, and analyzed data on community profiling disaggregated by village, gender, age, economic activity among others as stipulated in the PDM Guidelines, score 2 else score 0.	0	The LLG has no evidence to prove that all the Parishes have compiled, updated, and analyzed data on community profiling disaggregated by village, gender, age, economic activity among others as stipulated in the PDM Guidelines
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	0     0	The LLG has no evidence to show the mapping of all NGOs, CBOs & CSO operating in the LLG and involved them in raising awareness about the PDM and planning cycle     The LLG has no evidence that it provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on Approved activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY

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

0

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

The LLG has no evidence to show that it provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish

#### 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

No evidence to prove that LLG approved development plan Iv and no SDP seen

Maximum score is 6

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

0

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.

The LLG has no evidence show that it approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY Incorporates ranked priorities from all its respective parish submissions which are duly signed by the Parish Chief and PDC Chairperson

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

0

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

The LLG has no evidence to show that council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference

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

1

The LLG has evidence to prove that the budget included investments to be financed by the LLG like construction of administration block of latrine

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

The LLG has no evidence to prove that 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	0	The LLG budget was submitted after 15th/may
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 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 by the 30th April of the previous FY, evidenced by 14th/april/2025
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 investments in the approved LLG Budget for the current FY comply with the investment menu in the DDEG Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines as evidenced in capital projects at 80%(49647/62098) and M&E 1.6%, nutrition committee 2%

**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 collected OSR for the previous FY within +/- 10% of the budget as evidenced in the budgeted figure of 25,000,000/= and collections 35,000,000/= which 40% over collection
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  The OSR collected increased from previous FY but one to previous FY by more than 5 % as evidenced collections like 24/25.....35,095,000/=  23/24.....24,541,538/= which makes it 43%
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  The LLG Has evidence of remitting OSR to the administrative units as LCI and LCII 5,280,000/= was transferred

Evidence that the LLG:

ii. Did not use more than 20% of the OSR on councilors allowances in the previous FY (unless authority was granted by the Minister), score 1, else score 0

0

The LLG use more than 20% of the OSR on councilors allowances in the previous FY without any authorization evidenced 100% local revenue 7,784,112/= and council expenditure 10,570,000/= which is more

Evidence that the LLG:

iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0

1

The LLG has budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY as evidenced in planned shs605,000 as O&M then used it under voucher 24/03/2025 400,000/=

Evidence that the LLG:

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

0

The LLG has no evidence to show that it Publicized the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY

#### 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

The LLG submitted its Annual Financial Statement to the Auditor General (AG) on time as evidenced 29th/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 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

The LLG submitted quarter one financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time:

Q1 by 14th October 2024 by NAGIGAGA HADIJA

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

The LLG submitted quarter two financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time:

Q2 on 12th /01 /2025 by NAGIGAGA HADIJA

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

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

The LLG submitted quarter three financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time:

Q3 on 14th /04 /2025 by NAGIGAGA HADIJA

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

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

The LLG submitted quarter one financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time:

Q2 by 07th /07/ 2025 by NAGIGAGA HADIJA

**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

The SAS appraised staff including extension workers in the previous FY as evidenced by 27th/06/2025

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 or else 0 2

The SAS appraised head teachers in all public schools in the previous FY as evidenced by 20th/12/2024

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 2

The SAS appraised staff HCIII&II in the previous FY as evidenced by 27th/06/2025

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

The LLG has Publicized the list of LLG staff as evidenced on the sub county notice board

Evidence that the LLG has

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

3

The LLG has Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO as evidenced in the date 30/06/2025

**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

0

The LLG has no evidence to prove that it budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/ activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines

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 LLG has no evidence to prove the execution of budget in the previous FY does not deviate for any of the sectors/main programs by more than +/-10%

16

Completion of investments as per annual work plan and budget

Maximum score is 3

Evidence that the investment projects planned in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of FY (quarter four) :

If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3

If 70% -90%: Score 2

If less than 70 %: Score 0.

0

The LLG has no evidence that its 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

If 70% -90%

If less than 70 %

**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

The LLG has no evidence to prove that it carried out environmental, social and climate change screening where required, prior to implementation of all planned investments/ projects,

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>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>The LLG has no evidence to prove the 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</p> <p>The LLG has no evidence to show that it publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress</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 has no evidence to prove its 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</p>
<b>Assessment area: H. Basic (Pre &amp; Primary) Education services Management (in public and private schools)</b>				
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>0</p>	<p>The LLG has no evidence to prove that it conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery</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>0</p>	<p>The LLG has no evidence that it 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>



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	0	The LLG has no evidence to prove the functionality of school management committees in all schools
	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	0	The LLG has no evidence to prove that it conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery
	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	LLG has no evidence to prove that it monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY
	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 evidence of functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG as dated 16/02/2025,29/05/2025,25/3/2025,25/9/2024
	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	0	The SAS has no evidence to prove that it submitted in writing requests to the DWO for consideration in the planning of the current FY
	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	SAS has no evidence to prove that it monitored/supervised aspects of water and environment services during the previous FY including review of water points 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 LLG has no evidence to prove the functionality of Water and Sanitation Committees (including collection and proper use of community contributions)
	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 SAS has no evidence to prove that it updated lists on all its water and sanitation facilities (public latrines) and functionality status.
	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.	2	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 as evidenced in pest and diseases surveillance dated 28th/06/2025, fisheries 2/06/2024, live stock statistical data dated 5/5/2025
	Maximum score is 2			

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 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 as evidenced in monitoring reports dated 5/1/2025, sensitization reports 14/03/2025, awareness on swine fever in Iwainka reports dated 17/03/2025 and awareness on animals straying act in Lwanika & Bukaleeba parishes dated 1/04/2025
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	The LLG has no evidence to prove that the 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
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 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 as evidenced in training on ponds design and construction, on animals management practices in all parishes dated 30/06/2025
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 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 as evidenced by a farm visits in Budhaalas A, fingerling stocking and ponds site suitability surveys dated 28/11/2024, support to livestock & piggery at Buyamba and Mbiriabara dated 14/05/2025