



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Bwondha Town Council

(Vote Code: 273640)

Score 76/100 (76%)

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	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 nine members for each ward, minutes of PDCs available For example, Makonko ward PDC minutes dated April 23, 2025, discussing PDM field mobilizations.
	Maximum score is 2			
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.	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 wards provided to the assessment team.
	Maximum score is 2			
3	The LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and PDCs on strategies for the development of the parish	Evidence that the LLG: i. Has mapped NGOs, CBOs & CSO operating in the LLG and involved them in raising awareness about the PDM and planning cycle: score 2, or else 0	2	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
	Maximum score is 6			
		Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on: ii. Approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY score 2, else score 0	2	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 meetings held signed by the LCII chairperson and Town Agent shared with the assessment team, such as the Nalubabwe ward parish priorities activities planned for implementation were dated 9/3/2025, Bwondah central ward dated 10/3/2025, Nkalanga ward dated 30/3/2025 among others.

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 13/6/2025 and 30/9/2024 among the trained enterprises includes Tusitukiramu D piggery group in Bwondha central

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:

1

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 AWPB for the current FY incorporated prioritized investments identified by the individual parishes. This was reflected in the parish priorities provided, which were fully endorsed by their respective LC II chairpersons shared to the assessment team. for example, Nalubabwe ward ranked parish priorities dated 9/3/2025 highlighted need for security lights which reflected in the Town Council AWPB under DDEG program as procurement of solar light security system to nalubabwe ward.

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 investment priorities were as a result of the Budget conference. This was evidenced by the Budget conference report dated 10/01/2025, highlighting resolution to procure medical mattresses for Bwondha HC II. This was not only highlighted in the report but is also explicitly budgeted and funded within the AWPB via the DDEG program with an allocation of 2,100,000

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 installation of signpost with an allocation of shs.3,720,000 funded by OSR seen in the works AWPB for current FY25/26

	<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 NDPIII format for the planned investments to be implemented in the current FY, the projects that whose profiles were developed includes; Procurement of solar security system in Nalubabwe Ward of shs.5,000,000 funded by DDEG, Road opening of kyeswa-Nkalanga road of shs.7,100,000 funded by DDGE and Procurement of medical mattresses of shs. 2,100,000 funded by DDEG, and lastly installation of Town council signpost of shs.3,720,000 funded by OSR.</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 FY2025/2026 was delivered to the district and its receipt was acknowledged by the District central registry on May 15th, 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>	2	<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 29th may, 2025. This submission date confirms 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>	2	<p>The LLG AWPB for the current meets the investment criteria specified in the DDEG grant guidelines. This evident was observed in the Current FY 2025/2026 Budget where the total DDEG budget of shs. 23,390,936 includes shs. 20,200,000 for infrastructure investments, which amounts to 86% of the total DDEG Funds. This exceeds 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>	1	<p>The LLG collected OSR for previous FY within +/-10% of the budget this was evidenced by the LLG's AFS for FY2024/2025 presented to the assessment team which shows the budgeted OSR was shs.38,100,000, while actual revenue collection amounted to shs.37,810,500. This translates to a 92.2% revenue collection rate, which satisfies 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 for previous FY 2024/2025 decreased from that of the previous FY but one FY2023/2024, this was evident in the AFS where shs. 42,625,000 was collected in FY2023-2024 and shs. 37,810,500 in FY2024-2025, resulting in a deficit of shs. 4,814,500 . This represents a 11.3% 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>The LLG remitted OSR funds to LCI and LCII administrative units, totaling 1,500,000. This was supported by voucher payments examined by the assessment team, such as voucher serial no. 0484 dated 15/6/2025 for shs. 1,500,000.</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> <p>0</p>	<p>The LLG used more than 20% of the OSR on councilors allowances in previous FY, this was evidenced in the AFS Council trail balance where the expenditure on councilor allowances amounted to shs 11,400,000 representing 30% of the total revenue collected (37,810,500). This violates the acceptable limit of 20% OSR usage for councilor allowances.</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>The LLG budgeted and used OSR for Operational and maintenance(O&M) in previous FY worth shs.2,300,000 this was evidenced by the O&M payment vouchers on motorcycle repairs in voucher serial no. 0389 dated 17/10/2024 with shs.1,000,000, Voucher serial no. 0428 dated 23/2/2025 with shs.500,000 and lastly voucher serial no. 0.475 dated 29/5/2025 with shs.800,000</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 publicly disclosed the OSR collected in FY2024/2025. This was confirmed by the revenue collection sources of total shs. 37,810,500 verified by the Tow Clerk Lubaale Arthur 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 29th, 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>1</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>1</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>1</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>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 14th/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 14th/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 8th/4/2025. 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 15th/07/2025. This suits within the acceptable submission timeframe of by 15th 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>2</p>	<p>The LLG provided a staff list containing 18 staff members, including extension workers. All staff members were appraised by ag. Town Clerk Lubaale Aurther by June 30, 2025. This was confirmed by staff appraisal reports such as the one for Mukwana Hussein Town Agent, who was appraised on June 30, 2025. Other examples include Mboibe Jerry CDO, Mugweri Enos Assistant Accountant, Ntende sadik, Animal production officer, Kikoberwa scovia fisheries officer, etc of whom were appraised on June 30, 2025.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:</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>0</p>	<p>The assessment team found no evidence to support the claim that the LLG (Town Clerk) evaluated primary school head teachers of the government schools in the LLG by December 31st. This conclusion was reached by the existence of the Annual performance report of mr. sande william, head teacher of bwondha ps filled on 10/01/2025, witnessed by the SMC chairperson on the same date but not appraised by the Town clerk. These dates exceeds the required time of by 31st December.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:</p> <p>(iii) HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else</p> <p>0</p>	<p>The assessment team found no evidence to support the claim that the LLG (Town Clerk) evaluated Health incharges by June 30th. This conclusion was reached due to the LLG's failure to provide the Health incharge appraisal reports for the available Health Facilities to the assessment team.</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>3</p>	<p>The LLG publicized the staff list of staffs working in the local government this was evidenced by the list of 18 staff members pinned on the Town Council notice board i.e Kabandha sowali senior treasurer on no.8 of the pinned staff list.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LLG has</p> <p>(ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0</p> <p>3</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 july 2025 was submitted on May 3, 2025, and it indicated that Mukwana Hussein, the Town Agent attended work for 21 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> <p>2</p>	<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 construction of slaughter slab at shs.5035,000, Procurement and installation of solar lamp at Bwondah market costing 2,300,000.</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> <p>0</p>	<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, in AFS atotal of shs. 136,942,957 was budgeted and spent shs. 118,549,707 resulting in a budget absorption of -13.4% 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> <p>3</p>	<p>The LLG's investments projects planned in the previous FY2024/2025 were completed by the end of the FY (fourth quarter). This was evidenced by the progress reports provided to the assessment team for example in Q4 progress report construction of slaughter slab was among the activities done with shs. 5,000,000 dated 15/7/2025, laptop procurement in Q2 progress report with shs. 4,995,000 dated 14/01/2025 and solar security lamp in Bwondha market with shs. 2,300,000 in Q3 progress report dated 8/4/2025.</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> <p>0</p>	<p>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.</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>1</p>	<p>The LLG had adequate information regarding the 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 kyebogola juliet as grievance contact person in the LLG.</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>The LLG publicized the grevance redress mechanism for aggrieved parties to know where to report this was evidenced by the grievance redress mechanism posted on the notice board, and names of contact persons designated for grievance handling. for example Kyebogola Juliet (SCDO) was designed for GBV and child abuse</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>0</p>	<p>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.</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 the termly monitoring reports which included the government and private schools 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 composition lists and minutes of bwondah ps provided to the assessment team. Among them included SMC minutes of 21/2/2025, 5/6/2025, and 1/10/2024 e.t.c
	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 health awareness reports by the Health assistant mr. Hanghalo fred dated 25/9/2024, 12/12/2025 and 5/4/2025. further more community sensitization on waste disposal dated 30/6/2025 with attached attendance lists.
	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 the LLG in previous FY. This was evidenced by the 2 sets of inspection reports of Bwondha HC II done by Health inspector Mr. Hamza muyimbi dated 2/7/2025 for Q4 and 25/9/2024 for Q1.
	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 existence of the HUMC composition of Bwondah HC II in the letter submitted to the Town clerk by the health incharge on 2/3/2025 and HUMC minutes of the Health center provided to the assessment among the HUMC minutes includes 4/9/2024,19/12/2024 and 20/2/2025 etc
	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

Maximum score 2

(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.

(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:

20% in 2022/23

0

30% in 2023/24

40% in 2024/25

The LLG could not prove evidence on the existence of a detailed physical development plan and corresponding action plan(s) approved by the Council. This conclusion was reached because the LLG was unable to provide to the assessment team with the Approved Town Council (TC) physical development plan.

31

Implementation of the physical planning and building control measures as per guidelines

Maximum score 3

(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

0

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.

(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

0

The LLG does not have named streets, numbered plots, surveyed and demarcated roads as planned in the previous FY, this was concluded by the LLGs inability to provide the roads inventory survey report to the assessment team.

	(iii) Evidence that the LLG has a functional Development Control Team score 1 or else 0	0	The LLG failed to prove the functionality of 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.
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> <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.
	(ii) If the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns on the management of solid waste during the previous FY score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG conducted awareness campaigns on solid waste management during FY 2024/2025, this was evidenced by the provision of the solid waste monitoring progress reports dated 30/6/2025 to the assessment team.
33	<p>Operation and Maintenance of infrastructure</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>(i) If the LLG has prepared Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey report score 1 or else 0</p> <p>0</p>	The LLG does not have Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey report in existence this was concluded by the assessment team's inability to be availed by the Infrastructure and condition survey report for previous FY in place.
	(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 failed to prove on the preparation of an O&M Annual Plan which is based on the Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey report of previous FY, this was concluded upon by the LLG's inability to provide an Annual infrastructure inventory report which contains the plan for O&M of the current FY.

(iii) If the LLG has spent own source revenues of not less than 20% on O&M score 1 or else 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.2,300,000 for O&M against the collected OSR of 37,810,500 reflecting 6% expenditure nullifying its compliance of not less than 20% OSR spending criterion.

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.	2	The LLG collected data and provided statistics on agriculture (crop, animal, fisheries) and were submitted to DPO, this was evidenced by the Fisheries officer statistics reports on the fish captures submitted to DPO dated 30/9/2024. Crop and Animal statistics report dated 13/6/2025 and data collection of vaccinated livestock dated 30/3/2025
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 awareness meetings for PDM CBA trainings dated 7/3/2025 availed 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, and fisheries. This was evidenced by the Monitoring and farm visit reports submitted to DPO among which included, Monitoring the performance of farmer and farmer groups by Animal production officer report dated 30/6/2025, Farm visits reports dated 30th april 2025, among others

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, a report dated 29/11/2024 on training of farmers and farmer groups on Good animal production practices, by the Mr. Ntende K sadiki Animal Officer, CBA analysis training conducted on 2/6/2025.
	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 Farm visit report to the farmers and farmer groups dated 30/4/2025
	Maximum score is 2			