



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Jaguzi Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236737)

Score 63/100 (63%)

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 2 sets of PDC meeting minutes and a list of 7 members for each parish availed to the assessment team.
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 ii. Approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY score 2, else score 0	0 2	The LLG failed to provide evidence that (NGOs), (CBOs), and (CSOs) operating within the LLG were mapped or involved in awareness campaigns concerning the Parish Development Model (PDM) and the planning cycle. This conclusion was reached because the LLG could not produce NGO mapping reports or sensitization meeting minutes involving these organizations. 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 minutes shared with the assessment team.

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 provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on the Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish, this was evidenced by the LLG availing the assessors a list of enterprises being implemented in the parishes and training sessions evidenced in the Enterprise trainings in cost best analysis conducted dated 15/01/2025

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 SCDP IV, this was concluded by the assessment team not being in position to be availed with the updated sub county Development Plan IV despite them providing the Third sub county development plan III (SC 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 respective ranked parish priorities provided by all parishes, which were fully endorsed by their respective LC II chairpersons shared to the assessment team. for example, kaaza parish priorities incorporated borehole maintenance under water which also appears in the current AWPB as reparir & maintenance of boreholes in jaguzi, kaaza, serinyabi, bumba and sagitu at cost of shs. 11,511,312 under DDEG program, construction of patients waiting shed at masolya HCIII seen in masolya parish ranked priorities under Health which aslo appears in the Current AWPB.

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 investment priorities were as a result of the Budget conference. This was evidenced by the Budget conference report dated 13/11/2024, highlighting resolution to procure iron sheets at Kaaza ps. 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

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 NDPIII format for all the 4 planned investments to be implemented in the current FY as below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Road rehabilitation of jaguzi ps junction to jaguzi subcourt 2.0 km road costed 4,572,886 funded under URF. 2. construction of patients waiting shed at Masolya HC III costed 5,000,000 funded under DDEG 3. procurement of iron sheets at kaaza ps 3,200,000 funded under DDEG
		<p>vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0</p>	0	<p>The LLG Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current financial year, 2024/25, was submitted to the district and its receipt was confirmed by the District Central Registry on 14/7/2025. This submission date violates the established deadline of no later than May 15th.</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 12/4/2025. 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 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. 29,811,387 includes shs. 24,100,000 for infrastructure investments, which amounts to 81% 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.4,576,462 while actual revenue collection amounted to shs.4,538,462. This translates to a 99.1% 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>	0	<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. 6,913,462 was collected in FY2023-2024 and shs. 4,538,462 in FY2024-2025, resulting in a deficit of shs. 2,375,000 . This represents a 34.35% 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 1 else score 0.</p>	1	<p>The LLG remitted OSR funds to LCI and LCII administrative units, totaling 400,000. This was evidenced in the AFS under finance trial balance showing remittance to LCI and LCII shs.400,000 on pg48 of the AFS</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 did not use more than 20% of the OSR on councilors allowances in the previous FY, this was concluded to by the assessment team reviewing the AFS 48 trial balance on pg49 under Statutory where the councilors allowances of shs.6,840,000 where spent using District non wage grant not OSR as stipulated by the assessment guideline.</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>	1	<p>The LLG budgeted and used OSR for Operational and maintenance(O&M) in previous FY worth shs.400,000 this was evidenced by the O&M payment vouchers on maintenance of sub county administration block compound cleaning in Voucher dated 7/10/2024 worth 200,000 and voucher dated 23/5/2025 worth 200,000 respectively. similarly in the AFS under Management trial balance on pg48 shows maintenance of administration block compound at an expense of 400,000.</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>	1	<p>The LLG publicly disclosed the OSR collected in FY2024/2025. This was confirmed by the revenue collection sources variation between FY2023/2024 and FY2024/2025 of shs. 6,913,462 and shs.4,538,462 respectively 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>	4	<p>The LLG submitted its AFS for FY2024/2025 to the Auditor General on 25/8/2025. 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 14th/07/2024. 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 8th/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 15th/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 14th/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	Appraisal of all staff in the LLG in the previous FY	Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:		The assessment team found no evidence to support the claim that All the staff members in the LLG including extension workers in the previous FY (by 30th June) were appraised by SAS. This conclusion was reached due to the LLG's failure to provide to the assessment team the appraisals of the staffs members.
	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	0	
		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:		The assessment team found no evidence to support the claim that the LLG (SAS) evaluated Health in-charges by June 30th. This conclusion was reached due to the LLG's failure to provide the Health in-charge appraisal reports for the available Health Facilities to the assessment team.
		(iii) HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else	0	

13	Staff duty attendance	Evidence that the LLG has		The LLG publicized the staff list of staffs working in the local government this was evidenced by the list of 11 staff members pinned on the sub county notice board.
	Maximum score is 6	(i) Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 3 or else 0	3	
		Evidence that the LLG has		The LLG failed to produce and submit monthly analyses of staff attendance with recommendations to the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) for the previous FY. This conclusion was based on the LLG's inability to provide the assessment team with any evidence that these mandatory monthly analyses were submitted to the Accounting Officer, despite the existence of a staff arrival book.
		(ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0	0	

Assessment area: F. Implementation and Execution

14	The LLG has spent all the DDEG funds for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities	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		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 the placenta pit at sagitu health center II in serinyabi at a cost of 4500,000 and repair and maintenance of boreholes in jaguzi, kaaza, serinyabi, bumba,masolya,and sagitu at cost of shs.11,511,312
	Maximum score is 2		2	

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>	2	<p>The LLG's budget execution was highly effective, with all assessed sectors remaining within the required $\pm 10\%$ deviation from their budgeted amounts. The AFS confirmed this compliance: The Production and Statutory sectors demonstrated perfect budget absorption at 100% (with shs. 6,000,000 and shs. 8,840,000 spent, respectively). Administration had a 95.7% expenditure rate (shs. 8,840,000 spent on a shs. 9,236,835 budget). Finance had a 107.5% expenditure rate (shs. 8,405,761 spent on a shs. 7,818,301 budget).among others</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>	3	<p>The investments projects planned in the previous FY were finished by the end of the year. This was evidenced by reviewing the AFS of FY2024/2025 availed to the assessment team on pg.14 under statement of Budget performance which showed 3 budgeted projects and were all completed and they include; construction of placenta pit at sagitu HC II under DDEG at shs.4500,000, Repair and maintenance of boreholes in jaguzi, kaaza, serinyabi, bumba, masolya, and sagitu at shs.11,511,312 under DDEG and lastly road rehabilitation of naluwerere-maganda road at shs. 4,572,886 under URF</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 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>	1	<p>The LLG had adequate information regarding its grievance response mechanism and the designated person responsible for handling grievances. This was confirmed by the availability of the grievance book in place, grievance reporting mechanism pinned on the notice board.</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	1	There was grievance redress mechanism posted on the notice board, and the grievance committee members with their contacts.
19	<p>The LLG has a functional land management system</p> <p>Maximum score 1</p>	<p>If the LLG has a functional Area Land committee in place to assist the LG Land board in an advisory capacity on matters relating to land, including ascertaining rights on the land score 1 or else 0</p> <p>1</p>	<p>The LLG have an active Area Land Committee in place, which serves as an advisory body on land-related matters. This was confirmed by the composition of the Area land committee pinned on the notice board and sets of Area land minutes such as Minutes dated 21/5/2025 discussing issues affecting land owners in the sub county.</p>

Assessment area: H. Basic (Pre & Primary) Education services Management (in public and private schools)

20	Awareness campaigns and mobilization on education services conducted in last FY Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery score 3, else score 0	0	The 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	4	The LLG conducted monitoring of schools per term evidenced by 3 termly reports provided to the assessment team which included the supervision of all the 6 primary schools operating within the LLG.
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 despite the composition seen in place.

Assessment area: I. Primary Health Care Services Management

23	<p>Awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery score 3, else score 0</p>	0	<p>The LLG failed to conduct awareness campaigns and mobilize community regarding primary health care. This conclusion was reached by the assessment team due to the LLG's inability to provide any PHC awareness report to the team.</p>
24	<p>The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>Evidence that LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY , score 4 or else score 0</p>	4	<p>The LLG conducted monitoring visits to health centers in previous FY. This was evidenced by the End of year health monitoring report including all the Health centers in the LLG dated 20/6/2025</p>
25	<p>Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG; score 3, else score 0</p>	3	<p>The LLG has functional Health Management Committees (HMCs) in its health centers. This was confirmed by the provision of Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) composition appointment letters and meeting minutes. Specific evidence included the appointment letter for Mr. Mwesigwe Brando James as a member of the Sagitu HC II HUMC, and Okumu Omolo as a member of the Masolya HUMC. The functionality was further supported by the minutes from the Sagitu HC II meeting dated September 13, 2024, and the Masolya HC III meeting dated November 29, 2024, among others.</p>

Assessment area: J. Water & Environment Services Management

26	<p>Evidence that the LLGs submitted requests to the DWO for consideration in the current FY budgets</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>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</p>	0	<p>The LLG failed to avail evidence that water requests were submitted to DWO to be considered in the current FY. This was concluded by the LLG`s inability to provide water request submissions to the assessment team.</p>
----	---	---	---	--

27	The LLG has monitored water and environment services delivery during the previous FY Maximum score is 3	Evidence that SAS/ATC monitored/supervised aspects of water and environment services during the previous FY including review of water points and facilities, score 3 or else score 0	0	The LLG SAS did not monitor /supervise aspects of water and environment services during the previous FY including review of water points and facilities this was concluded to by the assessment team not being able to be availed by the monitoring of water sources report conducted for the previous FY.
28	Existence and functionality of Water and Sanitation Committees Maximum score is 2	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 did not have evidence to prove the existence of functional water user committees (WUCs) for all its water sources. This conclusion was based on the LLG's inability to provide lists of WUCs associated with each water source to the assessment team.
29	Functionality of investments in water and sanitation facilities Maximum score is 2	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 LLG failed to provide evidence on the updated list of all water and sanitation lists in the LLG. this conclusion was based on the LLGs inability to provide the water and sanitation lists to the assessment team.

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 production statics reports from the Animal officer Onzi Emma with numbers of farmers under irrigation and stray animals dated 15/01/2025
----	--	--	---	---

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 District production officer. This was evidenced by the livestock report on Animal production statistics report carried out on 7/4/2025 dated 30/4/2025, and for crop statistics seen in the statistical data for crop production/ yield estimates fy2024/2025 dated 30/5/2025 by the Agriculture officer mr. onzi Emmanuel.
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 report on monitoring of PDM farmers dated 30/3/2025 by the APO, and farm visits field report dated 11/5/2025 acknowledged receipt by the DPO on 11/05/2025 submitted to the assessment team.
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 sessions for farmers on irrigated agriculture, pest and disease management. This was evidenced by the training and sensitization reports on agronomic practices which were part of quarterly report, and livestock trainings of 60 farmers dated 31/3/2025 by the APO Luswata Dennis, and for crop Field farmer training report dated 15th/04,2025 acknowledged receipt by the DPO on 15/4/2025.
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 delivered technical support to farmer groups in crop management, aquaculture, and animal husbandry. This assistance is documented in several reports, including the fisheries farm visit (April 9, 2024), crop field visit (December 14, 2023), and the veterinary officer's PDM beneficiary monitoring report (June 30, 2024). Additionally, hands-on training for farmers in irrigation and good agronomic practices like pruning was conducted on April 30, 2025, and acknowledged by the DPO on the same day.