



## **LLG Performance Assessment**

LLG Performance Assessment

Kigandalo Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236739)

**Score** 32/100 (32%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
<b>Assessment area:</b> 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 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 seven members of each parish. For example, Kigandalo Parish PDC minutes dated April 25, 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 6 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	There was no evidence of mapped NGOs, CBOs and CSO reports operating in the LLG and involved in raising awareness about the PDM and planning cycle availed to the team.  The LLG did not provide guidance to Village Executive Committees (VECs) and Parish Development Committees (PDCs) on the programs and activities to be implemented within their respective parishes.

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 did not share with the assessment team a list of enterprises being implemented in the 6 parishes.

#### 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

DDP IV was not availed to the team to establish whether AWPB is consistent with the LLG approved development plan IV

Maximum score is 6

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

ii. Incorporates ranked priorities from all its respective parish submissions which are duly signed by the Parish Chief and PDC Chairperson score 1 or else 0.

1

The LLG AWPB for the current FY incorporated prioritized investments identified by the individual parishes. This was reflected in the comprehensive parish priorities provided by all the 6 parishes, which were fully endorsed by their respective LC II chairpersons which were shared to the assessment team. For example kyoga-Buyego road, 42km in Kyoga parish at shs11,000,000 , Nabaduli-Namasaka 4km in kigulu parish at shs.12,000,000 among others

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

There were no budget conference minutes and report availed to the team to establish whether the AWPB is based on its outcomes.

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.

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 did not develop project profile as per NDPIV format for the planned investments to be implemented in the current FY since they were not availed to the team

vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0

0

The LLG Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current financial year, 2025/26, was submitted to the district and its receipt was confirmed by the District Central Registry on 30th May, 2024. This submission date violates the established deadline of not later than May 15th.

5

Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement

Maximum score is 2

Evidence that the LLG prepared and submitted inputs into the procurement plan for all the procurements to be done in a LLG for the current FY) to the CAO/TC by the 30th April of the previous FY, Score 2 or else score 0

0

The assessment team found no evidence that the LLG submitted inputs to the procurement plan for the current FY to the CAO this was confirmed by the absence of any submitted procurement plan provided to the assessment team.

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

0

The LLG AWPB for the current FY does not meet the investment criteria specified in the DDEG grant guidelines. This evidence was observed in the Current FY Budget where the total DDEG budget of shs. 50,000,000 includes shs. 35,800,000 for infrastructure investments, which amounts to 71.6% of the total DDEG Funds. Hence does not exceed the minimum investment requirement of 80%.

#### **Assessment area:** C. Own Source Revenue Mobilization and Administration

7

LLG collected local revenue as per budget (Budget realization)

Maximum score is 1

Evidence that the LLG collected OSR for the previous FY within +/- 10% of the budget score 1 or else score 0.

1

The LLG's AFS for FY2024/2025 shows that budgeted OSR was shs.7,150,000 while actual revenue collection amounted to shs.7,813,115. This translates to a 101.1% revenue collection rate, which satisfies the +/- 10% criterion.

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

0

Annual Financial Statements for FY23/24 was not availed to check for the actual Revenue collected to calculate the increase in LLG revenue collection from FY24/25 and FY23/24

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.

0

No vouchers were availed to the team to show that the LLG remitted the mandatory share of OSR to the LG and administrative units

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

No vouchers were availed to show whether the LLG did not spend more than 20% of OSR on councilors allowances

Evidence that the LLG:

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

0

There was no evidence to show if the LLG Budgeted and used at least 5% OSR funds on operational and maintenance since no vouchers were availed to the team

Evidence that the LLG:

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

0

There was no OSR publicised on the notice board

#### **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

LLG submitted its Annual Financial Statement to the Auditor General (AG) on 29 August 2025 which is on time before 31 August.

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

Q1 report was submitted on 15/ October/2024

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	Q2 report was submitted to LG on 14/01/2025
ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0		
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	Q3 report was submitted to LG on 15 April 2025
iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0		
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	Q4 report was submitted to LG on 29 July 2025
iv. Q4 by 30th July score 3 or else 0		

**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:	2	The LLG provided a staff list containing 12 staff members, including extension workers. All staff members were appraised by SAS Etenu Timothy by June 30, 2025. This was confirmed by staff appraisal reports such as the one for Segawa Muzamilu the parish chief of Kigandalo parish who was appraised on June 30, 2025. Other examples include Mukisa Rose CDO, and Mukisa Racheal the SAA, etc of whom were appraised on June 30, 2025.
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		
		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	0	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.
		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	The assessment team found no evidence to support the claim that the LLG (SAS) 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.

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 12 staff members pinned on the sub county notice board i.e Community Development Officer Mukisa Rose on no.3 of the pinned staff list.
	Maximum score is 6	(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	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 the shaping of Kyoga-Buyego Road (42km, shs.11,000,000) among others
	Maximum score is 2			
15	The LLG spent the funds as per budget	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	There was no previous AFS that was availed to the team to determine whether the LLG did not deviate more than +/-10 % from the sector ceilings and programs.
	Maximum score is 2			
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	0	There was no proof provided to the assessment team that the planned investments for the previous financial year were finished by the end of the year. No completion certificates or reports were presented.
		If 70% -90%: Score 2		
		If less than 70 %: Score 0.		

**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> <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>	0	<p>The LLG did not provide adequate information regarding its grievance response mechanism and the designated person responsible for handling grievances. This was confirmed by the absence of a grievance book, reporting mechanism, or a designated grievance handler within the LLG.</p> <p>iii) There was no grievance redress mechanism posted on the notice board, as the LLG lacked a formal redress mechanism and a designated person to handle grievances.</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>	0	<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>
<b>Assessment area:</b> 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>	0	<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	Monitoring of service delivery in basic schools  Maximum score is 4	<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>	1	<p>The LLG conducted monitoring of schools per term evidenced by 4 quarterly reports provided to the assessment team such as Q1 dated 6th/8/2024, Q2 dated 11/11/24, Q3 dated 29/3/25, Q4 dated 28/6/25. However in each of the report all the 11 schools were not monitored for example in Q1 only 7 schools were monitored, Q2 only 4 schools were monitored, in Q3 only 8 schools were monitored, and Q4 only 5 schools were monitored. which gives a range of 60-79% schools monitored per term.</p>
22	Existence and functionality of School Management Committees  Maximum score is 3	<p>Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools; score 3, else score 0</p>	0	<p>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.</p>
<b>Assessment area: I. Primary Health Care Services Management</b>				
23	Awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY  Maximum score is 3	<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	The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY  Maximum score is 4	<p>Evidence that LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY , score 4 or else score 0</p>	0	<p>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.</p>
25	Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee  Maximum score is 3	<p>Evidence that the LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG; score 3, else score 0</p>	0	<p>The LLG was unable to prove the existence of functional Health Management Committees (HMCs) in the Health facilities operating within the Sub county. This conclusion was reached by the assessment team due to the LLG's inability to provide the minutes of HMCs for the available health facilities to the team.</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	<p>The LLG has monitored water and environment services delivery during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>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</p>	0	<p>The LLG did not avail any water requests submitted to DWO for consideration in current FY</p>
28	<p>Existence and functionality of Water and Sanitation Committees</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG have functional Water and Sanitation Committees (including collection and proper use of community contributions) score 2, else score 0</p>	0	<p>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.</p>
29	<p>Functionality of investments in water and sanitation facilities</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>Evidence that the SAS has an updated lists on all its water and sanitation facilities (public latrines) and functionality status. Score 2 else 0</p>	0	<p>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.</p>

**Assessment area:** L. Production Services Management

34	<p>Up to date data on agriculture and irrigation collected, analyzed and reported</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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.</p>	0	<p>The LLG failed to provide LLG Reports on production statistics to ascertain whether it was compiled, comprehensive and submitted to LG Production Office to the assessment team.</p>
----	---	---	---	---

35	Farmer awareness and mobilization campaigns carried out through farmer field days and awareness meetings  Maximum score is 2	If the LLG has carried out awareness and mobilization campaigns on all aspects of agriculture through farmer field days and awareness meetings, exchange visits, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG conducted agricultural awareness and mobilization campaigns by organizing farmer field days and awareness meetings. These activities were reported to the production office. This was evidenced by the sensitization reports for example on animal production dated December 30th, 2024 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 quarterly crop monitoring reports submitted to the assessment team. Some of the reports provided include the Q2 Crop report dated December 30, 2024, on micro-scale irrigation, banana, and cassava farmers, and the Q1 report dated October 22, 2024, on mushroom farmers under the PDM program by the agriculture officer
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 provided to the assessment team. For example crop statistics reports on sensitization were submitted to DPO dated June 30, 2025. Additionally, an activity report on a cost-benefit analysis training for tomato enterprise farmers on 26th July 2024.
38	The LLG has provided hands-on extension support to farmers and farmer organizations / groups  Maximum score is 2	If the LLG extension staff have provided extension support to farmers and farmer groups on crop management, aquaculture, animal husbandry, irrigation, Operation and Maintenance of equipment, postharvest handling, value addition, marketing etc. reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG extension staff provided assistance to farmer groups in areas such as crop management, aquaculture, and animal husbandry. This was evidenced by the fisheries farm visit report dated 10th, 10, 2025, the crop field visit report dated December 14, 2024, and the monitoring report of PDM beneficiaries by the veterinary officer dated June 30, 2025 provided to the assessors.