

LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment
Kityerera Subcounty
(Vote Code: 236730)

Score 55/100 (55%)

236730 Kityerera Subcounty

LLG Performance Assessment

Performance Measure

Scoring Guide Score Justification

2

and others

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 Maximum score is by mobilization of beneficiaries within a parish/ward, appraisal of all proposals submitted for the revolvina funds durina the previous FY for all parishes, score 2, else score 0.

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 as evidenced with minutes of PDCs and mobilization reports dated 25/09/2024,28/3/2025,30/12/2024,5/03/2025,27/09/2024

2

3

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 2 by village, gender, age, economic activity among others as stipulated in the PDM

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, as dated 11/02/2025,29/4/2025,2/7/2025, 30/06/2025

Maximum score is Guidelines, score 2 else 2

score 0.

quidance and information to the i. Has mapped NGOs, Village Executive Committees and

PDCs on strategies for the development of the parish

The LLG provided Evidence that the LLG:

CBOs & CSO operating in the LLG and involved them in raising awareness about the PDM and planning cycle: score 2, or else 0

0

The LLG Has no evidence that it mapped NGOs, CBOs & CSO operating in the LLG and involved them in raising awareness about the PDM and planning

Maximum score is

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

ii. Approved 0 Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY score 2, else score 0

The LLG has no evidence to prove that it provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on Approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY

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

0

1

1

iii. Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0 The LLG has no evidence that it provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on:

iii. Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish

Assessment area: B. Planning and Budgeting

4

The LLG Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and

Budgeting Guidelines

6

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

i. Is consistent with the

LLG approved Maximum score is development plan III; score 1 or else 0

The LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY Is consistent with the LLG approved development plan IV

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.

The LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY Incorporates ranked priorities from all its respective parish submissions which are duly signed by the Parish Chief and PDC Chairperson as evidence Nakyombo road-9.2 from Kitovu parish, 6.48 from wandeyi poarish and wandegeya TC-Katuba from wandengeya parish

	Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY: iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference as evidenced on date 30th/10/2024
	iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0	0	The LLG has no evidence to show that budget included investments to be financed by the LLG
	v. Evidence that the LLG developed project profiles for all capital investments in the AWP and Budget as per format in NDP III Score 1 or else score 0	0	The LLG has no evidence to show that developed project profiles for all capital investments in the AWP and Budget as per format in NDP III
	vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG budget was submitted to the District on 8th/05/2025
Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the LLG prepared and submitted inputs into the procurement plan for all the procurements to be done in a LLG for the current FY) to the CAO/TC by the 30th April of the previous FY, Score 2 or else score 0	2	The LLG prepared and submitted inputs into the procurement plan for all the procurements to be done in a LLG for the current FY) to the CAO on 25th/04/2025 as form 5 of the previous FY
LLG budget to DDEG investment menu for the current FY	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	2	The investments in the approved LLG Budget for the current FY comply with the investment menu in the DDEG Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines as evidenced on capital 85%(43,280/50,871), Nutrition committees 2%(1017/50,871), M&E 5%(2,543/50,871)

Assessment area: C. Own Source Revenue Mobilization and Administration

else score 0

5

6

7	LLG collected local revenue as per budget (Budget realization) Maximum score is 1	Evidence that the LLG collected OSR for the previous FY within +/-10% of the budget score 1 or else score 0.	1	The LLG collected OSR for the previous FY within +/- 10% of the budget as evidenced in budget O&R 11,000,000 collection 10,760,698 resulting in 97%
8	Increase in LLG own source revenues from last financial year but one to last financial year. Maximum score 1	Evidence that the OSR collected increased from previous FY but one to previous FY by more than 5 %, score 1 or else score 0	1	The OSR collected increased from previous FY but one to previous FY by more than 5 % as evidenced collection for FY24/2510,760,698 FY23/247,500,918 resulting to 435
9	The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY Maximum score 4	Evidence that the LLG: i. Has remitted OSR to the administrative units, score 1 or else score 0.	1	The LLG Has remitted OSR to the administrative units as evidenced voucher 05/05/2025360,000/=, 25% to LCI and LCII 03/03/2025400,000/= page 56 of final A/C show that 2,037,500 was transferred to LCI and LCIIs which is 30% as per LG act.
		Evidence that the LLG: ii. Did not use more than 20% of the OSR on councilors allowances in the previous FY (unless authority was granted by the Minister), score 1, else score 0	0	The LLG has npo evidence to prove that Did not use more than 20% of the OSR on councilors allowances in the previous FY (unless authority was granted by the Minister)
		Evidence that the LLG: iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0 Evidence that the LLG:	0	The LLG has no evidence to show budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY
		Evidence that the LLG.		

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

Assessment area: D. Financial Management

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

1, else score 0.

11

The LLG submitted annual financial statements for the previous FY on time

Evidence that the LLG submitted its Annual Financial Statement to the Auditor General (AG) on time (i.e., by

else score 0

4

1

The LLG submitted its Annual Financial Statement to the Auditor General (AG) on time as evidenced on 29th/08/2025

Maximum score is August 31), score 4 or

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

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:

The LLG submitted quarter one financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time as dated 14th/10/2024

i. Q1 by 15th October score 1 or else 0

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 1 Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time:

The LLG submitted quarter two financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time as dated 15th/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 1 Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time:

The LLG submitted quarter three financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time as dated 20th/03/2025

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 3 Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time:

The LLG submitted quarter four financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time as dated 15th/07/2025

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

Assessment area: E. Human Resources Management for Improved Service Delivery

0

0

12

Appraisal of all the previous FY

Evidence that the staff in the LLG in SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:

Maximum score is

(i) All staff in the LLG including extension workers in the previous FY (by 30th June): score 2 or else 0

The LLG has no evidence to prove that staff in the LLG including extension workers in the previous FY were appraised

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

The SAS has no evidence that appraised all the staff in the LLG Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December)

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

The SAS has no evidence to prove that appraised staff in the LLG HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th)

Staff duty attendance Evidence that the LLG

has

else 0

6

Maximum score is (i) Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 3 or

3

The LLG has Publicized the list of LLG staff as seen on the notice board

13

Evidence that the LLG has

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

3

2

3

2

The LLG has Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO as evidenced on 03rd/06/2025

Assessment area: F. Implementation and Execution

14

The LLG has spent all the DDEG funds for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities

Evidence that the LLG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/ activities as per the DDEG grant,

Maximum score is budget, and implementation guidelines: Score 2, or

else score 0

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 as evidenced 85% was on capital like partial construction of staff house at Kitovu II and road maintainace which all fall under eligible activities

5% on M&E

2% on Nutrition committee

8% investments

15

2

The LLG spent the funds as per budget

Maximum score is

Evidence that the execution of budget in the previous FY does not deviate for any of 2 the sectors/main programs by more than +/-10%: Score 2

The execution of budget in the previous FY does not deviate for any of the sectors/main programs by more than +/-10% it is evidenced with the guidlines

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 Maximum score is FY (quarter four):

3

If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3

If 70% -90%: Score 2

If less than 70 %: Score 0.

The investment projects planned in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of FY (quarter four) ,If more than 90 % was completed, If 70% -90%,If less than 70 as evidenced by partial construction of staff house Kltovu planned and completed Ndaiga TC -Ndaiga swamp 2.5km completed

Assessment area: G. Environmental and Social Safeguards

17

2

The LLG has implemented environmental and social safeguards during the previous FY

Evidence that the LLG carried out environmental, social and climate change screening where required, prior to implementation of all

Maximum score is planned investments/ projects, score 2 or else score 0

The LLG has carried carried out environmental, social and climate change screening where required, prior to implementation of all planned investments/ projects as dated 26/06/2025,28/06/2025,29/06/2025

The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling System

Maximum score is

(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 1 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

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 as evidenced case management book and surmous avilable, grievance management committee is avialb; le and displayed

(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

The LLG has no evidence to show that itpublicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress

19 The LLG has a functional land management system

If the LLG has a functional Area Land committee in place to assist the LG Land board in an advisory Maximum score 1 capacity on matters relating to land, including ascertaining rights on the land score 1 or else 0

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 as evidenced in appointment letters for members of ALC present letters are dated 20/12/2024

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

0

1

0

20

Awareness campaigns and mobilization on education services conducted in last

Maximum score is

Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery score 3, else score 0

The LLG has no evidence to show that it conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery

Monitoring of service delivery in basic schools Evidence that the LLG has monitored schools at least once per term in the previous 3 terms

Maximum score is and produced a list of

issues requiring attention of the committee responsible for education of the LLG council in the previous

If all schools (100%) score 4

If 80 - 99% - score 2

If 60 to 79% score 1

Below 60% score 0

The LLG has no evidence that it monitored schools at least once per term in the previous 3 terms and produced a list of issues requiring attention of the committee responsible for education of the LLG council in the previous FY

22

Existence and functionality of

School Management Committees

Evidence that the LLG have functional school management

committees in all

Maximum score is schools; score 3, else

score 0 3

0

0

0

0

The LLG have no evidence to prove the functional school management committees in all schools

Assessment area: I. Primary Health Care Services Management

23

Awareness

campaigns and mobilization on primary health

care conducted in and mobilized last FY

3

4

Evidence that the LLG has conducted

awareness campaigns

communities for

improved primary Maximum score is health care service delivery score 3, else

Evidence that LLG

score 0

The LLG has no evidence to prove that it conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery

24

The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the

monitored aspects of previous FY health service delivery during the previous FY, Maximum score is score 4 or else score 0

The LLG has no evidence to prove that it monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY

Existence and functionality of **Health Unit** Management Committee

Evidence that the LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the

The LLG have no functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities

Maximum score is

LLG; score 3, else score

Assessment area: J. Water & Environment Services Management

Evidence that the SAS

submitted in writing

26

Evidence that the LLGs submitted requests to the

DWO for consideration in the current FY budgets

requests to the DWO for 3 consideration in the planning of the current

Maximum score is FY score 3, else score 0

The SAS submitted in writing requests to the DWO for consideration in the planning of the current FY as evidenced on 14/11/2024 for the construction of boreholes

27

The LLG has monitored water and environment services delivery during the previous FY

Evidence that SAS/ATC monitored/supervised aspects of water and environment services during the previous FY including review of Maximum score is water points and facilities, score 3 or else score 0

0

0

0

The SAS has no evidence to prove monitoring /supervising aspects of water and environment services during the previous FY including review of water points and facilities

28

3

Existence and functionality of Water and Sanitation Committees

Evidence that the LLG have functional Water and Sanitation Committees (including

collection and proper Maximum score is use of community contributions) score 2,

else score 0

The LLG has no evidence to prove the functionality of Water and Sanitation Committees (including collection and proper use of community contributions)

29

Functionality of investments in water and sanitation facilities

Evidence that the SAS has an updated lists on all its water and sanitation facilities Maximum score is (public latrines) and functionality status.

The SAS has no evidence to prove the updated lists on all its water and sanitation facilities (public latrines) and functionality status

2 Score 2 else 0

Assessment area: L. Production Services Management

Up to date data on agriculture and irrigation collected, analyzed and reported

Maximum score is

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 2 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.

The LLG extension staff have collected, analyzed and reported data on agriculture (i.e., crop, animal and fisheries) and irrigation activities including production statistics for key commodities, data on irrigated land, farmer applications, farm visits etc. as per formats, the reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office as evidenced on 30/06/2024

35

36

Farmer awareness and mobilization campaigns carried out through farmer field days and awareness meetings

If the LLG has carried out awareness and mobilization campaigns on all aspects of agriculture through farmer field days and awareness meetings, exchange visits, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0

The LLG has carried out awareness and mobilization campaigns on all aspects of agriculture through farmer field days and awareness meetings, exchange visits. reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office as dated 30/6/2025

Maximum score is 2

The LLG has carried out monitorina activities on

production

activities for

and fisheries

crops, animals

If the LLG extension staff has implemented monitoring activities on agricultural production for crops, animal and fisheries covering among others irrigation, environmental safeguards, agricultural

Maximum score is 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 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 as evidenced on 18/11/2024, 15/4/2025 and 13/2/2025

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 Maximum score is equipment, linkage to markets etc. through for $\frac{2}{}$ example farmer field schools, demonstrations, and field training sessions, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score

2 or else 0.

The LLG extension staff has carried out farmer trainings on irrigated agriculture, agronomy, pests and diseases management, operation and maintenance of equipment, linkage to markets etc. through for example farmer field schools, demonstrations, and field training sessions, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office as evidenced 28/3/2024,02/5/2025

38

The LLG has provided handson 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 Maximum score is Maintenance of equipment, postharvest handling, value addition, marketing etc. reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0

2

The LLG extension staff have provided extension support to farmers and farmer groups on crop management, aquaculture, animal husbandry, irrigation, Operation and Maintenance of equipment, postharvest handling, value addition, marketing etc. reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office as evidenced on 23/5/2025,14/9/2024,14/4/2025