



## **LLG Performance Assessment**

LLG Performance Assessment

Magamaga Town Council

(Vote Code: 236738)

**Score** 43/100 (43%)

| No.  | Performance Measure   | Scoring Guide  | Score | Justification   |
|--|---|--|-------|---|
| <b>Assessment area: A. Functionality of Parish Administrative Structures</b> |   |  |       |   |
| 1  | The LLG has ensured that there are functional PDCs/WDCs in all their respective Parishes/Wards<br><br>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 4 parishes ie Wabulungu, Wandago, Magamaga and Bukoli. All the wards produced reports   |
| 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.<br><br>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     | Community profiling for all the 4 wards produced  |
| 3  | The LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and PDCs on strategies for the development of the parish<br><br>Maximum score is 6                            | <p>Evidence that the LLG:</p> <p>i. Has mapped NGOs, CBOs &amp; CSO operating in the LLG and involved them in raising awareness about the PDM and planning cycle: score 2, or else 0</p> <p>ii. Approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY score 2, else score 0</p> <p>iii. Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0</p> | 2     | <p>Reports for mapped NGOs, CBOs and CSOs produced</p> <p>Minutes and priority ranking produced and evidenced</p> <p>Priority enterprise lists per ward evidenced</p> |

**Assessment area: B. Planning and Budgeting**

|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines</p> | <p>Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:</p> <p>i. Is consistent with the LLG approved development plan III; score 1 or else 0</p>   | 0 | <p>The LLG had no development plan in place though the budget was produced</p>  |
| Maximum score is 6  |   |   |   |
|   | <p>Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:</p> <p>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.</p> | 0 | <p>With exception of Bukooli Parish all the other 3 had submitted their respective PDC priority lists dated 19/3/2025 for wandago, Wabulungu on 21/3/2025 and magamaga on 4/4/2025. Though the 3 had submitted priority lists, none of them was incorporated in the LLG budget for FY 2025/26</p>                       |
|   | <p>Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:</p> <p>iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0</p>  | 0 | <p>Budget Conference Minutes dated 2/12/2024 were not signed and there was no correlation between these minutes with the LLG AWPB for example investments mentioned in the an signed minutes were road maintenance of menya and wandago roads which were not part of the LLG investments in the AWPB for FY 2025/26</p> |
|   | <p>iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0</p>  | 1 | <p>LLG budget include procurement of laptop, road maintenance of Kayongo and Obbo roads as investments to be financed by the LLG</p>  |
|   | <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>Project profiles for road maintenances of Obbo and Kayongo roads evidenced</p>   |
|   | <p>vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0</p>   | 0 | <p>Budget in place but it was not submitted to district</p>   |

|   |  |  |   |  |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| 5 | Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement<br><br>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 | No evidence on submission produced   |
| 6 | Compliance of the LLG budget to DDEG investment menu for the current FY<br><br>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 had no DDEG Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines to investment whether its investments in the approved Budget for the current FY comply with the investment menu. |

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

|   |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 7 | LLG collected local revenue as per budget (Budget realization)<br><br>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.   | 0  | The LLG collected shs 35,362,418 as of final accounts FY 2024/25 via budgeted shs 76,908,250 for FY 2024/25 being 45%   |
| 8 | Increase in LLG own source revenues from last financial year but one to last financial year.<br><br>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  | From final accounts FY 2024/25 OSR collected was 35,362,418 while shs 71,342,440 was collected in FY 2023/24 showing a decline in collection of shs 35,980,022  |
| 9 | The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY<br><br>Maximum score 4                       | Evidence that the LLG:<br><br>i. Has remitted OSR to the administrative units, score 1 or else score 0.<br><br><br><br><br>Evidence that the LLG:<br><br>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<br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br>1 | No evidence on remittances made<br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br>Payment vouchers dated 9/4/2025, 13/8/2024, 17/2/2025, 18/12/2024, 17/12/2024, 7/12/2024, 14/9/2024, 14/9/2024 and 6/12/2024 have a total of 4,759,000 all being spent on councilors allowances. Thus resulting in a 13.4% of OSR being spent 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 | 1 | Payment Vouchers numbers 17/2/2025 shows disbursement of funds for O&M worthy 1,291,00 just as budgetd |
| Evidence that the LLG:   |   |  |
| iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.                     | 0 | No OSR publication made on its collection and usage  |

**Assessment area: D. Financial Management**

|    |   |  |                                     |  |
|----|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| 10 | The LLG submitted annual financial statements for the previous FY on time<br><br>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                                   | submitted on 28/8/2025   |
| 11 | The LLG has submitted all 4 quarterly financial and physical progress reports including finances for the Parish Development Model (PDM), for the previous FY on time and in the prescribed format<br><br>Maximum score is 6 | <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>0</p> <p>3</p> | <p>Submitted on 10/10/2024</p> <p>submitted on 15/1/2025</p> <p>submitted on 18/4/2025</p> <p>submitted on 10/7/2025</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>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>Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:</p> <p>(iii) HC III &amp; II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else</p> | <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> | <p>17 files / appraisals produced out of 33 files and the 17 appraisals were not endorsed</p> <p>Appraisals for the 4 head teachers not evidenced</p> <p>Appraisals for the 2 health centre incharges not evidenced</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>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>0</p>          | <p>Staff list pinned on the LLG notice board</p> <p>LLG monthly analysis of staff attendance not evidenced</p>  |
| <b>Assessment area: F. Implementation and Execution</b> |   |   |                            |   |
| 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>  | 0                          | <p>The LLG undertook road opening of kaziba road, procured laptop and office but failed to provide DDEG grant Budget and implementation guidelines to ascertain whether investments were on eligible projects/ activities as per the DDEG LLG investment menu</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>   | 0                          | <p>Payment Voucher number 2/2/2025 shows disbursement of shs 2,000,000 for CPA Capacity building something which wasn't budgeted for under UDEG for FY 2024/25 being 13.9% deviation</p>  |

|    |  |   |   |  |
|----|--|---|---|--|
| 16 | Completion of investments as per annual work plan and budget<br><br>Maximum score is 3 | Evidence that the investment projects planned in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of FY (quarter four) :<br><br>If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3<br><br>If 70% -90%: Score 2<br><br>If less than 70 %: Score 0. | 0 | The LLG didn't provide project progress reports and completion reports |
|----|--|---|---|--|

**Assessment area:** G. Environmental and Social Safeguards

|    |  |   |            |  |
|----|--|---|------------|--|
| 17 | The LLG has implemented environmental and social safeguards during the previous FY<br><br>Maximum score is 2 | Evidence that the LLG carried out environmental, social and climate change screening where required, prior to implementation of all planned investments/ projects, score 2 or else score 0  | 0          | No evidence of Environmental and Social Screening (E&S) Form/ESMP provided   |
| 18 | The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling System<br><br>Maximum score is 2                               | (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<br><br>(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<br><br>1 | The LLG had complaints log book with clear information and reference for onward action, a defined complaints referral path, and the public display of information at LLG offices.<br><br>The LLG has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress on the LLG notice boards |
| 19 | The LLG has a functional land management system<br><br>Maximum score 1                                       | 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   | 0          | The LLG had minutes of the Area Land committee in place dated 4/9/2024, 11/12/2024, 3/3/2025, 20/6/2025 but not signed by the indicated minute secretary mr. Gowa Ali who is also a member instead of the the Town Clerk and mr. Kiiza Mulwana as the chairperson  |

**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<br><br>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 | Reports on awareness campaigns and parents' mobilization for improvement of education services not evidenced |
| 21 | Monitoring of service delivery in basic schools<br><br>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:<br><br>If all schools (100%) - score 4<br><br>If 80 – 99% – score 2<br><br>If 60 to 79% score 1<br><br>Below 60% score 0 | 0 | Monitoring reports to determine whether the LLG monitored schools in the previous 3 terms not evidenced      |
| 22 | Existence and functionality of School Management Committees<br><br>Maximum score is 3                     | Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools; score 3, else score 0  | 3 | Minutes of all SMC meetings evidenced  |

**Assessment area: I. Primary Health Care Services Management**

|    |  |   |   |  |
|----|--|---|---|--|
| 23 | Awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY<br><br>Maximum score is 3 | Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery score 3, else score 0 | 0 | Reports on awareness campaigns and community mobilization for improvement of primary health care not evidenced |
| 24 | The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY<br><br>Maximum score is 4  | Evidence that LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY , score 4 or else score 0   | 0 | Health monitoring reports not evidenced  |



|   |  |   |                            |  |
|---|--|---|----------------------------|--|
| 25  | Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee<br><br>Maximum score is 3                      | Evidence that the LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG; score 3, else score 0  | 3                          | Health unit Management Committee Appointments and minutes produced   |
| <b>Assessment area: K. Urban Planning and Management (Applicable to Town Councils and Divisions only)</b> |  |   |                            |  |
| 30  | Development of the Physical Development Plans as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 2                         | <p>(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</p> <p>(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:</p> <p>20% in 2022/23</p> <p>30% in 2023/24</p> <p>40% in 2024/25</p> | <p>0</p> <p>1</p>          | <p>Physical Planning Committee was properly and fully constituted but submission of at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD was not evidenced</p> <p>physical plan in place and aplan registration book in evidenced too</p>   |
| 31  | Implementation of the physical planning and building control measures as per guidelines<br><br>Maximum score 3 | <p>(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</p> <p>(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</p> <p>(iii) Evidence that the LLG has a functional Development Control Team score 1 or else 0</p>   | <p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p> | <p>The certificate of compliance is issued by 30th October every year for the implementation of a PDP for the previous year was not evidenced</p> <p>roads were surveyed and demarcated as the road inventory was evidenced</p> <p>The LLG had a Physical planning committee and not Development Control Team Committee with 1 set of minutes dated 1/5/2025</p> |
| 32  | The LLG has developed and implemented a solid waste management plan<br><br>Maximum score 2                     | (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  | 0                          | solid waste management plan and implementation status report for the previous FY not evidenced   |

|    |   |  |   |
|----|---|--|---|
|    | (ii) If the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns on the management of solid waste during the previous FY score 1 or else 0 | 0  | A report/minutes on awareness campaigns for solid waste management was not evidenced  |
| 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>(ii) If the LLG has prepared an O&amp;M Annual Plan which is based on the Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey score 1 or else 0</p> <p>(iii) If the LLG has spent own source revenues of not less than 20% on O&amp;M score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>1</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>  |
|    |   |  | <p>Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey report especially on roads evidenced</p> <p>LLG had no O&amp;M Annual Work Plan in place</p> <p>The only O&amp;M expenditures were on repair of a wheelbarrow under voucher number 17/2/2025 and not on the infrastructures</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>   | 2 | <p>Reports for the veterinary officer and the agricultural officer evidenced</p>        |
| 35 | <p>Farmer awareness and mobilization campaigns carried out through farmer field days and awareness meetings</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p> | <p>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</p>  | 2 | <p>Farmer awareness and mobilization campaigns reports produced</p>                     |
| 36 | <p>The LLG has carried out monitoring activities on production activities for crops, animals and fisheries</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>  | <p>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</p> | 0 | <p>No evidence on Monthly monitoring reports by extension staff produced by the LLG</p> |

|    |   |   |   |  |
|----|---|---|---|--|
| 37 | Farmer trainings through training farmer field schools and demonstrations organized and carried out<br><br>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 | Farmer trainings reports produced with attendance lists attached                                     |
| 38 | The LLG has provided hands-on extension support to farmers and farmer organizations / groups<br><br>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                                    | 0 | Only the Vetinary officer provided the report while the agricultural officer didn't provide evidence |