



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Mpungwe Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236734)

Score 51/100 (51%)

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 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 7 members per parish. For example, Maina Parish PDC minutes dated 29 April, 2024, 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 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	2 2	The LLG Mapped NGOs, CBOs, and CSOs operating within the LLG and involved them in raising awareness about the Parish Development Model (PDM). This was evidenced by the list of NGOs operating in the LLG and the PDM awareness report prepared by CDO Ms. Kandha Hamidah on May 20, 2025, which indicated the involvement of BACHI coordinator Kayihura Dan in the sensitization meetings and community engagements The LLG provided guidance to Village Executive Committees (VECs) and Parish Development Committees (PDCs) on the programs and activities to be implemented within the 5 respective parishes. This was confirmed by the approved parish priorities shared with the assessment team, such as Buyere parish activities planned for implementation, dated April 23, 2025.

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

2

iii. Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0

The LLG shared with the assessment team a list of enterprises being implemented in the 5 parishes. It was found that the LLG provided guidance to the Parish Development Committees (PDCs) through field visits and training sessions evidenced in the Enterprise trainings in cost best analysis conducted such as Wairama parish availed report dated 30/6/2025

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:
i. Is consistent with the LLG approved development plan III; score 1 or else 0

0

There was no DPIV 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 five parishes, which were fully endorsed by their respective LC II chairpersons which were shared to the assessment team. As an example, Buyere parish submitted its priorities on March 13, 2025, signed by both the parish chief, Nambuba Zaina, and the LC II chairperson, Kadde John which included priorities like rehabilitation of Busima-Buwalilira road, 2km was also incorporated in the budget. Likewise, Wairama parish submitted its priorities on the same date, signed by Nakiisinde Brenda, the parish chief, Kuffa Allupa, the LC II chairperson.

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 2025/26 AWPB prioritized investments outlined in the budget conference report dated 30th, November 2024. One such investment is grading of Nawankole road 1km project suggested by Wairama parish community as seen in the Budget conference report and funded by the DDEG program in the AWPB.

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	1	The LLG developed project profile as per NDPIV format for the planned investments to be implemented in the current FY, the projects that whose profiles were developed includes; Procurement of 30 desks to Buswikira p/s and Maina P/S at 4,800,000 ending 31/03/25 under DDEG, Maintenance of Mfudo-Lugangu road at 10,021,262 having a start date of 1/Oct/2025 and end date 31/Dec/ 2025 under DDEG among others
		vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0	0	LLG submitted the AWPB for the current FY on 30 May 2025 after 15th May of the previous FY.
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	2	LLG submitted the procurement plan on 30 April 2025 not later than 30th April of the previous FY for procurements to be made in the current FY.
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	2	The LLG AWPB for the current FY meets the investment criteria specified in the DDEG grant guidelines.
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.	0	The LLG's AFS for FY2024/2025 shows that budgeted OSR was shs 5,000,000, while actual revenue collection amounted to shs.4,464,800. This translates to 89.9% revenue collection rate, which does not satisfy the +/-10% criterion.

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>FY23/24 budget and AFS were not availed to the team to calculate the increase in LLG own source revenue collection from previous FY but one to previous FY by more than 5 %</p>
9	<p>The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum score 4</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG:</p> <p>i. Has remitted OSR to the administrative units, score 1 or else score 0.</p>	1	<p>The LLG remitted OSR funds to LCI and LCII administrative units, This was supported by voucher payments examined by the assessment team, such as voucher no. 1/5/25 dated May 1st, May 2024, for shs. 1,800,000</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LLG:</p> <p>ii. Did not use more than 20% of the OSR on councilors allowances in the previous FY (unless authority was granted by the Minister), score 1, else score 0</p>	0	<p>The LLG's expenditure on councilor allowances amounted to shs.1,435,000, representing 32.1% of the total revenue collected (4,464,800 Uganda Shillings). This falls outside the acceptable limit of 20% OSR usage for councilor allowances. This was evidenced by Payment vouchers with amounts 300,000=, 120,000=, 685,000= and 330,000=.</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 600,000. This was evidenced by the O&M payment vouchers on sub county maintenance of sub county offices among others.</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 the previous FY. This was confirmed by the revenue collection sources 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 August 29, 2025. This submission falls within the acceptable timeframe of not exceeding August 31st.</p>
----	--	---	---	---

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

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

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 15th/07/2024.

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:

ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0

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 13th/01/2025.

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:

iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0

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/April/2025.

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:

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

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/07/2024.

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:

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

The LLG provided a staff list containing 10 staff members, including extension workers. All staff members were appraised by SAS Migoli Silagi by June 30, 2025. This was confirmed by staff appraisal reports such as Kandha Hamida and Nambuba Zainawho who were appraised on June 30, 2025.

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 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

Maximum score is 6

Evidence that the LLG has

(i) Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 3 or else 0

The LLG publicized the staff list of staffs working in the local government this was evidenced by the list of 10 staff members pinned on the sub county notice board for example Community Development Officer Kandha Hamidah on no.8 of the pinned staff list.

Evidence that the LLG has

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

Maximum score is 2

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 road maintenance and rehabilitation projects, such as the opening and shaping of Mfudo-Lugangu 2km Road (2km, shs.10,021,262), procurement of desks to Buswikira p/s among others

15

The LLG spent the funds as per budget

Maximum score is 2

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

The AFS provided to the assessment team revealed that the LLG deviated from budget execution in certain sectors, exceeding or falling short of the +/-10% threshold. DDEG was underspent by 79.2%, with a budget of shs.35,019,857 and spending of shs. 27,719,857 among other sectors that over spent and underspent.

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>	0	<p>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.</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>	2	<p>The LLG provided evidence on the environmental, social, and climate change screening of the planned project implemented in previous FY24/25. This was confirmed by the environmental screening forms in place prepared by the District Natural resource officer Lubanga Musa for all of 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>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>	1	<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 sets of Area land minutes such as Minutes dated 10/5/2025 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	0	The LLG failed to conduct at least one monitoring visit to schools per term. The assessment team concluded this due to the LLG's inability to provide any education service monitoring reports, citing a lack of funding for such activities.
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.

Assessment area: I. Primary Health Care Services Management

23	Awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY 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	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.
----	--	---	---	--

24	The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY Maximum score is 4	Evidence that LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY , score 4 or else score 0	4	The LLG conducted monitoring visits to health centers in previous FY. This was evidenced by the quarterly monitoring reports done by Health Assistant. Some of the reports are dated 13/3/2025, 28/5/2025 as captured in the executive committee meeting.
25	Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee 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	The LLG has functional Health Management Committees (HMCs) in the health centers functional in the LLG. This was evidenced by the HMC minutes of Health centers provided to the assessment team forexample Muggi HC HMC minutes dated 10/11/2024 among others

Assessment area: J. Water & Environment Services Management

26	Evidence that the LLGs submitted requests to the DWO for consideration in the current FY budgets Maximum score is 3	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	0	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.
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	There were no reports availed to the team on water and environment monitoring/supervision reports submitted by the SAS showing whether new and old facilities were covered.
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	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.
	Maximum score is 2			

Assessment area: L. Production Services Management

34	Up to date data on agriculture and irrigation collected, analyzed and reported	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.	0	LLG Reports on production statistics to ascertain whether it was compiled, comprehensive and submitted to LG Production Office were not availed to the assessment team
	Maximum score is 2			
35	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	0	The LLG availed only Q3 and Q4 awareness reports for animal husbandry leaving out Q1 and Q2 awareness reports, also they failed to avail the crop husbandry reports for all the quarters
	Maximum score is 2			
36	The LLG has carried out monitoring activities on production activities for crops, animals and fisheries	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 Q3 Crop report dated March 29, 2025, on micro-scale irrigation, banana, and cassava farmers, and the Q2 report dated January 4, 2025, on mushroom farmers under the PDM program. All these reports were prepared by B the agricultural officer.
	Maximum score is 2			

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.	0	The LLG extension staffs did not carry out farmer trainings on irrigated agriculture, agronomy, pests and diseases management, operation and maintenance of equipment, linkage to markets .This was concluded by the LLGs inability to provide provide monthly/quarterly farmer training reports to the assessment team
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 26/June/2025, the crop field visit report dated 30/12/2024, and the monitoring report of PDM beneficiaries by the veterinary officer dated June 10, 2024 provided to the assessors.