



## **LLG Performance Assessment**

LLG Performance Assessment

Wairasa Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236728)

**Score** 51/100 (51%)

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  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 sub county has 4 parishes and these are Iguluyibi, Wandago, Misoli and Busuyi. All parishes had Minutes of PDCs submitted to the LLG to establish whether the PDC appraised all proposals submitted for the revolving funds during the previous FY, PDCs were fully constituted and functional
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.	0	No evidence produced
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  Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on:  iii. Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0	0  2  0	No evidence produced  Evidence on whether approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY by the Sub county was evidenced from all parishes  Only Misoli parish produced parish priorities fully signed by the Chairman and secretary

**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>Maximum score is 6</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 sub county had no development plan IV but the approved budget as of 10th/4/2025 was in existence</p>
	<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>Only Misoli parish had submitted a duly signed PDC priority list dated 24th/3/2025 and one of its priorities captured in the sub county approved workplan for FY 2025/26 (Nalubale road maintenance). But there was no evidence of priority submission from the other 3 parishes</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>	1	<p>Minutes of the budget conference dated 12/12/2024 duly signed by the SAS evidenced With solutions of some priorities evidenced in the Sub county's approved workplan for FY 2025/26. some of the priorities or Budget conference outcomes included in the AWP were road maintenance of Othieno and Mulanja roads</p>
	<p>iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0</p>	1	<p>The sub county budget has investments to be financed by the LLG. Among them are road maintenance of Othieno, Nalubale and Mulanja roads as evidence on page 17 of the sub county's AWP</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>The sub county produced evidence of project profiles for all capital projects to be undertaken in the current FY. project profiles evidenced were for Othieno, Nalubale and Mulanja roads</p>
	<p>vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May; score 1 or else 0</p>	1	<p>Submitted on 10th/4/2025</p>

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	Submissions made on 28/4/2025
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	As evidenced from the approved budget dated 10th/4/2025, prioritized investment comply to the DDEG Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines investment menu with activities budgeted on were road maintenance, Environmental management, M&E and Nutrition activities

**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	As evidenced on page 1 of the FY 2024/25 AWP, shs 49,200,000 was budgeted as OSR while page 10 and 20 of the final accounts statement for the financial year 2024/25 show OSR collection of shs 13,573,461
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	Collected OSR for FY 2024/25 was shs 13,573,461 and that of FY 2023/24 was shs 28,669,037 as evidenced on page 27 of the final accounts 2023/24
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.	1	Payment vouchers dated 23/12/2024 and 24,12/2024 shows OSR remittances to LCIs and LC IIs
		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	1	OSR payment Vouchers dated 12/8/2024, 31/10/2024, 12/8/2024 and 31/10/2024 Show a total disbursement of OSR shs 1,540,000 on councilors allowances being 11.3%

<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>	<p>1</p>	<p>OSR payment vouchers dated 20/5/2025, 19/12/2024 and 07/11/2024 show disbursements of OSR funds on operational and maintenance as evidenced from the LLG AWP</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>	<p>0</p>	<p>No publications on OSR usage was evidenced by the time of assessment</p>

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

OSR payment vouchers dated 20/5/2025, 19/12/2024 and 07/11/2024 show disbursements of OSR funds on operational and maintenance as evidenced from the LLG AWP

Evidence that the LLG:

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

No publications on OSR usage was evidenced by the time of assessment

**Assessment area:** D. Financial Management

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 August 31), score 4 or else score 0

submitted on 29/8/2025

Maximum score is  
4

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:

1

Submitted on 1/10/2024

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 Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time;

1

submitted on 13/1/2025

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

Submitted on 10/4/2025

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

Submitted on 10/7/2025

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  Maximum score is 6	<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>(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>(iii) HC III &amp; II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else 0</p>	0  0  0	<p>Appraisal forms for the SAS, CDO and 1 parish chief wasn't evidenced</p> <p>The LLG has 4 primary schools and out of the 4 only 3 head teachers were appraised and these were Mr. Bampalana, Mugga and Magumba. Mr. Obongot was missing</p> <p>The LLG has 2 HCs and none of the in charge had evidence of being appraised</p>
13	Staff duty attendance  Maximum score is 6	<p>Evidence that the LLG has</p> <p>(i) Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 3 or else 0</p> <p>(ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0</p>	3  0	<p>Staff list was evidenced pinned on the notice board</p> <p>LLG did not provide evidence on Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance</p>

**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	<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>	2	<p>DDEG guidelines evidenced and activities implemented by the LLG included road opening, environmental screening and they are all eligible per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines</p>
15	The LLG spent the funds as per budget  Maximum score is 2	<p>Evidence that the execution of budget in the previous FY does not deviate for any of the sectors/main programs by more than +/-10%: Score 2</p>	2	<p>As evidenced from payment vouchers no deviations were made from the budget</p>

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 If 70% -90%: Score 2 If less than 70 %: Score 0.	0	Completion and progress reports were not evidenced to ascertain project completion status

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

17	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 planned investments/ projects, score 2 or else score 0	0	No evidence produced on whether LLG carried out environmental, social and climate change screening where required, prior to implementation of all planned investments/ projects
	Maximum score is 2			
18	The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling System	(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	0	No evidence on whether he 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 produced by the LLG
		(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	LLG had 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	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	No evidence produced on fuctionality of the area land committe
	Maximum score 1			

**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	3	Awareness reports campaigns and parents' mobilization for improvement of education services produced
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	Monitoring reports to determine whether the LLG monitored schools in the previous 3 terms were not produced
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	Only 3 primary schools had the SMC minutes out of the 4 primary 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	No Reports on awareness campaigns and community mobilization for improvement of primary health care were produced by the LLG
----	--	---	---	--



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	0	No monitoring report on aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY were evidenced
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	Minutes from the 2 HCs and appointment letters were produced

**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	No Requests from the LLGs for consideration in the current FY were provided
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	No water and environment monitoring/supervision reports submitted by the SAS produced
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	2	Water sources, lists and minutes of the Water and Sanitation Committees evidenced

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	2	Updated list for water sources produced
	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.	2	Reports on crop, animal and fisheries and irrigation activities including production statistics from the Animal Production Officer, Animal Officer and fisheries officer all evidenced
	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	2	The Animal Production Officer awareness reports backed with pictures and attendance lists was produced and evidenced
	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	0	Animal officer and Fisheries Officer had no Monthly monitoring reports
	Maximum score is 2			
37	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 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	Training reports on agriculture, agronomy, pests and diseases management, operation and maintenance of equipment, linkage to markets evidenced
	Maximum score is 2			

The LLG has provided hands-on 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 Maintenance of equipment, postharvest handling, value addition, marketing etc. reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0	2	Field reports on extension support provided evidenced by the Animal Production Officer and the Animal Officer reports
Maximum score is 2			