LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Mulanda Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236981)

Score 58/100 *(58%)*

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	There was evidence that all the four parishes in Mulanda sub-county had PDCs duly constituted as per the PDM guidelines. The list of PDCs by parish (Chawolo, Korobudi, Mulanda and Pasindi) is attached. **The composition of PDCs at Mulanda sub-county was as follows:** **Chawolo Parish** Oburu Moses, LC2 Chairperson Alowo Christine, Chairperson Parish Women Council Ongede Benja, Chairperson Parish Youth Council Bugenyi Jane, Chairperson Parish Disability Council Olowo Godfrey, Chairperson Parish NRM Olowo Solomon J, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council Oketcho Fred, Parish Chief **Korobudi Parish** Othieno Matthew, LC2 Chairperson Atim Dorothy, Chairperson Parish Women Council Oburu Matunis, Chairperson Parish Youth Council Owino Geroldo Chairperson Parish Disability Council Nyaburu Suzan Othieno, Chairperson Parish NRM Ofumbi Alfred, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council Obedo Joseph Yola, Parish Chief **Mulanda Parish** Lapa John, LC2 Chairperson Awori Lenorah, Chairperson Parish Women Council Okumu Batholomayo, Chairperson Parish Youth Council Onyango Nicos Chairperson Parish Disability Council Akoth Georgina, Chairperson Parish NRM Awino Mary K, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council Awori Mary, Parish Chief

				Pasindi Parish Oketch Frank, LC2 Chairperson Awino Ephulance, Chairperson Parish Women Council Okello Alexander, Chairperson Parish Youth Council Olowo Wilson, Chairperson Parish Disability Council Mutchwa Deo A, Chairperson Parish NRM Ochwo Wilson, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council Opoya Esther, Parish Chief There was also evidence that the PDCs were functional by holding quarterly meetings in line with what they were supposed to do in their respective parishes. For example, review of the minutes showed that Chawolo PDC held a meetings on 29/11/2023, 4/1/2024 and 31/5/2024; Korobudi PDC held meetings on 5/10/2023, 23/2/2024 and 30/5/2024; Mulanda PDC held meetings on 12/1/2021 and 7/6/2024; and Pasindi PDC held meetings on 21/4/2024 and 23/5/2024 where all PDCs discussed on issues to do with PDM, among other development activities in their parishes. However, there was no evidence of minutes presented to proof that PDCs appraised all proposals submitted for revolving funds. This was because the appraisal of proposals for the revolving funds was no longer the responsibility of the PDCs but it was the responsibility of the PDM SACCO Loan Committees.
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	Although all the four parish chiefs of Mulanda sub-county had compiled parish data through PDMIS, there was no evidence of updated data and their analysis disaggregated by village, gender, age and economic activity, among others.

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
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	0	Although mapping of NGOs, CBOs and CSOs was done and mapping report of NGOs, CBOs and CSOs produced was on file, there was no evidence, for example, where any of the following NGOs, CBOs and CSOs indicated on the mapping report (Compassion International, Reproductive Health Uganda, UWESO, BRAC Uganda Ltd,, Uganda Cares, SpotLight and Sikiliza Leo) were involved in the raising awareness about PDM and planning cycle..
		Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on: ii. Approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY score 2, else score 0	2	Although all 4 parishes of Mulanda sub-county did not have parish development action plans for FY 2024/2025, there was evidence of an approved sub-county work plan and budget for FY 2024/25 by Council under minute 7/MSC/CM/14/05/2024 in the meeting held on the 14th May 2024.
		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	2	All the 4 parishes had their respective parish priority enterprises, which were as follows: Chawolo parish (Cassava, Groundnuts and Piggery); Korobudi parish (Piggery, Poultry and Groundnuts); Mulanda parish (Piggery, Poultry and Groundnuts); and Pasindi parish (Poultry, Cassava and Piggery).

Assessment area: B. Planning and Budgeting

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
4	The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines Maximum score is 6	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	1	Opening of Pobwok-Lwala pobona-Pa nyakado CAR, maintenance of Pobwok-Paita CAR& maintenace of Lokomwa CAR attached at the end of the development plan not paged , AWP Pg 12 & budget Pg 8 so they are linked.

		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.	0	Priorities not presented for all the parishes of Korubudi, Pasindi, Mulanda, Chaawolo.
		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	Budget Conference was held on 10/10/2023 were opening of Pobwok-Lwala pobona-PaNyakado CAR, maintenance of Pobwok-Paita CAR & maintenace of Lokomwa CAR was considered.
		iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0	0	The LLG budget did not include investments to be financed by the LLG as well as other funding sources
		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 profiles for opening of Pobwok-Lwala pobona-PaNyakado CAR, maintenance of Pobwok-Paita CAR & maintenace of Lokomwa CAR.
		vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0	1	Submitted the budget on 14/4/2024 to the office of CAO
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	Submitted the procurement plan on 14/3/2024 to CAO

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	Completion of construction of a pit latrine at Pasindi P/s and opening of 2.7km pabwok -lwala Pobona CAR was costed at shs 14,358,276 out of the total budget of shs 17,947,846 representing 80% complying with the DDEG 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.	1	According to the final accounts submitted to AG Actual realized 4,384,383 out of the total budget of shs 4,500,000 standing at **97.4%** okay
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	FY 2022/23 Actual 4,393,542-FY 2023/24 4,384,383 =9,159 representing a decrease of total collection by **0.2%**
9	The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY Maximum score 4	Evidence that the LLG: i. Has remitted OSR to the administrative units, score 1 or else score 0.	0	👎 No evidence of OSR remittance to the District or Local Councils
		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	👎 Spent more than 20% of OSR on councilor’s allowances. (Out of Total Budget of ugx 5,546,706, ugx 3,000,000 was spent on councilor allowances representing 54% without authorization from 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	1	👎 Budgeted for OSR and funds used on operation & maintenance. (Refer Annual budget FY 2023/24 Pg 3 and VR 1/3)

		Evidence that the LLG: iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.	1	👎 There is evidence of Publicizing OSR and how it was used for the previous FY as seen on the notice board.

Assessment area: D. Financial Management

10	The LLG submitted annual financial statements for the previous FY on time Maximum score is 4	Evidence that the LLG submitted its Annual Financial Statement to the Auditor General (AG) on time (i.e., by August 31), score 4 or else score 0	4	AFS for previous FY was submitted on 30/8/2024
11	The LLG has submitted all 4 quarterly financial and physical progress reports including finances for the Parish Development Model (PDM), for the previous FY on time and in the prescribed format Maximum score is 6	Evidence that the LLG submitted all four quarterly financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time: i. Q1 by 15th October score 1 or else 0	1	👎 Availed a signed copy of PBS Q1, submitted to CAO’s office on 06th/10/2023 and to other relevant authorities.
		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	1	👎 Availed a signed copy of PBS Q2, submitted to CAO’s office and to other relevant authorities.
		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	1	👎 Availed a signed copy of PBS Q3, submitted to CAO’s office on 09th/04/2024 and to other relevant authorities.

		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	3	👎 Availed a signed copy of PBS Q4, submitted to CAO’s office on 05th/07/2024 and to other relevant authorities. 👎 Reported PDM funds and how funds were spent.

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	Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG: (i) All staff in the LLG including extension workers in the previous FY (by 30th June): score 2 or else 0	2	• Staff structure on the Notice board • Staff list SAS, CDO, Assistant Accountant, 4 parish chiefs, AAO, AHO,(office Typist & Office attendant hired service). • Performance plan are in the individual files • Appraisal reports done and submissions were made on 5/8/2024,
		Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG: (ii) Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0	0	The LLG did not avail evdience of appraisals of Headteachers in public primary schools operating in the LLG in the previous school calendar year.
		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	LLG did not avail complete appraisal evidence for Health In-Charges of heath facilities operating in the LLG to ascertain the appraisal timeframe if whetehr it is within required timeframe of by 30th June of previous FY
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	3	The LLG Publicize the list of staf on Notice board.
		Evidence that the LLG has (ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0	3	The LLG produce and made submission to CAO's Office as follow 5/7/2024, 10/6/2024, 5/5/2024,12/4/2024,15/3/2024,5/2/2024,5/1/2024, 7/12/2023, 6/11/2023, 13/10/2023, etc.

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	0	DDEG payment vouchers not presented.
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	0	Payment vouchers not presented.
16	Completion of investments as per annual work plan and budget 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) : If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3 If 70% -90%: Score 2 If less than 70 %: Score 0.	0	Payment vouchers not presented.

Assessment area: G. Environmental and Social Safeguards

17	The LLG has implemented environmental and social safeguards during the previous FY 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	2	Environmental and Social Screening (E&S) Forms were filled for maintenance of Pobwok-Paita Lwala Pobone Panyakado CAR, maintenance of Lokomwa & construction of 2 stance pit latrine.

18	The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling System 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	1	The grievance redress log book maintained for instance a case was registered on 24/3/2023 of Mr. Okoth Timoth a resident of Mulanda S/C complaining of destruction of a wall fence due to road opening of Cocola- Atangala road.
		(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	0	The LLG did not publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress
19	The LLG has a functional land management system 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	Although 6 members of ALC were appointed on 4/3/2023 under minute No 19/TDLG/C/24/11/2021 with Mr. Othieno Pinato being C/person other members are Atila Christine, Oboth Edrian, Alihiza Harriet, Owere John and Japian Anthony Paul as a secretary there were no minute of them sitting.

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	LLG conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery. LLG availed community sensitization dated 14/11/2023.

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	LLG has not 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. LLG did not avail Monitoring reports and Minutes of the committee availed at time of assessment.
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	LLG do not have a functional school management committee in all schools. LLG did not avail composition of the SMCs for schools operating in the LLG and MInutes for the meetings held by the SMCs of the schools operating in the LLG.

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	3	The LLG conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery as per report produced on quarterly on 13/5/2024, 9/5/2024, 18/6/2024, 11/6/2024,6/6/2024, 5/6/2024, etc creating awareness on other noticeable diseases, conjunctivitis of house hold level, and environmental health.
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 monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY as evidenced by a monitoring report dated 8/2/2024 and 2/7/2024 in respect to ensure the fencing of HC IV is complete, transfers of staff is done, ensure drugs are safe and adequate, hygiene and sanitation is maintained at the health unit, among others.

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 members of HUMC are 9 (Nyamoka C/person, Obbo Faustine Sec other members Oyo Charles Osiaga, Aya Jackline, Apoya Christine, Isabirye Henry, Okello Onyem, Obur Pesience , Okech Ashia Wilson. The minutes of committee meetings were dated 6/7/2024,21/3/2024,23/12/2023 discussing presentation of facility work-plans, staffing gaps, etc.

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	LLG did not avail evidence of request letter for consideration in the current FY.
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	3	LLG SAS did the monitor of water and environment services during the previous FY 2023/2024 as indicated by the monitoring reported 8/11/2023. The water sources monitored with their status and recommendations was presented during the assessment.
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	LLG do not have functional Water and Sanitation Committees. LLG did not avail composition fo the Water and Sanitation Committee LLG did not avail minutes for the meetings held by any water and sanitation committee
29	Functionality of investments in water and sanitation facilities Maximum score is 2	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	LLG SAS did not avail an updated lists on all its water and sanitation facilities and or public latrines entailing their functionality status.

Assessment area: L. Production Services Management

34	Up to date data on agriculture and irrigation collected, analyzed and reported Maximum score is 2	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	There was no evidence of analysis of production data collected, it was not comprehensive and it was also not submitted to the LG Production office.
35	Farmer awareness and mobilization campaigns carried out through farmer field days and awareness meetings Maximum score is 2	If the LLG has carried out awareness and mobilization campaigns on all aspects of agriculture through farmer field days and awareness meetings, exchange visits, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0	0	There was no evidence in form of awareness reports and associated attendance sheets to show that the LLG carried out awareness and mobilization campaigns on all aspects agriculture
36	The LLG has carried out monitoring activities on production activities for crops, animals and fisheries Maximum score is 2	If the LLG extension staff has implemented monitoring activities on agricultural production for crops, animal and fisheries covering among others irrigation, environmental safeguards, agricultural mechanization, postharvest handling, pests and disease surveillance, equipment installations, farmers implementing knowledge from trainings, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0	0	There was no evidence of monthly monitoring reports by extension staff to show that monthly monitoring was carried out; and similarly there was no evidence on file of supervision reports by SAS.

37	Farmer trainings through training farmer field schools and demonstrations organized and carried out Maximum score is 2	If the LLG extension staff has carried out farmer trainings on irrigated agriculture, agronomy, pests and diseases management, operation and maintenance of equipment, linkage to markets etc. through for example farmer field schools, demonstrations, and field training sessions, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0.	2	There was evidence on file that LLG extension workers such as Ochola Patrick (Assistant Agricultural Officer) and Omam Charles Patrick (Animal Husbandry Officer) carried out farmer trainings as per attendance sheets on training reports submitted to LG Production office on 4/4/2024, 5/4/2024, 19/4/2024, 5/7/2024 and 11/7/2024.
38	The LLG has provided hands-on extension support to farmers and farmer organizations / groups Maximum score is 2	If the LLG extension staff have provided extension support to farmers and farmer groups on crop management, aquaculture, animal husbandry, irrigation, Operation and Maintenance of equipment, postharvest handling, value addition, marketing etc. reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0	2	There were field reports on extension support found on file that were submitted to LG Production office on 4/4/2024 and 19/4/2024. For filled agricultural extension diaries, MAAIF abolished hard copies of extension diaries and introduced e-extension diaries app in the FY 2022/2023 and in the FY 2023/2024, the app developed a problem whereby it failed to update data to-date.