



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Name: Apopong Subcounty

Pallisa District

(Vote Code: 919)

Assessment	Scores
LLG Performance Assessment	19%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
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.	The sub-county has 5 parishes but with no evidence of formation of PDCs	0
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.	No evidence of data collection.	0

3	<p>The LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and PDCs on strategies for the development of the parish</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG:</p> <p>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</p>	No report on mapping	0
3	<p>The LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and PDCs on strategies for the development of the parish</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on:</p> <p>ii. Approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY score 2, else score 0</p>	No evidence provided	0
3	<p>The LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and PDCs on strategies for the development of the parish</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on:</p> <p>iii. Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0</p>	No evidence provided	0

B. Planning and Budgeting

4	<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>	No evidence provided	0
	<p>Maximum score is 6</p>			
4	<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>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>	No evidence provided.	0
	<p>Maximum score is 6</p>			
4	<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>iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0</p>	No evidence provided	0
	<p>Maximum score is 6</p>			

4	<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>iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>No evidence was provided</p>	0
4	<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>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>	<p>No profiles were prepared.</p>	0
4	<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>vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>No submission was made</p>	0

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	No submissions were made.(It was reported that the sub-county has no procurements to be made in the current financial year).	2
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	No evidence since the annual workplan is not in place.	0

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.	The final accounts were not yet prepared therefore couldn't ascertain performance.	0
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	OSR Financial Year 2020/2021 = shs 21,667,569 Financial Year 2021/2022 = shs Not ascertained.	0

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.	No evidence provided.	0
9	The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY Maximum score 4	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	The Final Accounts were not prepared therefore not ascertained.	0
9	The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY Maximum score 4	Evidence that the LLG: iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0	No evidence was provided.	0
9	The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY Maximum score 4	Evidence that the LLG: iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.	No evidence was seen on the notice board.	0

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>	<p>No submission was made.</p>	0
11	<p>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</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</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>i. Q1 by 15th October score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>No submission was made.</p>	0
11	<p>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</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</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>No submission was made</p>	0

11	<p>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</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</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>No submission was made.</p>	0
----	--	--	--------------------------------	----------

11	<p>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</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</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>No submission was made</p>	0
----	--	--	-------------------------------	----------

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>No appraisal forms for the staff were seen</p>	0
----	---	--	---	----------

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: (ii) Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0	No performance reports for headteachers were seen	0
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: (iii) HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else	No appraisal forms were seen	0
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	No posting was done on the notice board.	0
13	Staff duty attendance Maximum score is 6	Evidence that the LLG has (ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0	No monthly analysis was done .	0

F. Implementation and Execution

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>	<p>Projects implemented;</p> <p>4-stance pit-latrine at katukei primary school</p> <p>4-stance pit-latrine at sub-county</p> <p>Installation of a gate at Apopong HCIII</p> <p>Fencing of Kaukura HCII</p> <p>All the projects are within the eligible area.</p>	2
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>	<p>No Final Accounts in place .</p>	0
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>	<p>Budget</p> <p>Final Accounts</p> <p>Installation of a gate shs:7,000,000</p> <p>4-stance pit-latrine shs :18,000,000</p> <p>4 -stance pit-latrine at HQTRS shs :18,000,000</p> <p>Fencing Kaukura HCII shs : 10,000,000</p> <p>Renovation Kaukura OPD & staff house ceiling shs:7,000,000</p> <p>Rate of completion not ascertained.</p>	0

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>	<p>ESSF forms on file for Kaukura staff house renovation, 4 stance pit-latrines at sub-county headquarters, 4 stance pit-latrines at Katukei ps and Installation of a fence at Apopong HCIII prepared by Samuka Muhammed -DNRO</p>	2
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 person to coordinate response to feedback, 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>No evidence provided.</p>	0
18	<p>The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling System</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</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>	<p>No evidence provided.</p>	0
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>	<p>No evidence of formation.</p>	0

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

20	Awareness campaigns and mobilization on education services conducted in last FY	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and parent’s mobilization for improvement of education service delivery score 3, else score 0	No report in place	0
	Maximum score is 3			
21	Monitoring of service delivery in basic schools	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:	No reports in place.	0
	Maximum score is 4	<p>If all schools (100%) - score 4</p> <p>If 80 – 99% – score 2</p> <p>If 60 to 79% score 1</p> <p>Below 60% score 0</p>		
22	Existence and functionality of School Management Committees	Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools; score 3, else score 0	No evidence of functionality of SMCs	0
	Maximum score is 3			

I. Primary Health Care Services Management

23	<p>Awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery score 3, else score 0</p>	<p>No reports available.</p>	0
24	<p>The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>Evidence that LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY , score 4 or else score 0</p>	<p>No monitoring reports presented.</p>	0
25	<p>Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG; score 3, else score 0</p>	<p>No minutes available .</p>	0

J. Water & Environment Services Management

26	<p>Evidence that the LLGs submitted requests to the DWO for consideration in the current FY budgets</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>No request submitted.</p>	0
----	---	---	------------------------------	----------

27	The LLG has monitored water and environment services delivery during the previous FY	Evidence that SAS/ATC monitored/supervised aspects of water and environment services during the previous FY including review of water points and facilities, score 3 or else score 0	Evidence of monitoring report available dated 28/6/2022 prepared by Amongin Mary (Health Assistant).	3
	Maximum score is 3			
28	Existence and functionality of Water and Sanitation Committees	Evidence that the LLG have functional Water and Sanitation Committees (including collection and proper use of community contributions) score 2, else score 0	No evidence availed.	0
	Maximum score is 2			
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	No evidence provided	0
	Maximum score is 2			

K. Urban Planning and Management (Applicable to Town Councils and Divisions only)

30	Development of the Physical Development Plans as per guidelines	(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
	Maximum score 2	

30	<p>Development of the Physical Development Plans as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 2</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>
31	<p>Implementation of the physical planning and building control measures as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 3</p>	<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>
31	<p>Implementation of the physical planning and building control measures as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 3</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>
31	<p>Implementation of the physical planning and building control measures as per guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score 3</p>	<p>(iii) Evidence that the LLG has a functional Development Control Team score 1 or else 0</p>

32	<p>The LLG has developed and implemented a solid waste management plan</p> <p>Maximum score 2</p>	<p>(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</p>
32	<p>The LLG has developed and implemented a solid waste management plan</p> <p>Maximum score 2</p>	<p>(ii) If the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns on the management of solid waste during the previous FY score 1 or else 0</p>
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>
33	<p>Operation and Maintenance of infrastructure</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>(ii) If the LLG has prepared an O&M Annual Plan which is based on the Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey score 1 or else 0</p>
33	<p>Operation and Maintenance of infrastructure</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>(iii) If the LLG has spent own source revenues of not less than 20% on O&M score 1 or else 0</p>

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>	<p>Statistical report compiled and analyzed on the following areas (Fish,poultry,dairy,piggery and vegetables)</p>	2
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>	<p>Awareness report on agronomy dated 1/10/2021,18/5/2022 prepared by okia ibrahim</p> <p>Attendance lists attached.</p>	2
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>	<p>Joint monitoring report compiled on livestock farmers and crop farmers dated 20/1/2022.</p>	2

37	<p>Farmer trainings through training farmer field schools and demonstrations organized and carried out</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Training reports on agronomy and vegetables available dated 18/5/2022 with pictorial evidence .</p>	2
38	<p>The LLG has provided hands-on extension support to farmers and farmer organizations / groups</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Field report on agronomy filed with list of farmers supported dated 18/5/2022</p>	2