



## **LLG Performance Assessment**

LLG Name: Mayanga Subcounty

Mitooma District

(Vote Code: 893)

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Scores</b>
LLG Performance Assessment	50%

No.	Summary of requirements	Definition of compliance	Compliance justification	Score
<b>A. Functionality of Parish Administrative Structures</b>				
1	<p>The LLG has ensured that there are functional PDCs/WDCs in all their respective Parishes/Wards</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>PDM guidelines available</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of PDCs members for each parish in the LLG were available for mayanga parish, katangata parish, Rwamujura parish, Rwanja east</li> <li>• Minutes of PDCs/WDCs were available for mayanga and Katangata dated 6th June 2023,</li> <li>• List of proposals submitted for the revolving funds were evidenced</li> <li>• Report for field mobilization not evidenced</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>
2	<p>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.</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>parish data was available but not in format according to PDM guidelines</p>	<b>2</b>
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 &amp; CSO operating in the LLG and involved them in raising awareness about the PDM and planning cycle: score 2, or else 0</p>	<p>NGOs, CBOs &amp; CSO mapping report was available dated 26th-06-2022</p>	<b>2</b>

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>	<p>Consultative meeting minutes and attendance lists for mayanga parish was available dated 30th-3-2023</p> <p>List of Parish priority enterprises were available</p>	2
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>	<p>The PDCs and Village Executive committees were not provided with guidance</p>	0
<b>B. Planning and Budgeting</b>				
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>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>	<p>No Consistence evidenced</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>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>	<p>Received for only manyaga parish other ranked priorities for 3 parishes were not available</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>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>	<p>The sub county did held Budget Conference</p>	0

4	The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines  Maximum score is 6	iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0	Tree planning in sub county compound page 7 of the workplan	<b>1</b>
4	The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines  Maximum score is 6	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	no project profiles produced	<b>0</b>
4	The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines  Maximum score is 6	vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0	was submitted on 9th -may- 2023 which is below 15th may	<b>1</b>
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	It was submitted on 12th /9/2023 which is beyond 30th -4-2023	<b>0</b>
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	The sub county supplied chairs in primary schools and procurement of office computer	<b>2</b>
<b>C. Own Source Revenue Mobilization and Administration</b>				
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.	not evidenced the sub county lacked current AFS	<b>0</b>

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	Annual financial statements for the previous FY was not available	<b>0</b>
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.	sub county remitted OSR to the administrative units evidenced by payment voucher	<b>1</b>
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	Spent 28% on councilors allowances	<b>0</b>
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	The sub county spent 500,000 on office maintenance which is 12%	<b>1</b>
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.	Sub county publicised the OSR	<b>1</b>
<b>D. Financial Management</b>				
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	LLG did not submitted its Annual Financial Statement to the Auditor General (AG) on time	<b>0</b>

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	quarterly reports from previous FY were submitted to the LG by the SAS/TC with inclusions of the funding for the PDM.  were not submitted	0
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: ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0	quarterly reports from previous FY were submitted to the LG by the SAS/TC with inclusions of the funding for the PDM.  were not submitted	0
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: iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0	quarterly reports from previous FY were submitted to the LG by the SAS/TC with inclusions of the funding for the PDM.  were not submitted	0
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: iv. Q4 by 30th July score 3 or else 0	quarterly reports from previous FY were submitted to the LG by the SAS/TC with inclusions of the funding for the PDM.  were not submitted	0

**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	No appraisal reports for staff	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	appraised primary headteacher for itara primary school 29th -09-2022	2
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	In- charge appraisal was not appraised by SAS	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	Staff lists were publicized	3
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	staff attendance was not analysis monthly	0
<b>F. Implementation and Execution</b>				
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	Received 12 million and 5 million on payment voucher 116 on completion of sub county offices	0
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	no evidence that the execution of budget in the previous FY does not deviate for any of the sectors/main programs by more than +/-10%	0

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.	Certificate of completion was available for completion of office block	3
----	--	---	--	---

**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	Environmental and social screening forms were not available	0
----	--	--	---	---

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	The LLG has didnt have Operational Grievance Handling System	0
----	--	---	--	---

18	The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling System Maximum score is 2	(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	the grievance redress mechanisms were not publicized	0
----	--	--	--	---

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	Appointment letters for the members of Area Land Committee were available	1
----	--	---	---	---

**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	The LLG didnt conduct awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization	0
----	---	---	---	---



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	evidenced monitoring report for Kakyeza and Makoomi primary schools dated 12/18/2022	<b>4</b>
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	smc executive meeting was held on 29-03-2021	<b>3</b>
<b>I. Primary Health Care Services Management</b>				
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	NO evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery	<b>0</b>
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	LLG conducted campaigns for health services evidenced by HUMIC minutes dated 28-06-2022	<b>4</b>
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	Overview of composition Health Unit Management Committee and Minutes of meetings,were available	<b>3</b>

**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	Requests from the LLGs were not obtained	0
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	No water monitoring reports evidandc	0
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	no evidence of functionality water user committees	0
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	updated lists on all its water and sanitation facilities (public latrines) and functionality status were available	2

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

30	Development of the Physical Development Plans as per guidelines  Maximum score 2	(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		
30	Development of the Physical Development Plans as per guidelines  Maximum score 2	(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:  20% in 2022/23  30% in 2023/24  40% in 2024/25		

31	Implementation of the physical planning and building control measures as per guidelines  Maximum score 3	(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
31	Implementation of the physical planning and building control measures as per guidelines  Maximum score 3	(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
31	Implementation of the physical planning and building control measures as per guidelines  Maximum score 3	(iii) Evidence that the LLG has a functional Development Control Team score 1 or else 0
32	The LLG has developed and implemented a solid waste management plan  Maximum score 2	(i) If the LLG has prepared status report on the implementation of the approved solid waste management plan during the previous FY score 1 or else 0
32	The LLG has developed and implemented a solid waste management plan  Maximum score 2	(ii) If the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns on the management of solid waste during the previous FY score 1 or else 0
33	Operation and Maintenance of infrastructure  Maximum score is 3	(i) If the LLG has prepared Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey report score 1 or else 0

33	Operation and Maintenance of infrastructure	(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
	Maximum score is 3	
33	Operation and Maintenance of infrastructure	(iii) If the LLG has spent own source revenues of not less than 20% on O&M score 1 or else 0
	Maximum score is 3	

**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.	Production statistics report was available	<b>2</b>
	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	Awareness reports were available  • Attendance lists were available  Farm visits reports were available	<b>2</b>
	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	monitoring reports were available for 4 quarters	<b>2</b>
	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.	held training in business plan implementation dated 7th -6-2023	<b>2</b>
	Maximum score is 2			

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

Farm visit reports were available