

LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Name: Nyakizinga Mitooma District (Vote Code: 893)

Assessment Scores

LLG Performance Assessment 61%

| Nyakizinga | Assessment | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|-------|
| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
| A. Funct | ionality of Parish Adı | ministrative 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. | PDM guidelines were available List of PDCs members for each parish in the LLG were obtain for Murambi Parish, Nyakizinga parish, Rubirizi parish, Kikani parish and Muti parish, | 2 |
| | | | • Minutes of PDCs/WDCs for Nyakizinga parish dated 16-9-2022, Murambi Parish dated 16-9-2022 Rubirizi parish dated 29-5- 2023, Kikani parish and Muti parish , | |
| | | | • List of proposals submitted for the revolving funds were obtained for all parishes | |
| | | | Report for field mobilization was available dated 23rd- 5-2022 | |

Agents have collected, compiled, Parish/community profiling as stipulated in the PDM Guidelines.

2

LLG has ensured that Evidence that all the Parishes/Wards in a all Parish Chiefs/Town LLG have compiled, updated, and analyzed data on community profiling disaggregated by village, gender, age, economic activity and analyzed data on among others as stipulated in the PDM Guidelines, score 2 else score 0.

Parish data for the previous FY was not obtained

0

Maximum score is 2

| | guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and PDCs on strategies for the development of the parish Maximum score is 6 | 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 | the LLG was obtained and among those Raising the village workplan was available |
|----------------------|--|---|--|
| 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 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 | PDCs and Village Executive Committees were provided guidance on under minutes dated 13th - 10-2022 for Ntungamo village and Kibungo village |
| 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 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 | No evidence obtained from LLG on providing guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees |
| B. Plann 4 | ing and Budgeting 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 | The LLG approved development plan III was not obtained |
| 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: 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. | ranked priorities from parishes were not obtained |

List CBOs operating in

The LLG provided Evidence that the LLG:

| ł | 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: iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0 | The sub county did not hold a Budget Conference | 0 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| l | 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 | Renovation of the main office block on page 5 | 1 |
| ł | 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 | LLG did not prepare the project profiles | 0 |
| l | 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 | LLG submitted the AWPB for the current FY on 09th -5-2023 before 15th May of the previous FY. | 1 |
| 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 | the procurement plan was not submitted | 0 |

| 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 prioritized investment comply to the DDEG Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines investment menu which was construction of Immunisation hall. | 2 |
|----------|--|--|--|---|
| C. Own S | iource Revenue Mobi | lization and Administration | | |
| 7 | LLG collected local revenue as per budget (Budget realization) | Evidence that the LLG collected OSR for the previous FY within +/- 10% of the budget score 1 or else score 0. | LLG budgeted OSR of 10945000= and collected 391000= which makes -64% | 0 |
| | Maximum score is 1 | | | |
| 8 | | Evidence that the OSR collected increased from previous FY but one to previous FY by more than 5 %, score 1 or else score 0 | The Annual financial statements for the previous FY but one were not obtained because it was a newly created sub county so the local revenue collections was combined with its mother sub county. | 1 |
| 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. | The LLG remitted OSR to the administrative units evidenced by payment voucher | 1 |
| 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 LLG spend more than 20% of OSR on councilors allowances | 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 | it's a newly created sub county , the last years but one collections were combined in the Annual Financial Statement with its mother sub county | 1 |

| 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. | OSR was publicized on notice boards | 1 |
|-----------------------|---|--|---|---|
| D. Finar 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 | Annual Financial Statement was submitted to the Auditor General (AG) on time by 30th-8- 2023 | 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 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 | Reports were not submitted on time | 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 Maximum score is 6 | Evidence that the LLG submitted all four quarterly financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time: ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0 | Reports were not submitted on time | 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 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: iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0 | Reports were not submitted on time | 0 |
| | | | | |
| 11 | 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 | Reports were not submitted on time | 0 |
| | Maximum score is 6 | | | |
| E. Huma 12 | n Resources Manage Appraisal of all staff in the LLG in the | ment for Improved Service Delivery Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG: | SAS/Town Clerk did not appraise staff in | 0 |
| | previous FY Maximum score is 6 | (i) All staff in the LLG including extension workers in the previous FY (by 30th June): score 2 or else 0 | the LLG | |
| | | | | |
| 12 | Appraisal of all staff in the LLG in the previous FY | Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG: | The head teachers were not appraised on time | 0 |
| | Maximum score is 6 | (ii) Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0 | | |
| 12 | Appraisal of all staff in the LLG in the previous FY | Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG: | In charges not applicable no HC in sub county | 2 |
| | Maximum acara is C | (iii) HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY | | |

(III) HC III & II In-charges in the previous Maximum score is 6 (by June 30th) – score 2 or else

| 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 | Publicized the list of LLG staff: | 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 | monthly analysis of staff attendance was not produced | 0 |
| F. Impler | mentation and Execu | tion | | |
| 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 | No evidence that spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/ activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines | 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 | budget in the previous | 2 |
| 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 | Certificate of completion was not produced | 0 |
| | | If less than 70 %: Score 0. | | |
| | | | | |

G. Environmental and Social Safeguards

- 17
- The LLG has Evidence that the LLG carried out Environmental and implemented environmental, social and climate change screening where required, prior to environmental and implementation of all planned investments/ social safeguards

projects, score 2 or else score 0

social screening forms from the SAS/ATC was not produced

0

Maximum score is 2

during the previous

FY

| 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 | No evidence produced on grievance handling | 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 and grievance handling committee were publicized | 1 |
| 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 not obtained Minutes of Area Land Committees were not obtained | 0 |
| H. Basic | (Pre & Primary) Edu | cation services Management (in public an | d 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 | Reports on awareness campaigns and parents' mobilization for improvement of education services were obtained in minutes of Ntugamo village meeting dated 13-10-2022, min 4 | 3 |
| 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 | Monitoring reports on schools were obtained one dated10th-10-2022 | 4 |
| | | lf 80 – 99% – score 2 | | |

If 60 to 79% score 1

Below 60% score 0

| 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 | Minutes of school management committees were not obtained |
|---------|---|--|--|
| | Maximum score is 3 | | |
| | ary Health Care Servic | es Management | |
| 23 | Awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY | Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery score 3, else score 0 | Report on awareness campaigns and community mobilization were available dated 05-10- |
| | Maximum score is 3 | | 2023 |
| 24 | The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY | Evidence that LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY , score 4 or else score 0 | No health Centre in the sub county so not applicable |
| | Maximum score is 4 | | |
| 25 | Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee | Evidence that the LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG; score 3, else score 0 | No health Centre in the sub county so not applicable |
| | Maximum score is 3 | | |
| J. Wate | er & Environment Serv | ices Management | |
| 26 | Evidence that the LLGs submitted requests to the DWO for consideration in the current FY budgets | 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 | |
| | Maximum score is 3 | | |
| | The LLG has | Evidence that SAS/ATC | water and |

| 28 | | | |
|----|--|---|---|
| 20 | 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 | composition of Water and Sanitation Committees were produced |
| | Maximum score is 2 | | Minutes of meetings were not produced that means the is no evidence that its functional |
| 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 | Monitoring/progress reports were produced |
| | Maximum score is 2 | | |
| | | | |
| | Planning and Manag | gement (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 | (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: | |
| | Maximum score 2 | 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 Maximum score is 3 | (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 |

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 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. | The production statistics were available. | 2 |
| 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 | Awareness reports were available dated 30/5/2023 and 13/4/2023 No distribution was done due to PDM | 2 |
| 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 | Monitoring report was avaialble on 30/5/2023 | 2 |
| 37 | Farmer trainings through training farmer field schools and demonstrations organized and carried out Maximum score is 2 | If the LLG extension staff has carried out farmer trainings on irrigated agriculture, agronomy, pests and diseases management, operation and maintenance of equipment, linkage to markets etc. through for example farmer field schools, demonstrations, and field training sessions, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0. | Training reports were available and attendance sheets were available and dated 19/4/2023 | 2 |

hands-on extension support to farmers and farmer organizations / groups

Maximum score is 2

The LLG has provided 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