



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Kwapa Town Council

(Vote Code: 273847)

Score 43/100 (43%)

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			There was evidence that all the three coded parishes out of five parishes in Kwapa town council had PDCs duly constituted as per the PDM guidelines. The list of PDCs by coded parish (Kabosa, Kwapa and Ochehen) is attached.
	Maximum score is 2			The composition of the four fully constituted PDCs in coded and uncoded parishes only at Kwapa town council was as follows: Kabosa Parish Omanyala James, LC2 Chairperson Aujat Jane, Chairperson Parish Women Council Emoit Benard, Chairperson Parish Youth Council Odekori Vincent, Chairperson Parish Disability Council Awala Joseph, Chairperson Parish NRM Okitela Stephen, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council Adikini Tabisa, Parish Chief Kwapa Parish Kapule Charles, LC2 Chairperson Lucy Okurut, Chairperson Parish Women Council Okware Henry, Chairperson Parish Youth Council Osewuku Noah, Chairperson Parish Disability Council Emongolem Allan Stephen, Chairperson Parish NRM Omuniyeng Christiano, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council Amoit Rachael, Parish Chief Ochehen Parish Erwangat Steven, LC2 Chairperson Amusugut Rose, Chairperson Parish Women Council Omoit Ivan, Chairperson Parish Youth Council
	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	

Epugot Venance, Chairperson Parish Disability Council

Onyapidi Valentine, Chairperson Parish NRM

Owaret Simon, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council

Amunyelet Jane Frances, 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 Kabosa PDC held meetings on 6/7/2023, 12/12/2023 and 25/3/2024; Kwapa PDC held meetings on 30/8/2023 and 11/12/2023; and Ochege PDC held meetings on 8/12/2023 and 28/6/2024 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.

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 data from all the parishes in Kwapa town council had been compiled through PDMIS, there was no evidence of updated data and their analysis disaggregated by village, gender, age and economic activity, among others

Maximum score is 2

3

The LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and PDCs on strategies for the development of the parish

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

At the time of assessment, the LLG did not avail the list and mapping report for the NGOs, CBOs and CSOs operating in Kwapa town council.

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

2

Although all 5 parishes of Kwapa town council did not have parish development action plans for FY 2024/2025 in the right format, there was evidence of an approved sub-county work plan and budget for FY 2024/25 by Council reflecting parish activities.

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 3 coded parishes had their respective parish priority enterprises, which were as follows: Kabosa parish Dairy, Cassava and Onions); Kwapa parish (Cassava, Maize and Poultry); and Ochege parish (Cassava, Maize and Onions).

Assessment area: B. Planning and Budgeting

4

The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines

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

0

Although opening of Aterait-Akadot-Kanyagor via Kabosa I to Apetai road a pear both in the AWP & budget but not in the development plan.

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.

1

Ranked parish priorities for the current FY were availed during the time of assessment and projects of maintenance of Kwapa close, Adamu and Asoceit CAR.

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

The budget conference was held on 13/10/2023 and what was discussed were planned and budgeted for.

iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0

0

The LLG 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	0	The LLG did not develop the project profiles
	vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0	1	The budget was submitted on 14/5/2024
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	0 Evidence of submission of procurement plan not availed
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 Investment cost according to the AWP is shs 6,740,612 out of the total budget of shs 8,425,765 representing 80% hence 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.	0 According to final accounts submitted to AG Actual/Budgeted (Revised) (8,446,234/10,000,000) x 100 = 84% -16%
---	--	---	---

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	According to Final Accounts submitted Tto AG: Actual for FY 2023/24 8,446,236 Actuals for FY 2022/2023 22,136,666 %tage decrease (13,690,430/22,136,666) x100 62%
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. 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 iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0 iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.	0 1 1 1	🔗 No evidence of OSR remittance to the administrative units. 🔗 Spent less than 20% of OSR on councilor's allowances. 🔗 Budgeted for OSR and funds used on operation & maintenance. 🔗 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 submitted to AG 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

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

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

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

☞ No PBS submitted for Q1.

0

☞ Availed a signed copy of PBS Q2, submitted to CAO's office on 10th/01/2024 and to other relevant authorities.

1

Availed a signed copy of PBS Q3, submitted to CAO's office on 15th/04/2024 and to other relevant authorities.

1

☞ Availed a signed copy of PBS Q4, submitted to CAO's office on 08th/07/2024 and to other relevant authorities.

3

☞ 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

0

3 Ward Agents, SAA, 3 headteachers files availed but not appraised.

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

2 Headteachers provided ie Omungat Richard and Emoel Joseph and 2 performance plans. The rest could not be accessed.

Appraisal of 3 parish chiefs submitted on 13/8/2024. The CDO was not appraised.

	Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:	0	No evidence presented for the appraisal of health in-charge.
	(iii) HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else		
13	Staff duty attendance	Evidence that the LLG has	Staff monthly analysis provided for August submitted on 3/9/2024, July submitted on 1/8/2024, June submitted on 5/7/2024, May submitted on 4/6/2024, April submitted on 6/5/2024, March submitted on 2/4/2024, February submitted on 5/3/2024, January submitted on 3/2/2024, etc.
	Maximum score is 6	(i) Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 3 or else 0	3
		Evidence that the LLG has	
		(ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0	3
			Staff list publicized on the Notice board.

Assessment area: F. Implementation and Execution

14	The LLG has spent all the DDEG funds for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities	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 vouchers for FY 2023/2024 not presented
	Maximum score is 2			
15	The LLG spent the funds as per budget	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	Since the DDEG AWP for FY 2023/2024 not presented it was difficult to compute the deviation
	Maximum score is 2			
16	Completion of investments as per annual work plan and budget	Evidence that the investment projects planned in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of FY (quarter four) :		
	Maximum score is 3	If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3	0	Since the DDEG AWP for FY 2023/2024 and vouchers not presented it was difficult to know the completion period
		If 70% -90%: Score 2		
		If less than 70 %: Score 0.		

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	0	The Environmental and Social Screening (E&S) Forms no presented for assessment.
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 (ii) If the LLG has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress score 1 or else 0	1 1	The grievance handling system in place and with a latest case registered on 16/8/2024. the issue was trespass of the central market land by Mr. Olyauna Silver. Case handled and forwarded to Solicitor General for better management. The LLG 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	The file for Area Land committee not presented during the time of assessment.

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	0	No evidence presented on awareness campaigns and mobilization on education services conducted in last FY
----	---	---	---	--

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:		
	Maximum score is 4	If all schools (100%) - score 4 If 80 – 99% – score 2 If 60 to 79% score 1 Below 60% score 0	4	Although monitoring reports for Kwapa P/s dated 31/5/2024, 2/8/2023, Asinge P/s term I, Ochege P/s 16/8/2023, 9/8/2023 discussing school feeding as a challenge there were no consolidated monitoring reports for the 3 terms.

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	0	Kwapa P/s had 2 minutes 26/10/2023 & 5/07/2023, Asinge P/s 1 minute 6/7/2023 not signed, Ochege P/s no minutes and also they do not have implementation reports on issues raised.
	Maximum score is 3			

Assessment area: I. Primary Health Care Services 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	0	No evidence availed on awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY
	Maximum score is 3			
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	0	No evidence that the LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY
	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	0	No evidence of functionality of Health Unit Management Committee in form of minutes availed.
	Maximum score is 3			

Assessment area: 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	0	No functional Physical Planning Committee for town council.
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	0	No functional Physical Plan.
30% in 2023/24		
40% in 2024/25		

31

Implementation of the physical planning and building control measures as per guidelines	(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	0	No list of investments and no certificates of compliance.
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	0	Evidences not availed.
---	---	------------------------

(iii) Evidence that the LLG has a functional Development Control Team score 1 or else 0	0	No developed control team.
---	---	----------------------------

32

The LLG has developed and implemented a solid waste management plan	(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	0	The LLG has not 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	0	The LLG has not conducted awareness campaigns on the management of solid waste during the previous FY

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 (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 (iii) If the LLG has spent own source revenues of not less than 20% on O&M score 1 or else 0	0 0 0	The LLG has not prepared Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey report The LLG has not prepared an O&M Annual Plan which is based on the Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey The LLG has not spent own source revenues of not less than 20% on O&M
----	---	---	---------------------	---

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.	2	There was evidence of comprehensive and analysed production statistics reports submitted to LG Production office on 31/3/2024.
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	2	There was 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. For example, reports submitted to LG Production office indicated that farmers were involved in awareness meetings held on 12/5/2024 and 3/7/2024.
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	At the time of assessment, the LLG did not avail any monthly monitoring reports by extension staff and supervision reports by SAS.

37	Farmer trainings through training farmer field schools and demonstrations organized and carried out	If the LLG extension staff has carried out farmer trainings on irrigated agriculture, agronomy, pests and diseases management, operation and maintenance of equipment, linkage to markets etc. through for example farmer field schools, demonstrations, and field training sessions, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0.	2	There was evidence on file that LLG extension workers such as Nyaburu Florence (Assistant Agricultural Officer) and Ayeet Charles (Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer) carried out farmer trainings as per attendance sheets on training reports submitted to LG Production office on 30/9/2023, 30/12/2023, 29/3/2024, 13/5/2024, 10/6/2024 and 30/6/2024.
	Maximum score is 2			
38	The LLG has provided hands-on extension support to farmers and farmer organizations / groups	If the LLG extension staff have provided extension support to farmers and farmer groups on crop management, aquaculture, animal husbandry, irrigation, Operation and Maintenance of equipment, postharvest handling, value addition, marketing etc. reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0	2	There were field reports on extension support found on file that were submitted to LG Production office for farmer visits conducted on 31/12/2023, 31/3/2024 and 30/6/2024. 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.
	Maximum score is 2			