



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Kwapa Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236995)

Score 59/100 (59%)

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			Although there was evidence that four out of five parishes in Kwapa sub-county had PDCs duly constituted as per the PDM guidelines (The list of PDCs by parish (Asinge, Kojim, Oburi and Ogiroi) is attached).
	Maximum score is 2			The composition of the four fully constituted PDCs in coded and un-coded parishes only at Kwapa sub-county was as follows: Asinge Parish (Coded) Ochwei David, LC2 Chairperson Amoit Christine, Chairperson Parish Women Council Ekirapa Kanot, Chairperson Parish Youth Council Oria Richard, Chairperson Parish Disability Council Onyango Benard, Chairperson Parish NRM Oketcho Remegio, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council Omai Joseph, Parish Chief Kojim Parish (Un-coded) Ajalet Grace, LC2 Chairperson Akereut Esther, Chairperson Parish Women Council Padde Alex, Chairperson Parish Youth Council Imai Yosam, Chairperson Parish Disability Council Isaria Patrick, Chairperson Parish NRM Ochoko Lawrence, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council Ocanit Julius, Parish Chief Oburi Parish (Un-coded) Olakitar Matthew, LC2 Chairperson Mukade Christine, Chairperson Parish Women Council Emongoluk Richard, 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.	0	

Juliet Ayeet, Chairperson Parish Disability Council

Emojong William, Chairperson Parish NRM

Omaidi Charles, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council

Saite Mary Pauline, Parish Chief

Ogiroi Parish (Un-coded)

Epero Pius, LC2 Chairperson (RIP)

Amase Betty, Chairperson Parish Women Council

Tanga Denis, Chairperson Parish Youth Council

Omoding Peterson, Chairperson Parish Disability Council

Omusolo Cyprian Moses, Chairperson Parish NRM

Okemeri Joventine, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council

Ofwono Peter, Parish Chief

However, at the time of assessment, the LLG did not avail minutes on meetings held by especially Asinge PDC that is coded and facilitated. There was no evidence also availed to proof that the PDC 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

Maximum score is 2

Although data from all the parishes in Kwapa sub-county 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.

3

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

Maximum score is 6

Evidence that the LLG:

i. Has mapped NGOs, CBOs & CSO operating in the LLG and involved them in raising awareness about the PDM and planning cycle: score 2, or else 0

2

The LLG Presented the list and mapping report for the NGOs, CBOs and CSOs operating in Kwapa sub-county

and this include BRAC, UDHA, Africa Water Solution, ACCORD operating in various parts of the sub county.

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 sub-county 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

There was evidence that one coded parish (Asinge) had their respective parish priority enterprises, which were as follows: Piggery, Poultry and Cassava).

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

Maximum score is 6

Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:

i. Is consistent with the LLG approved development plan III; score 1 or else 0

1

The documents are aligned eg opening of Ogiroi Go Down-Mukuju road and maintenance of Akoret B1-Komol road are in the DDEG WP and budget Pg 2 and the project profile attached to the development plan.

Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:

ii. Incorporates ranked priorities from all its respective parish submissions which are duly signed by the Parish Chief and PDC Chairperson score 1 or else 0.

0

The sub county has 5 parishes of Kojim, Obur, Apuwai Asinge, Ogiroi. Only Asinge parish priorities dated 24/2/2024 were availed.

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 report dated 27/10/2023 was availed and it formed the basis of planning and budgeting for instance opening of Ogiroi Go Down-Mukuju road and maintenance of Akoret B1-Komol road are considered in the meeting and in budgeting.

	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	1	The project profiles for opening of Ogiroi Go Down-Mukuju road and maintenance of Akoret B1-Komol road were developed for the current FY.
	vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0	0	The budget was submitted on 31/5/2024 instead of submitting it before 15th May.
5	Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the LLG prepared and submitted inputs into the procurement plan for all the procurements to be done in a LLG for the current FY) to the CAO/TC by the 30th April of the previous FY, Score 2 or else score 0 2	The procurement plan for all LLG procurement was submitted on 26/4/2024.
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	The total Investment costs for opening Ogiroi-Mukuju road and maintenance of Akoret B1-Komol road and procurement of tree seedlings was shs 7,86,142 out of budgeted cost of shs 9,795,177 amounting to 80% so complying with the g

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 (965,343/2,000,000) x 100 Budget performance is at =48.2%
---	--	--	--

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

1

Acording to final accounts

FY 2023/24 actual 965,343

FY 2022/23 actual 748,419

%tage increase
(216,924/748,419) x 100

=28.8

9

The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY

Maximum score 4

Evidence that the LLG:

i. Has remitted OSR to the administrative units, score 1 or else score 0.

0

👉 No evidence of OSR remittance to the District or Local Councils

Evidence that the LLG:

ii. Did not use more than 20% of the OSR on councilors allowances in the previous FY (unless authority was granted by the Minister), score 1, else score 0

0

👉 No evidence of 20% of OSR on councilor's allowances.

Evidence that the LLG:

iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0

0

- 🔗 Budgeted for OSR and but no evidence of funds used on operation & maintenance.

Evidence that the LLG:

iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.

1

☞ There is evidence of Publicizing OSR and how it was used for the previous FY as seen on the notice board.

Assessment area: D. Financial Management

10

The LLG submitted annual financial statements for the previous FY on time

Maximum score is
4

Evidence that the LLG submitted its Annual Financial Statement to the Auditor General (AG) on time (i.e., by August 31), score 4 or else score 0

4

N AFS for previous FY was submitted on 30/8/2024

11

The LLG has submitted all 4 quarterly financial and physical progress reports including finances for the Parish Development Model (PDM), for the previous FY on time and in the prescribed format

Maximum score is 6

Evidence that the LLG submitted all four quarterly financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time:

1

Availed a signed copy of PBS Q1 submitted to CAO's office and to other relevant authorities on 13th/10/2023

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:

1

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

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:

1

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

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:

3

Availed a signed copy of PBS Q4, submitted to CAO's office on 12th/07/2024 and to other relevant authorities.

iv. Q4 by 30th July score 3 or else 0

Reported PDM funds

Assessment area: E. Human Resources Management for Improved Service Delivery

12

Appraisal of all staff in the LLG in the previous FY

Maximum score is 6

Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:

(i) All staff in the LLG including extension workers in the previous FY (by 30th June): score 2 or else 0

2

6 staffs were appraised as follows: Omai Josoph Parish chief Appraised on 30/6/2024, Saite Mary Pauline Parish chief, Obonyo Joseph parish chief, Olupot Romans Office attendant, Nyaburu Florence Agric officer, Ayeet Charles AAHO,

Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:

(ii) Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0

0

The head teacher could not be accessed although the submission was done on 25/7/2024 no acknowledged by registry.

Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:

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

0

The in-charge falls under Kwapa town council

13	Staff duty attendance	Evidence that the LLG has		Staff list publicized.
	Maximum score is 6	(i) Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 3 or else 0	3	Ochanit Julius Parish chief Kojim parish, Oman Joseph Parish chief Asinge parish, Joseph Obonyo for Apuwai parish, Osere John Baptist Ogiroi parish, Sansi Pauline for Obur parish.
		Evidence that the LLG has		Monthly analysis prepared on time with remarks:
		(ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0	3	June 2023/24 submitted on 11/7/2024, May submitted on 11/6/2024, April submitted on 14/5/2024, March submitted on 12/4/2024, Feb submitted on 12/3/2024, Jan submitted on 9/2/2024, etc.

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 work plan and AFS not availed to determine the performance.
	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	DDEG work plan, vouchers and AFS not availed to determine the performance.
	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	3	All the projects were completed in the month of April 2024
		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	2	E&S screening forms for opening Akoret-Komol road & maintenance of Akoret-Asinge road was filled on 26/5/2024.
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 log book was being maintained eg a complain by Mr. Oroni was registered on 12/2/2024 a bout the road being opened from Mayembe trading center to Kekwenyi zone passing through his land. however the matter was referred to CAO who advised the work to be halted until the matter is resolved. The LLG publicized the grievance redress mechanisms on the Notice Board 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 Area Land Committee file not presented.

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 that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery.
----	---	---	---	---

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	4	Monitoring reports dated 21/7/2023 and submitted on 27/5/2024, 5/7/2023
		If 80 – 99% – score 2		for Apuwai P/S was available but not discussed at committee level.
		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	0	No existence and functionality of School Management Committees in form of minutes for Apuwai P/S.
	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 of 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 health center
	Maximum score is 3			

Assessment area: J. Water & Environment Services Management

26	Evidence that the LLGs submitted requests to the DWO for consideration in the current FY budgets Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the SAS submitted in writing requests to the DWO for consideration in the planning of the current FY score 3, else score 0	0	No evidence of submission was availed.
27	The LLG has monitored water and environment services delivery during the previous FY Maximum score is 3	Evidence that SAS/ATC monitored/supervised aspects of water and environment services during the previous FY including review of water points and facilities, score 3 or else score 0	3	The LLG monitored water and environment services delivery during the previous FY as evidenced by the monitoring reports dated 12/6/2024,.
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	2	The LLG have functional Water and Sanitation Committees (including collection and proper use of community contributions) as evidenced by minutes of meetings dated 12/6/2024, 29/2/2024.
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	2	The LLG updated lists on all its water and sanitation facilities (public latrines) and functionality status on 30/6/2024

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 8/1/2024 for season 2 and 30/6/2024 for season 1 FY 2023/2024.
----	---	---	---	---

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	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 24/1/2024 and 22/5/2024.
	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	0	At the time of assessment, the LLG did not avail any monthly monitoring reports by extension staff and supervision reports by SAS.
	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.	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 18/4/2024 and 7/7/2024.
	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 on 8/1/2024, 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			