



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Mella Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236994)

Score 51/100 (51%)

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 four parishes in Mella sub-county had PDCs duly constituted as per the PDM guidelines. The list of PDCs by coded parish (Kinyil, Koitangiro and Mella) is attached.
	Maximum score is 2			The composition of the four fully constituted PDCs in coded and un-coded parishes only at s in Mella sub-county was as follows: Kinyil Parish Opuru Donato, LC2 Chairperson Asinde Everlyne, Chairperson Parish Women Council Wasike Anthony, Chairperson Parish Youth Council Wakweya Peter, Chairperson Parish Disability Council Osillo Denis, Chairperson Parish NRM Osillo Yafesi, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council Akiru Martha Epugot, Parish Chief Koitangiro Parish Osikol Stephen, Charles, LC2 Chairperson Ajaa Leah, Chairperson Parish Women Council Ekisa Joseph, Chairperson Parish Youth Council Mukholi Moses, Chairperson Parish Disability Council Etyang George, Chairperson Parish NRM Kapule Charles Odiye, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council Akongo Joyce Mary, Parish Chief Mella Parish Omungat Paul, LC2 Chairperson Anyango Florence, Chairperson Parish Women Council Obwana Denis, Chairperson Parish
		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	

Youth Council

Osikol John Geoffrey, Chairperson
Parish Disability Council

Elukait John, Chairperson Parish
NRM

Obwana George, Chairperson
Parish Older Persons Council

Alukudo Hope, Parish Chief

At the time of assessment, LLG
availed minutes PDCs for
meetings held by 3 PDCs. Kinyil
PDC held meetings on 24/8/2023,
14/12/2023 and 7/6/2024;
Koitangiro PDC held meetings on
21/12/2023 and 30/5/2024; and
Mella PDC held meetings on
27/11/2023, 11/1/2024 and
29/5/2024 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.

of 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

Maximum score is 2

Although data from all the
parishes in Mella 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

0

At the time of assessment, the LLG did not avail a mapping report for all NGOs, CBOs and CSOs operating in Mella 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 4 parishes in Mella 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

0

At the time of assessment, the LLG did not avail the list of the parish priority enterprises for all the 4 parishes (Kadomoche, Kinyil, Koitangiro and Mella).

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

0

Current FY budget was not presented to ascertain consistence in planning and budgeting.

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 priorities from all parishes of Koitangiro, Mella, Kinyil and Kadomoche were availed. priorities were incorporated into the budget eg maintenance of Bisimilai-Katek CAR, maintenance of Old Mella to Morukatipe CAR, maintenance of Ofinya to Total and maintenance of Kinyil Central to Mella market.

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 LLG held a budget conference on 27th October 2023 as per the report signed by Akongo Joyce Mary Clerk to council.

	iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0	0	The current FY budget was not availed to ascertain investments to be financed by 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 LLG prepared the project profiles for maintenance of Bisimilai-Katek CAR, maintenance of Old Mella to Morukatipe CAR, maintenance of Ofinya to Total and maintenance of Kinyil Central to Mella market.
	vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0	0	The current year budget was not availed to ascertain when it was submitted to the district.
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 No evidence of submission of the procurement plan.
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 Costs on investment was 80% of the total budget 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.	1 According to financial statements the FY 2023/24 actual OSR realised was shs 2,072,640 out of the revised budgeted amount of shs 2,072,640 representing 100% collection.
---	--	---	---

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	The FY 2022/2023 OSR actuals was shs 2,517,938 and FY 2023/2024 was shs 2,072,640 giving a short fall in reveenue collection of shs 445,298 representing 17.6% decrease
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 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 Evidence that the LLG: iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0 1 Evidence that the LLG: iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0. 1	🔗 No evidence of OSR remittance to the District or Local Councils 🔗 Spent more than 20% of OSR on councilor's allowances. 🔗 Budgeted for OSR and funds used on operation & maintenance. 🔗 No evidence of Publicizing OSR and how it was used for the previous FY.

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 was submitted on 30/8/2024 for previous FY
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 1	🔗 PBS Q1 submitted on 15/10/2023.

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

📎 PBS Q2, submitted to CAO's office on 15th/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

📎 PBS Q3 was submitted on 5/4/2024

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

PBS Q4 was submitted on 5/7/2024.

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

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

9 staff were appraised and submission was made on 28/6/2024 to CAO. The members include Akello Debora CDO, Oboth Bazirio the Asst. Accountant, Akongo Joyce parish chief, Akiru Marther parish chief, Alukudo Hope parish chief, Akello Lilian parish chief, Amoit Kanah Lucy Ochopa Charles HM Koitangiro P/s, Biyali Syliver I/C Mella HCIII.

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

Head teachers appraised but agreements and reports could not be accessed for they were with DEO

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

In charge appraised but no submission made

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

3

Staff list presented and publicized

Evidence that the LLG has

(ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0

3

7 monthly analysis of staff attendance prepared ie July 2023 submitted on 13th/08/2023, September 2023-submitted 13th/October 2023, December 2023-submitted on 15th/01/2024, Jan 2024 submitted 08th/02/2024, Feb 2024-submitted 18th/03/2024, March 2024 submitted 15th/04/2024, June 2024-submitted on 10th/07/2023. Comments made to CAO

Assessment area: F. Implementation and Execution

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

0

The total investment cost for maintenance of Kinyil-Katek to Kinyil Central CAR, opening of Total to Finya CAR, procurement of filling cabinets and procurement of tree seedlings amounts to shs 7,900,000 out of the total budget of shs 19,369,917 representing only 40% instead of atleast 80%.

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

0

AFS for previous FY and Payment vouchers not availed.

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

3

If 70% -90%: Score 2

If less than 70 %: Score 0.

Worked on Kinyil-Kateki to Kinyil Central, Opened Total to Offinya road and procured tree seedlings and so the works and supplies were executed at 100%

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

Environmental and Social Screening (E&S) Forms filed for opening of Total market to Ofinya 1.5km CAR.

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	0 0	Grievance Log book not maintained. No evidence of referral parth ways being publicized on the Notice Board. The grievance redress handling mechanism not publicized on the Notice Board.
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	Although the members of Area Land Committee were duly constituted there were no evidence in form of minutes to show that they meet.

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	3	AGM held on the 21st/06/2024 under min 11/21/06/2024 ie amounts of feeding to be paid
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	4	Consolidated monitoring report dated 15/1/2024, 15/4/2024, 14/7/2024 discussing issues of feeding of learners, improvement of teachers attendance to duty among other things.

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	Koitangiro p/s meeting held on 26th/07/2023 and no action plan and extent of implementation. Mella p/s meeting held on the 01/08/2023 and no action and extent of implementation. Need to have regular meetings
	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 reports for awareness creation meetings conducted
	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 reports availed
	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	1st meeting held on 22nd/08/2023 ie issues of absenteeism discussed, 2nd meeting held on the 20th/12/2023 ie security at the facility being questionable and 3rd meeting on the 6th/04/2024 budget allocation and 4th on 20th/03/2024 ie reports mechanisms should be improved. Action plan and extent of implementation not provided
	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	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	3	Submission of request submitted to CAO in regards to un funded priorities in the areas of water, health and production on 15th/01/2024 and not copied to DWO
	Maximum score is 3			

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	0	No evidence of monitoring water sources
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	0	No evidence provided
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	0	No evidence provided

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.	0	At the time of assessment, the LLG availed production statistics reports (submitted to LG production office on 4/7/2024, 9/7/2024 and 24/7/2024) that were not comprehensive and analysed.
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	At the time of assessment, the LLG availed awareness reports on tick and tsetse control that was carried out on 27/6/2024 and report submitted to LG Production office on 9/8/2024.

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 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.	2	There was evidence on file that LLG extension worker such as Otabong John (Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer) carried out farmer trainings as per attendance sheets on training reports submitted to LG Production office on 9/8/2024.
38	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	2	There were field reports on extension support found on file that were submitted to LG Production office as per farmer visit reports dated 26/6/2024 and 27/6/2024. The 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.