



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Merikit Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236979)

Score 41/100 (41%)

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 Maximum score is 2	Although there was evidence that all the three coded parishes out of six parishes in Merikit sub-county had PDCs duly constituted as per the PDM guidelines (The list of PDCs by coded parish (Amurwo, Apokor and Malir) is attached), The composition of PDCs in coded parishes only at Merikit sub-county was as follows: Amurwo Parish Owino Emmanuel, LC2 Chairperson Lilian Oketch, Chairperson Parish Women Council Emusugut Joeeph, Chairperson Parish Youth Council Edewa Alfred, Chairperson Parish Disability Council Juliet Muawere, Chairperson Parish NRM Okello John Bosco, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council Nekesa Rita, Parish Chief Apokor Parish Oketcho John Martin, LC2 Chairperson Achieng Christine, Chairperson Parish Women Council Okadapau Tome, Chairperson Parish Youth Council Nyachwo Eseza, Chairperson Parish Disability Council Florence Okiru, Chairperson Parish NRM Omukaga Moses, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council Opio Yokim, Parish Chief Malir Parish Osillo Yowas, LC2 Chairperson Achieng Anne Rose, Chairperson Parish Women Council Ombagga Emmanuel, Chairperson Parish Youth Council Etyang Yosam, 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.	0		

Disability Council

Omuduku James, Chairperson Parish NRM

Ochepa Wilson, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council

Onawe Michael, Parish Chief

only two (Apokor and Malir) out of the three PDCs produced 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 Apokor PDC held meetings on 15/8/2023, 16/12/2023 and 3/6/2024; and Malir PDC held meetings on 19/7/2023, 15/12/2023, 14/5/2024 and 10/6/2024 where all PDCs discussed on issues to do with PDM, among other development activities in their parishes.

Minutes for one parish (Amurwo) could not be accessed because the parish chief (Nekesa Rita on suspension) reportedly left office without handing over parish working document. However, there was no evidence of minutes presented to proof that the two 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

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 Merikit 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

Although one NGO (Every Child Ministries) was reportedly operating in Merikit sub-county there was no evidence of the mapping report for NGOs, CBOs and CSOs operating in Merikit sub-county. The sub-county management presented only the MoU that was not signed

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 6 parishes of Merikit 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:

2

iii. Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0

There was evidence that two parishes (Apokor and Malir) had their respective parish priority enterprises, which were as follows: Apokor parish (Dairy, Poultry and Piggery); and Malir parish (Piggery, Cassava and Poultry),..

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

There is consistence in planning and budgeting eg opening of Apokor trading center via Asinge to Kapiro road, installation o culverts on Maliri trading center-Asinge and installation of culverts on kacholia via deliverance church to Mukwanotrading center appearing in the development plan on Pg56/57, budget Pg 5,& AWP Pg 10

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

All 6 parish priorities from Apokor, Asinge, Maliri, Aruwa Amurwo & Kalungu were availed and incorporated in the budget eg installation of culverts on Kacholia via Deliverance church in Kalungu parish was planed for.

5	Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement Maximum score is 2	Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:	1	The budget conference was held on 3/8/2023 and projects were identified for consideration in the budgeting process eg installation of culverts on Kacholia via Deliverance church in Kalungu parish was taken care of.
		iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0		
		iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0	0	No 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	Profiles not updated.
		vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0	1	The approved was submitted on 14/5/2024
		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 Procurement plan for current FY
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 is shs 18,920,763 out of the budgeted amount of shs 19,900,953 amounting to 95%

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	🔓 Approved budget for previous FY is dully signed and submitted to CAO's office as at 12th/05/2023 🔓 No Annual Financial Statements for previous FY.
---	--	---	---	--

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	🔗 No Annual Financial Statements for previous FY. 🔗 No AFS for previous FY but one
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	Spent more than 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	1	🔗 Budgeted for OSR and funds used on operation & maintenance. (Refer Annual budget FY 2023/24 Pg 2)
		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	0	No evidence of submission of AFS 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

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:

0

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

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

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

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

☞ Did not avail PBS Q1

☞ Availed a signed copy of PBS Q2, submitted to CAO's office on 09th/01/2024 and to other relevant authorities.

☞ Availed a signed copy of PBS Q3, submitted to CAO's office on 12th/04/2024 and to other relevant authorities.

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

☞ 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

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

There are 6 parish chiefs, 1 Sub accountant, a parish chief is acting as a CDO and Agric officer. Vet is assigned 9 staffs chiefs inclusive. however, no performance improvement plan evidence of appraisals for staff.

There are 4 schools and only 1 appraised.

	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 of HCII not appraised.
13	Staff duty attendance		
	Evidence that the LLG has		
	(i) Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 3 or else 0	0	Staff list not publicized
	Maximum score is 6		
			Produce monthly analysis of staff attendance report;
	Evidence that the LLG has		July 2023 submitted on 4/8/2023, Sept 2023 submitted on 6/9/2023, Sept 2023 submitted on 5/10/2023, Oct 2023 submitted on 7/11/2023, Nov 2023 submitted on 11/12/2023, Dec 2023 submitted on 5/1/2024, Jan 2024 submitted on 7/2/2024, March 2024 submitted on 5/4/2024, May 2024 submitted on 12/6/2024, Aug 2024 submitted on 6/9/2024, Feb 2024 submitted on 9/3/2023, April 2024 submitted on 6/5/2024.
	(ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0	3	

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	2	Procurement of 45 desks, installation of culverts & surveying of land costed shs 16,031,000 out of the budgeted amount of shs 19,900,933 performing at 80.5%
	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	2	There was no deviation because all the funds were utilized as planned eg all the DDEG funds of shs 19,900,933 was used accordingly.
	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 If 70% -90%: Score 2 If less than 70 %: Score 0.	3	All the projects were executed within the FY and funds spent 100%.

Assessment area: G. Environmental and Social Safeguards

17	The LLG has implemented environmental and social safeguards during the previous FY	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	No evidence of environmental and social screening (E&S) Form filled.
	Maximum score is 2			
18	The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling System	(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	0	No evidence of grievance handling system in place for investment interventions.
	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	0	The LLG did not 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	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	No evidence of appointment of Area land Committee.
	Maximum score 1			

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 reports on awareness campaigns and parents' mobilization for improvement of education services
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	0	3 reports were availed on monitoring but they were not brought to the attention of the committee.
22	Existence and functionality of School Management Committees Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools; score 3, else score 0	0	Maliri P/S Minute of SMC meeting dated 13/2/2024 and 13/3/2024 no attendances. However other schools there were attendances.,

Assessment area: I. Primary Health Care Services Management

23	Awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery score 3, else score 0	0	No evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service.
----	--	---	---	--

24	The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY Maximum score is 4	Evidence that LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY , score 4 or else score 0	0	No evidence of monitoring reports availed.
25	Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG; score 3, else score 0	3	There were evidences of HUMIC meetings eg sat on 5/6/2024,22/12/2023, 14/9/2023, 14/6/2022, 16,2/2023 discussing among other things work plans, staff to be paid, fumigation, etc.

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	3	Submission dated 5/10/2023 was made to CAO and copied to DWO.
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 report on water and environment services.
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 for establishment and operations of Water and Sanitation Committees in all projects.

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	0	No evidence that the SAS has an updated lists on all its water and sanitation facilities (public latrines) and functionality status.
	Maximum score is 2			

Assessment area: L. Production Services Management

34	Up to date data on agriculture and irrigation collected, analyzed and reported	If the LLG extension staff have collected, analyzed and reported data on agriculture (i.e., crop, animal and fisheries) and irrigation activities including production statistics for key commodities, data on irrigated land, farmer applications, farm visits etc. as per formats, the reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0.	2	There was evidence of production statistics reports submitted to LG Production office on 8/1/2024 for season 1 and 18/3/2024 for season 2 FY 2023/2024 and data collected was comprehensive and analyzed.
	Maximum score is 2			
35	Farmer awareness and mobilization campaigns carried out through farmer field days and awareness meetings	If the LLG has carried out awareness and mobilization campaigns on all aspects of agriculture through farmer field days and awareness meetings, exchange visits, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0	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, a report submitted to LG Production office on 18/7/2024 indicated that farmers were involved in field days and exchange visits that took place on 3/7/2024 at COFIA farm, among other awareness activities.
	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	2	There was evidence on file that LLG extension workers such as Agero Judith for Namono Juliet (Agricultural Officer) and Jenga Paul (Animal Husbandry Officer) carried out farmer trainings as per attendance sheets on training reports submitted to LG Production office on 7/2/2024, 26/6/2024 and 15/7/2024
	Maximum score is 2	score 2 or else 0.		
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	2	There were field reports on extension support found on file that were submitted to LG Production office on 18/3/2024 and 28/6/2024. 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	score 2 or else 0		