LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Petta Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236987)

Score 55/100 *(55%)*

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	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	There was evidence that all the four parishes in Petta sub-county had PDCs duly constituted as per the PDM guidelines. The list of PDCs by parish (Mbula, Pakoi, Petta and Ramogi) is attached. **The composition of PDCs at Petta sub-county was as follows:** **Mbula Parish** Othieno Julius, LC2 Chairperson Kageni Sarah, Chairperson Parish Women Council Oloka Stephen, Chairperson Parish Youth Council Akongo Francis, Chairperson Parish Disability Council Ogwang Remegiyo Godfrey, Chairperson Parish NRM Yoga Michael, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council Omollo Hannington, Parish Chief **Pakoi Parish** Okuni Jackson Isaac, LC2 Chairperson Adikin Beatrice, Chairperson Parish Women Council Othieno William, Chairperson Parish Youth Council Ochieng Peter, Chairperson Parish Disability Council Oyo Wilberforce, Chairperson Parish NRM Aroda John Paul, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council Nekesa Suzan, Parish Chief **Petta Parish** Obbo Geoffrey, LC2 Chairperson Nyaburu Josephine, Chairperson Parish Women Council Opio Benon, Chairperson Parish Youth Council Mingalo Simon, Chairperson Parish Disability Council Kitopi Michael Opio, Chairperson Parish

NRM

Ogen Aremo, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council

Kalenda Agnes, Parish Chief

Ramogi Parish

Palinyang Moses, LC2 Chairperson

Athieno Dorothy, Chairperson Parish Women Council

Oketch Jackson, Chairperson Parish Youth Council

Aluka Osinde Akisofer Chairperson Parish Disability Council

Ochandi Okumu, Chairperson Parish NRM

Okoth Vincent, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council

Aketch Betty, Parish Chief

However, not all the 4 PDCs were functional by way of holding meetings. Only two PDCs (Mbula PDC and Pakoi PDC) produced minutes as an evidence of holding meetings in line with what they were supposed to do in their respective parishes. For example, review of the minutes showed that Mbula PDC held meetings on 19/12/2023, 21/12/2023 and 10/6/2024; and Pakoi PDC held meetings on 5/10/2023, 21/12/2023 and 12/6/2024 where all the two PDCs discussed on issues to do with PDM, among other development activities in their parishes.

All the four PDCs did not produce evidence of minutes 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. Maximum score is 2	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 all the four parish chiefs of Petta sub-county had compiled parish data 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 mapping of NGOs, CBOs and CSOs was done and mapping report of NGOs, CBOs and CSOs produced was on file, there was no evidence, for example, where any of the following NGOs, CBOs and CSOs indicated on the mapping report (Uganda Development Health Associates, Foundation for Open Development, UWESO, Africa Water Solutions, Tororo District Youth Advocacy Network, Hope for Kids, COSMES and Every Child Ministries) were involved in the raising awareness about PDM and planning cycle..
		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 of Petta sub-county did not have parish development action plans for FY 2024/2025, there was evidence of an approved sub-county work plan and budget for FY 2024/25 by Council under minute 93/4/2024 in the meeting held on the 16th April 2024.
		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 4 parishes had their respective parish priority enterprises, which were as follows: Mbula parish (Poultry, Cassava and Piggery); Pakoi parish (Cassava, Poultry and Piggery); Petta parish (Cassava, Piggery and Poultry); and Ramogi parish (Poultry, Cassava and Piggery).

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 Development plan, budget AWP linked eg Opening of Ayago C to Pajakong road is in the AWP Pg 16, budgeted on Pg13 at shs 14,920602 under roads & bridges and 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.	1	Parish Priorities for Pakoi Mbula, Ramogi & Petta were presented they were not duly signed by parish chiefs & PDCs
		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 out comes of the budget conference held on 11/10/2023 were considered in the budgeting process for instance maintenance of Church of Uganda via Pomeja to Pajakongo was 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	1	Project profiles were prepared for maintenance of COU to Pajakongo and Patezira to Komolo roads.
		vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0	1	Approved 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	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	Total investment cost is shs. 16,177,000 out of budgeted amount of shs 20,221,000 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	Actual FY 2023/24 23,686,876 x 100% Budgeted 48,500,000 Performance	**48%**
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	Actual FY 2023/24 23,686,876 x 100% Actual FY 2022/23 58,992,910 Performance 40% Hence giving a decline of 60% in collection	
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.	1	👍 Evidence of OSR remittance to the 4 parishes was availed of shs 1,200,000 each parish getting shs 300,000 as indicated by a vr No.10/5 and cheque 05813 dated 27/5/2024.	
		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 without authority granted by the Minister.	
		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 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	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	The 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: i. Q1 by 15th October score 1 or else 0	0	Availed a signed copy of PBS Q1 but no evidence of submission to CAO's office and to other relevant authorities.
		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	1	Availed a signed copy of PBS Q2, submitted to CAO's office on 10th/01/2024 and to other relevant authorities.
		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	1	Availed a signed copy of PBS Q3, submitted to CAO's office on 05th/04/2024 and to other relevant authorities.
		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	3	Availed a signed copy of PBS Q4, submitted to CAO's office on 05th/07/2024 and to other relevant authorities. Reported PDM funds and how they 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	Staffs appraised eg Akech betty on 27/6/2024, Nekesa Susan on 27/6/2024, Omollo Hannington on 20/5/2024 their performance plans were attached.
		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 headteachers for Mbula Machar , Petta, Mbula, Ramongi, & Pakoi primary schools were appraised but no reports and agreements presented and no submissions as well.
		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 submission made on 28/6/2024 to DHO and CAO for. in-charges for Mbula HC2, Makauri HC & Petta HC but no appraisals accessed.
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 Publicized on the public notice board.
		Evidence that the LLG has (ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0	3	The LLG produced the 12 monthly analysis from July 2023 to June 2024

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	2	DDEG projects costed shs.15,800,000 including bank charges out of the total budget of shs 20,373,733 representing 80% performance.
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	2	The LLG did not deviate from the sector program eg uder DDEG all the funds were spent as planned..

16				
	Completion of investments as per annual work plan and budget Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the investment projects planned in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of FY (quarter four) : If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3 If 70% -90%: Score 2 If less than 70 %: Score 0.	3	All the DDEG projects were executed within the FY.

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 were filled for opening of Ayago C to Pajakongo junction CAR, Procurement of desks, maintenance of Loy to Pajakongo and Patezira to Komolo 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	0	The Grievance handling system for capital investment not maintained.
		(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	Although the Grievance log book for capital investment not maintained, the referral parth ways 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	1	The members of the Area Land Committee were appointed on 3/3/2023 under minute No 49/TDLG/C/29/06/2022 and they were Owino James-chairperson, Auma Podesta-member, Nekesa Suzan-secr, Okello Kamith-member & Oloka Yakobo-member Meetings of 21/7/2023 and 6/5/2024 held to handle land conflict.

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 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	The was 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: 1st Qter 18/10/2023 2nd Qter 23/01/2024 3rd Qter 25/4/2024 4th Qter 24/6/2024
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	Petta H/C had a minute, St Jude H/C had a minute, Ramongi H/C Had no minute, Pakoi had a minute and not signed.

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	3	Report on disease surveillance conducted on 16/1/2023 13/3/2024, 6/2/2024, 11/10/2023, etc.

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 minute was availed in relation to health monitoring reports.
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	0	Although the minutes were availed they were not signed

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 of water request 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	3	Report on water safety and quality monitoring conducted quarter 4 2023/24
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 documents presented.

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	Reports were not accessed.

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, two production statistics reports had been submitted to LG Production office on 10/5/2024 and 12/8/2024. However, the reports were not comprehensive and lacked analyzed data.
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, a report submitted to LG Production office on 18/7/2024 indicated that 21 (9 female) farmers were involved in field days and exchange visits that took place at COFIA farm, among other awareness activities
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	There was no evidence of all monthly monitoring reports by extension staff to show that monthly monitoring was carried out; and similarly there was no evidence on file of supervision reports by SAS. For example, extension staff had two monitoring reports submitted to LG Production office on 5/10/2023 and 31/3/2024; and SAS had submitted one supervision report to CAOs office on 2/5/2024.

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 workers such as Nyayuki Alexandra Barbara (Agricultural Officer) and Okoth Simon Peter (Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer) carried out farmer trainings as per attendance sheets on training reports submitted to LG Production office on 5/10/2023, 18/4/2024, 3/7/2024 and 12/8/2024.
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 on 12/8/2024. 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