

LLG Assessment 2026

LLG Assessment 2026

Bukabooli Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236731)

Score 71/100 *(71%)*

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: (i) appraisal of all proposals submitted for the revolving funds; and (ii) monitoring and supervision of PDM investments; to ensure effective utilization of PDM funds by beneficiaries; during the previous FY for all parishes; score 2, else score 0.	0	The LLG failed to meet the performance criteria for PDC functionality under the Parish Development Model. Although PDC membership lists were verified for all six (6) parishes (Bukabooli, Bugoto, Matovu, Buyugu, Bugumia, and Mayirinya) and evidence of PDC sittings and monitoring reports was confirmed (notably in Bugumia, Buyugu, and Bugoto parishes), there was no documentary proof that the PDCs reviewed, appraised, or formally submitted the list of beneficieries for revolving funds.
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.	2	Examination of PDM data records confirmed that all Parishes/Wards within the LLG complied with community profiling guidelines. Parish Chiefs systematically collected, updated, and analyzed household and community data disaggregated by village, gender, age, and economic activity. Compliance was verified through both the online Parish Development Model Information System (PDMS) and physical hard-copy "Spear Reports" presented for each parish.
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 met the performance requirement for mapping and engaging civil society organizations in PDM awareness and local development planning. verification confirmed the existence of an official CBO/NGO mapping report dated 19/12/2025, which registered 17 active civil society organizations operating within the LLG. The document was formally endorsed by the Community Development Officer, Sajjabi Aggrey, confirming that these organizations were integrated into PDM sensitization and local planning activities.

		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	The LLG successfully met the performance criteria for providing guidance on approved parish programmes and activities to PDCs and Village Executive Committees. Examination of local planning records revealed documented village minutes, including aparticipatory planning meeting for Bugumia Parish held on 20th/2/2026 where community priority projects—such as the Makoma to kirongo Road rehabilitation raised by Mr. Muloni Faruk were discussed. Cross-referencing confirmed that these parish interventions were aligned with and captured in the approved FY 2026/2027 Annual Work Plan and Budget.
		Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG provided structured guidance on parish priority enterprises to be implemeted. Assessment documentation confirmed that capacity building and Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) training were conducted for multiple farmer groups across constituent areas, including the Nakawa Poultry Farm group in Nakawa, the Bugumia Piggery Group in Bugumia, alongside organized groups in Matovu, Buyugu, Namulawa in the report dated 2/01/2026.
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 IV; score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG successfully met the performance requirement for alignment between its Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) and Five-Year Development Plan IV (DDP IV). Cross-examination of the approved DDP IV (Page 108) against the FY 2026/2027 AWPB confirmed direct consistency: road infrastructure priorities—such as Bulowoza to Kirongo Road (UGX 14M) and Kirongo A to Makoova Road (UGX 11.5M) appear on AWPB on Page 45, while administrative investments—such as the Sub-County Administration Block renovation (UGX 7.5M)—are reflected on AWPB Page 12 of the DDEG workplan.
		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 LLG partially satisfied the indicator requiring the incorporation of signed, ranked priorities from all parish submissions into its Annual Work Plan and Budget. verification revealed administrative gaps ranked parish priorities for Buyugu and Mayirinya Parishes were completely missing, while submissions for Bugumia, Bakabooli, Bugoto, and Matovu Parishes were available. Nevertheless, project-level alignment was verified for Bugumia Parish, where the priority project for the maintenance of Budumla to Kirongo Road was successfully integrated into the approved Works sector budget costing 14m.

		iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG fully satisfied the performance requirement for basing its Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) on the outcomes of the annual Budget Conference. Minutes presented to the assessment team confirm that the conference was held on 31st October 2025, where stakeholder priorities were discussed and recorded under Minute 6/SC/10/2025. Cross-verification confirmed that key infrastructure projects agreed upon during the proceedings such as the Kirongo A to Makoova Road intervention were directly integrated into the approved FY 2026/2027 Works sector workplan and budget on Page 45.
		iv. That the LLG budget includes investments to be financed by the LLG including projects funded using OSR; score 1, or else score 0.	0	The LLG did not budget on Own Source Revenue (OSR) for capital investment allocations. Detailed review of the approved FY 2026/2027 Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) confirmed that no capital development projects were budgeted using Local Revenue.
		v. Evidence that the LLG developed project profiles for all capital investments in the AWP and Budget as per format in NDP IV; score 1, or else score 0.	1	The LLG fully met the performance requirement regarding project profile preparation as per NDP IV-compliant project profiles for all four capital investment projects budgeted for FY 2026/2027. Verification of project documentation confirmed detailed profiles for the Nabyama Central to Nabyama Beach Road (UGX 17.07m), kirongo A to Makoova Road (UGX 11.5m), Budumba to kirongo B Road (UGX 14m), and Completion of Bukaboli Administration Block (UGX 7.5m) funded under DDEG.
		vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May; score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG was Compliant for the budget submission and adhered to statutory procedural timelines. Official council minutes confirm that the Sub-County Council formally sat and passed the Annual Work Plan and Budget under Minute 5/SC/05/ 2026 on 10th May 2026, after which the council-approved document was submitted to the District and stamped received by the District Central Registry on 14th May 2026. By completing both formal council approval and submission to the district prior to the statutory cutoff of 15th May, the LLG satisfied all legal and procedural requirements.
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	The LLG scored 0 Marks for this indicator due to late submission beyond the statutory deadline. Under national procurement and local government planning guidelines, the LLG is required to compile and transmit all procurement plan inputs for the current financial year to the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) by 30th April. While the LLG did prepare its procurement inputs, physical verification confirmed they were submitted to the CAO on 14th May 2026 representing a delay of 14 days. Because the submission missed the mandatory 30th April deadline, the requirement was not satisfied.

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 LLG complied with the DDEG guidelines of infrastruture DDEG menu as verified by an analysis of the approved current financial year budget allocations against the DDEG Grant, Budget, and Implementation Guidelines. Out of an approved total DDEG budget of UGX 49,774,934, the LLG allocated UGX 39,819,948 toward eligible infrastructure investments. Because this infrastructure expenditure constitutes exactly 80.00% of the total DDEG budget, the LLG fully satisfied the mandatory minimum threshold of 80%, qualifying for full compliance.

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	The LLG scored based on the Integrated Revenue Administration System (IRAS) adoption clause in the assessment guidelines. An analysis of the verified financial statements confirmed an approved local revenue budget target of UGX 11,500,000 against an actual realized revenue collection of UGX 29,633,280 (a realization rate of 257.68%). Under the specific assessment provision where revenue expansion and significant collection growth resulting from the rollout and adoption of IRAS qualify the entity for compliance.
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	The LLG complied with the performance measure requiring a year-on-year local revenue increase exceeding 5%. A comparative review of audit reports established that actual OSR collections rose from UGX 18,255,362 in FY 2024/25 to UGX 29,633,280 in FY 2025/26. This translates to an absolute increment of UGX 11,377,918, representing a 62.33% growth rate.
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	The LLG satisfied the performance requirement regarding the statutory remittance of Own Source Revenue to lower administrative units (LC1 and LC2). Review of page 50 of the Annual Financial Statements for FY 2025/26 under the Finance Department confirmed that funds totaling UGX 4,880,000 were allocated and remitted to administrative units. Verification of expenditure records confirmed payment vouchers backing these transfers, including: 1. Voucher No. 8/10/2025: UGX 1,692,000 2. Voucher No. 3/2/2026: UGX 2,533,000 3. Voucher No. 9/6/2026: UGX 1,056,000

		ii. Did not use more than 20% of the OSR (that was remitted to the LLG by the HLG) on councilors allowances in the previous FY (unless authority was granted by the Minister), score 1, else score 0	0	The LLG did not meet the requirement of spending on councilors' allowances not more than 20% of collected OSR. Review of page 50 of the Annual Financial Statements (Statutory Bodies Trial Balance) revealed that UGX 6,250,000 was spent on allowances out of UGX 29,633,280 collected. This represents 21.09% of OSR, exceeding the maximum permissible threshold of UGX 5,926,656 (20%) by UGX 323,344.
		iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0	1	The LLG satisfied the compliance criteria for allocating and utilizing local revenue on the operation and maintenance of public assets and infrastructure during the previous financial year. Verification of the Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) for FY 2025/26 confirmed that UGX 600,000 was budgeted under the Administration Department for compound maintenance at the sub-county headquarters. Further examination of the Annual Financial Statements (page 49, Administration Trial Balance) confirmed actual O&M expenditure of UGX 2,000,000 on compound upkeep and general operational maintenance funded via OSR.
		iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.	1	The LLG satisfied the performance requirement regarding the publicity and public disclosure of OSR collections and utilization for the previous financial year. Physical inspection of the LLG main notice board confirmed that the total OSR collection performance of UGX 29,633,280 along with its corresponding expenditure breakdown was prominently displayed for public viewing and transparency.

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 LLG fully satisfied the statutory performance requirement regarding the timely preparation and submission of its Annual Financial Statements (AFS) for audit. Verification of official submission records and acknowledgment stamps from the Office of the Auditor General (OAG) confirmed that the LLG submitted its financial statements for the ended financial year on 31st August 2026.
11	The LLG has submitted all 4 quarterly financial and physical progress reports for the previous FY on time and in the prescribed format Maximum score is	Evidence that the LLG submitted all four quarterly financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer on time: i. Q1 by 15th October score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG satisfied the statutory requirement for submitting its Quarter I financial and physical progress performance report to the LG Accounting Officer. Official reports and submission acknowledgment records confirm that the Quarter I report was submitted on 14th October 2025. Having submitted the report one day ahead of the statutory deadline of 15th October, the LLG achieved full compliance for this quarter.

6			
	ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG satisfied the statutory requirement for submitting its Quarter II financial and physical progress performance report to the LG Accounting Officer. Verification of official submission records and receipt stamps confirmed that the Quarter II report was submitted on 12th January 2026. Having submitted the report three days prior to the statutory deadline of 15th January, the LLG achieved full compliance for this quarter.
	iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG satisfied the statutory requirement for submitting its Quarter III financial and physical progress performance report to the LG Accounting Officer. Documentary evidence and submission tracking registers confirmed that the LLG transmitted its Quarter III progress report on 15th April 2026. Having fulfilled the reporting requirement on the exact statutory deadline of 15th April, the LLG achieved full compliance for this quarter.
	iv. Q4 by 15th July score 3 or else 0	3	The LLG satisfied the statutory requirement for submitting its Quarter IV financial and physical progress performance report to the LG Accounting Officer. Official submission records and acknowledgment receipts confirm that the Quarter IV report was transmitted on 14th July 2026. Having submitted the report one day prior to the statutory deadline of 15th July, the LLG achieved full compliance for this quarter.

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: • All staff in the LLG including extension workers (where applicable) in the previous FY (by 30th June): score 2 or else 0	0	The LLG failed to satisfy the statutory performance requirement regarding the completion and submission of staff performance appraisals within the required financial year deadline (by 30th June). A review of the personnel records and appraisal files submitted for the remaining staff members established that while performance appraisals were conducted, key submissions breached the statutory deadline: Deadline Non-Compliance: The appraisal for Sajjabi Aggrey, conducted by SAS Kakuru Albert, was completed and signed on 2nd July 2026. Because this appraisal was completed after the statutory cutoff date of 30th June 2026, the LLG failed to achieve 100% timely appraisal coverage for all staff within the mandatory statutory window.
	• Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0	0	The LLG failed to satisfy the statutory performance requirement regarding the performance evaluation of primary school leadership within the mandatory school calendar year deadline (by 31st December). A review of education management and personnel records established that although the LLG has 18 public primary schools within its jurisdiction, no completed performance appraisal files were presented for verification. Because the LLG failed to present evidence of appraisals for any of the 18 Head Teachers serving in its public primary schools, the sub-indicator was evaluated as Non-Compliant.

		• HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else 0.	0	The LLG failed to satisfy the statutory performance requirement regarding the performance evaluation of health facility leadership within the mandatory financial year deadline (by 30th June). A review of health service management and personnel files established that no documentary evidence (such as completed appraisal forms or performance agreements) was presented to confirm that In-Charges of Health Center IIIs and Health Center IIs serving within the LLG were appraised for the previous financial year. Due to the total lack of appraisal records for the health facility In-Charges, the sub-indicator was evaluated as Non-Compliant
13	Staff duty attendance Maximum score is 6	Evidence that the LLG has • Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG fully satisfied the statutory transparency and governance requirement regarding the public dissemination of its staff establishment list. Physical inspection of the LLG premises and public notice boards confirmed that a complete list of LLG staff members was publicly displayed on the main administrative notice board. Because the LLG ensured open public access to its staff disclosure records in accordance with national transparency guidelines, the sub-indicator was evaluated as Compliant
		• Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG fully satisfied the performance requirement regarding the generation and submission of monthly staff attendance analyses with clear administrative recommendations to the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO). A review of administrative records and submission letters confirmed that the Senior Assistant Secretary (SAS) systematically conducted monthly staff attendance analyses and submitted formal reports to the CAO (including a comprehensive report dated 4th August 2026 and submission evidence covering December). The analysis reports systematically tracked staff duty presence and flagged persistent absenteeism, specifically detailing: Mr. Nanjona Dennis (Agricultural Officer): Attended for only 11 days in December, and recorded zero (0) attendance across the entire months of February, March, April, and June. Furthermore, the monthly analysis reports contained explicit, actionable recommendations urging the CAO to institute formal disciplinary action against Mr. Nanjoma Dennis for his prolonged, unexcused absence from duty.
		• CAO/Tc took action on recommendations; score 2 or else 0	0	The LLG did not meet the requirement for verifying action taken by the CAO on submitted staff attendance recommendations. Although the sub-county provided proof of submitting attendance reports flagging severe absenteeism, no evidence was presented during field verification to show that the CAO issued warning letters, initiated pay deductions, or took formal disciplinary steps against the affected officers.

Assessment area: F. Implementation and Execution

14	The LLG has spent all the DDEG funds for the previous FY on eligible projects and activities Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the LLG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects and activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines: Score 2, or else score 0	2	The LLG fully satisfied the compliance requirement regarding the utilization and expenditure of the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) for the previous financial year (FY 2025/2026) on eligible projects and activities in accordance with national DDEG grant guidelines. Verification of the financial expenditure files, procurement documentation, and project completion reports established that all DDEG funds were spent on authorized, eligible development investments. Key funded investments included: 1. Public Office Furniture: Procurement of 40 plastic chairs for administrative functions. 2. Education Infrastructure Support: Procurement and delivery of 18 primary school desks. 3. Land Governance & Asset Security: Formal land surveying and boundary mapping of the sub-county headquarters land. 4. Administrative Infrastructure: Completion works on the sub-county institutional administration block. 5. Local Economic Infrastructure / Access Roads: Rehabilitation and spot-improvement of the Kalagara–Matovu Road.
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 or else 0	0	For the FY 2025/2026 performance assessment, the LLG failed the budget execution variance indicator due to significant sectoral distortions between approved budgets and actual expenditures in the Annual financial statements. While Management (budgeted UGX 26,939,165 vs. spent UGX 29,066,000; variance of +UGX 2,126,835 or 107.89%), Finance (budgeted UGX 22,120,000 vs. spent UGX 21,300,000; variance of -UGX 820,000 or 96.29%), and Community (budgeted UGX 607,391,000 vs. spent UGX 646,400,000; variance of +UGX 39,009,000 or 106.42%) operated within the allowable $\pm10\%$ threshold, major failures occurred across other departments. Council overspent by UGX 8,462,721 (budgeted UGX 25,927,807 vs. spent UGX 34,390,528; 132.64%), Works overspent by UGX 378,277,500 (budgeted UGX 479,522,500 vs. spent UGX 857,800,000; 178.89%), Production recorded an unprecedented variance of +UGX 857,156,000 (budgeted UGX 744,000 vs. spent UGX 857,900,000; 115,309.14%), and Health experienced a severe under-absorption deficit of UGX 347,729,800 (budgeted UGX 349,229,800 vs. spent UGX 1,500,000; 0.43%). Consequently, because these key sectors drifted outside the required 90% to 110% absorption range, the indicator was scored Non-Compliant.

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) : Note 3: Refer to the completion rate computation table at the end of the Manual If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3 If 70% -90%: Score 2 If less than 70 %: Score 0.	3	The LLG achieved a 100% project completion rate for investment projects planned in the previous FY (FY 2025/2026), Verification of the Quarter 4 cumulative progress report dated 30th June 2026, submitted by the Senior Assistant Secretary (SAS) Mr. Kakuru Albert, confirmed that all sampled capital road investment projects specifically the maintenance of the Kalagala to Matovu Road and the Kalagala to Namululi Road were fully executed and completed by the end of the fourth quarter.

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	The LLG evidenced that Environmental, Social, and Climate Change (ESCC) screening was systematically conducted prior to the implementation of all planned capital investments. Document inspection verified completed environmental screening forms on file for all infrastructure projects, including: the construction of Budumba to kigongo B Road 1.4 km; the completion of Bukabooli Administration Block; road maintenance of Chigongo A to Makova Road; and the road construction and maintenance of Nabyama Central to Nabyama Beach School Road. Because the LLG provided completed ESCC screening forms confirming pre-implementation safeguard assessments across all projects, the indicator was evaluated as Compliant.
18	The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling Mechanism Maximum score is 2	If the LLG has specified a mechanism for i) recording, ii) investigating and iii) responding to grievances which includes a designated person to coordinate response to feed-back, complaints logbook 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	1	The LLG fully met the compliance requirements for establishing and operationalizing a functional Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM). Assessment verification confirmed that the LLG has a designated Grievance Redress Committee and a clear GRM framework actively managed by the Community Development Officer (CDO) as the designated focal point. A physical inspection of the active Grievance Logbook confirmed proper recording, investigation, and referral tracking, highlighted by a verification entry on 12th/01/ 2026 regarding a child neglect complaint lodged by Bwenene Saida.

		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	The LLG fully met the performance requirement regarding the publicization of its Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM). Physical verification at the sub-county headquarters confirmed that the complete GRM framework detailing reporting channels, designated focal points, and procedures for seeking redress was prominently displayed on the official sub-county 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 LLG fully met the compliance requirements for establishing and operationalizing a functional Area Land Committee. Verification of administrative records confirmed that a 5-member committee is fully constituted, under the leadership of Chairperson Nalukindi Ayub and Secretary/Member Khigati Mukisa James. Active functionality was evidenced through official committee minutes from a sitting held on 8th September 2026, demonstrating ongoing advisory engagement and processing of land rights ascertainment.

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	The LLG failed to provide evidence of education awareness campaigns and parental mobilization activities for improved education service delivery. Assessment guidelines mandate that the LLG submit verifiable documentation such as signed attendance rosters, activity reports, or meeting minutes confirming community and parental engagement. In the absence of any supporting evidence presented to the assessment team, the indicator was evaluated as Non-Compliant.
21	Monitoring of service delivery in basic schools Maximum score is 4	Evidence that the LLG has monitored schools (both public and private) 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 LLG conducted comprehensive monitoring of both public and private schools and generating an issue-tracking report for council review. Document inspection verified a general school monitoring report dated 30th June 2026, compiled following field inspections led by the Senior Assistant Secretary, Mr. Kakuru Albert, and area Parish Chiefs. The exercise covered all 18 government primary schools (including Butumbula, Musubi Church of God, Buyugu Church of Uganda, and St. Mary's Nabyama, kinawambuzi primary school) alongside several private institutions such as Radio Nursery and Primary, St. Peter's Nursery and Primary, and Michael Patrick Children Foundation.

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	The LLG failed to present documentary evidence demonstrating the operational functionality of School Management Committees across all public primary schools in the sub-county.

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	The LLG conducted Primary Health Care (PHC) awareness campaigns and community mobilization during the financial year. Compliance was verified through a formal report dated 15th September 2026, titled "Environmental Health Activities in Financial Year 25/26", prepared and submitted by the Health Assistant, Mr. Waako Kirizo. The document provides clear evidence of community-level sensitization on environmental hygiene, sanitation, and disease prevention, fully satisfying the performance assessment criteria.
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	The LLG failed to present any documentary evidence demonstrating routine or quarterly monitoring of health service delivery aspects within its health facilities. Compliance guidelines dictate that achieving marks under this indicator requires verifiable proof—such as joint supervision reports, Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) inspection reports, or technical supervision reports compiled by the SAS/Health Assistant substantiating that health facility operations were routinely monitored. In the total absence of supporting evidence or field inspection reports presented to the assessment team, the LLG failed to satisfy the performance benchmark.
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	The LLG earned Full Marks for demonstrating functional Health Unit Management Committees (HUMCs) across all health facilities in its jurisdiction. Field verification covered three facilities—two Health Centre IIs (Bugoto and Busiira) and Nawampongo Health Centre III and Buyugu HCIII where approved committee rosters and minuted records of HUMC meetings were presented to the assessment team.

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	The LLG earned Full Marks for demonstrating evidence that the Senior Assistant Secretary (SAS) submitted written water priority requests to the District Water Officer (DWO) for inclusion in current financial year planning. Document inspection verified an official submission compiled by the SAS, Mr. Kakuru Albert dated 14/10/2026, requesting targeted water supply and infrastructure interventions across six villages, namely: Bugomya, Kanyana, Kikunu, Nakasuwa, Bukabooli, and Kakonge. Because the LLG fulfilled the requirement of formally documenting and transmitting lower local government water needs to the higher local government departmental head, the indicator was scored as Compliant.
27	The LLG has monitored water and environment services delivery during the previous FY Maximum score is 3	Evidence that SAS 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 demonstrated that the Senior Assistant Secretary (SAS) actively monitored and supervised water and environment services during the previous financial year. Document inspection verified an official Monitoring of Water Activities Report dated 28th June 2026, which detailed field assessments of various water supply infrastructure across the sub-county. Specifically, the inspection covered four water sources in Nabyama, evaluating operational production wells, functional boreholes, and non-functional water points requiring repair.
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 provided evidence of functional Water and Sanitation Committees (WSCs) actively managing community water facilities. Verification of the sector report dated 28th June 2026 confirmed that WSCs are operational across community water points, with established mechanisms for collecting and properly utilizing user contributions towards facility operation and maintenance (O&M). Because the LLG demonstrated both committee functionality and financial oversight of local water management
29	Functionality of investments in water and sanitation facilities Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the SAS has an updated list on all its water and sanitation facilities (public latrines) and functionality status. Score 2 else 0	2	The LLG provided evidence that the Senior Assistant Secretary (SAS) maintains an updated inventory of all water and sanitation facilities, complete with their functionality status. Verification of the sector report dated 28th June 2026 confirmed a comprehensive asset list covering public water points and public latrines across the sub-county, explicitly capturing operational status to distinguish functional facilities from non-functional infrastructure requiring maintenance.

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	The LLG demonstrated that extension staff consistently collected, analyzed, and reported agricultural and irrigation data to the District Production Office throughout FY 2025/2026. Verification of production sector files confirmed complete sets of dated quarterly reports for both Veterinary and Crop extension sub-sectors. Veterinary quarterly reports were presented for Q1 (01/10/2025), Q2 (02/01/2026), Q3 (02/04/2026), and Q4 (02/07/2026). Similarly, Crop extension reports were verified for Q1 (01/10/2025), Q2 (05/01/2026), Q3 (10/04/2026), and Q4 (10/07/2026). Because the reports captured key commodity production statistics, farm visit tracking, and farmer engagements in accordance with required reporting formats, the indicator was scored as Compliant.
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	The LLG conducted agricultural awareness and mobilization campaigns for farmers across the sub-county. Verification of quarterly production reports submitted to the District LG Production Office confirmed active extension engagements in both livestock and crop sectors. Specifically, the Q4 Veterinary Report documented farmer sensitization campaigns regarding new Foot-and-Mouth Disease (FMD) vaccination protocols, while the Q2 Crop Report detailed community mobilization on micro-scale irrigation technologies.
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	The LLG failled to provide evidence of dedicated monitoring of agricultural production, infrastructure, and environmental safeguards. Although the LLG presented submitted quarterly reports for Veterinary (dated 01/10/2025, 02/01/2026, 02/04/2026, and 02/07/2026) and Crop extension (dated 01/10/2025, 05/01/2026, 10/04/2026, and 10/07/2026), document inspection confirmed that these reports were limited to training and sensitization events. They contained no field monitoring evidences, pest surveillance tracking, equipment installation checks, or photographic proof of field supervision.

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	The LLG conducted comprehensive farmer training sessions on agronomy, institutional development, and livestock management during FY 2025/2026. Document inspection of submitted quarterly production reports confirmed structured extension trainings across multiple villages. In the Crop sub-sector, the Q1 report (dated 1st October 2025) verified training on farmer institutional development across Kanyana, Nakasuwa, Buyugu, and Bugumya villages, while the Q2 report (dated 5th January 2026) documented Community-Based Advisor (CBA) training in Nakawa, Matovu, Buyugu, and Namulawa. In the Veterinary sub-sector, Cost Benefit Analyis to PDM beneficieries capacity-building was conducted in the Q3 report (dated 2nd April 2026), followed by targeted livestock management and disease control training in the Q4 report (dated 2nd July 2026).
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	The LLG provided technical extension support to farmers and farmer groups through organized training sessions and sensitization meetings during FY 2025/2026. Verification of submitted production files confirmed that extension support was delivered via documented group trainings and community sensitization campaigns across both livestock and crop sub-sectors. For Crop extension, reports submitted on 01/10/2025 (Q1), 05/01/2026 (Q2), 10/04/2026 (Q3), and 10/07/2026 (Q4) captured technical advisory on farmer institutional development, micro-scale irrigation, and CBA capacity building across multiple villages (including Kanyana, Nakasuwa, Buyugu, Bugumya, Nakawa, Matovu, and Namulawa). For the Veterinary sub-sector, reports submitted on 01/10/2025 (Q1), 02/01/2026 (Q2), 02/04/2026 (Q3), and 02/07/2026 (Q4) verified extension support covering CBA animal health training and farmer sensitization on new FMD vaccination protocols.