

LLG Assessment 2026

LLG Assessment 2026

Bukatube Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236732)

Score 60/100 *(60%)*

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	out of the 5 parishes, only 4 parishes provided evidence for the composition of the PDCs in accordance with the Parish Development Model (PDM) guidelines. This was confirmed by the availability of PDC meeting minutes and a list of nine members for each of the 4 parishes that submitted. For example, Bukaleeba Parish PDC minutes dated Sept 20, 2025, discussing the approval of PDM beneficiaries.
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	There was no evidence of spear data report that was availed including the parish data reports.
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	The LLG failed to provide evidence that (NGOs), (CBOs), and (CSOs) operating within the LLG were mapped or involved in awareness campaigns concerning the Parish Development Model (PDM) and the planning cycle. This conclusion was reached because the LLG could not produce NGO mapping reports or sensitization meeting minutes involving these organizations.

	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 provided guidance to Village Executive Committees (VECs) and Parish Development Committees (PDCs) on the programs and activities to be implemented within their respective parishes. This was confirmed by the approved parish priorities shared with the assessment team, such as the Bukaleba parish activities planned for implementation, dated April 23, 2026.
	Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0	0	There was no evidence of LLG provided Priority enterprises through at least one of the following: demos, field visits, field days and competitions among others.

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	Page 114 of SDP has construction of administration block, procurement of desks among other projects and these projects are also in the AWPB pointing out consistence
	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	The LLG AWPB for the current FY incorporated prioritized investments identified by the individual parishes. This was reflected in the comprehensive parish priorities provided by all four parishes, which were fully endorsed by their respective LC II chairpersons which were shared to the assessment team. for example, Nabeeta parish priorities incorporated needs for procurement of desks at Nabeeta and Luubu PS under education which also appears in the current AWPB under DDEG program
	iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG developed project profile as per NDPIII format for the planned investments to be implemented in the current FY, the projects that whose profiles were developed includes; partial construction of Bukatube SC Headquarters, supply of 30 desks for Lukindu and Luubu PS among other projects

		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 AWPB for the current FY did not show any evidence of capital investments being funded by the LG's own source revenue, suggesting that the LLG did not plan to finance any investments using these funds
		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 developed project profile as per NDPIII format for the planned investments to be implemented in the current FY, the projects that whose profiles were developed includes; partial construction of Bukatube SC Headquarters, supply of 30 desks for Lukindu and Luubu PS among other projects.
		vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May; score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG AWPB for the current FY25/26 was delivered to the district and its receipt was acknowledged by the District central registry on 7, May, 2026. This suits within the agreed submission dates of 15th may
5	Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the LLG prepared and submitted inputs into the procurement plan for all the procurements to be done in a LLG for the current FY) to the CAO/TC by the 30th April of the previous FY, Score 2 or else score 0	2	The LLG submitted the procurement plan for the inputs to be procured for the current financial year, 2026/27,to the district and its receipt was confirmed by the District Central Registry on 22/04/2026. This submission date confirms the established deadline of no later than 30th April.
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 AWPB for the current FY meets the investment criteria specified in the DDEG grant guidelines. This evident was observed in the Current FY Budget where the total DDEG was budgeted on DDEG activities such as procurement of office furniture, opening and shaping of Batwalume-Bukaseno road among other DDEG projects.

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 collected OSR for previous FY within +/-10% of the budget. This was evidenced by the LLG's AFS for FY2025/2026 presented to the assessment team which shows the budgeted OSR was shs.16,000,000, while actual revenue collection amounted to shs.29,411,732 This translates to 54.4% revenue collection rate, which satisfies the +/-10% criterion.

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 LLG's own source revenue (OSR) collection for previous FY 2025/2026 decreased from that of the previous FY but one FY2024/2025, this was evident in the AFS where shs. 35,095,000 was collected in FY2024-2025 and shs. 29,411,732 in FY2025-2026, resulting in a deficit of shs.5683268 This represents a 11.3% decline, which does not meet the required increase of over 5%.
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	There was evidence of voucher payments examined by the assessment team, such as voucher no. 21/12/25 of shs 1800000 and another voucher of no. 22/2/25 of shs. 3000000.However, budget of receipt by LCIs and IIs were not availed
		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	1	The LLG's expenditure on councilor allowances amounted to shs.5050,000, representing 14.4% of the total revenue collected. This falls within the acceptable limit of 20% OSR usage for councilor allowances. This was supported by Payment vouchers expenditure such as voucher no. 4/2/2025 dated February 19, 2025, voucher no. 14/5/2025 dated May 22, 2025, and voucher no. 9/2/2025 dated February 19, 2025.etc
		iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0	1	There were vouchers nos of 10/12/25 and 7/5/26 each of 200,000 that were availed to the assessment team
		iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.	0	There were no publications of OSR 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	AFS was submitted on 28/ 08/2026

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 6	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 submitted the previous FY's Q1 PBS financial and physical progress reports, including PDM funding, to the Accounting Officer. This was confirmed by the Q1 progress report provided to the assessment team, with submission acknowledgments dated 6/10/2025. This suits within the acceptable submission timeframe of by 15th October.
		ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG submitted the previous FY's Q2 PBS financial and physical progress reports, including PDM funding, to the Accounting Officer. This was confirmed by the Q2 progress report provided to the assessment team, with submission acknowledgments dated 18/Dec/2025. This suits within the acceptable submission timeframe of by 15th Jan.
		iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0	0	Q3 PBS report was not availed to the team
		iv. Q4 by 15th July score 3 or else 0	3	The LLG submitted the previous FY's Q4 PBS financial and physical progress reports, including PDM funding, to the Accounting Officer. This was confirmed by the Q4 progress report provided to the assessment team, with submission acknowledgments dated 6/May/2026. This suits within the acceptable submission timeframe of by 15th July

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	2	The LLG provided a staff list containing 11 staff members, including extension workers. All staff members were appraised by SAS Naigaga Hadijah by June 30. This was confirmed by staff appraisal reports such as the one for Muyiga Wilson, the arish chief who was appraised on June 30, 2025. Other examples include Musaali Joel the SAA, Akunzi Saviour the fisheries officer, and Tiribuza Shfilu the veterinary officer, etc of whom were appraised by June 30.
		• Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0	2	The assessment team found evidence that the LLG (SAS) evaluated primary school head teachers by December 31st where all the headteacherswere appraised by 30/ Dec/2025
		• HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else 0.	2	There was a submission to CAO ON 26/6/2026 that was availed with photocopies of appraisal forms and performance agreements seen

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 publicized the staff list of staffs working in the local government this was evidenced by the list of 11 staff members pinned on the sub county notice board i.e Community Development Officer Achieng Harriet and SAS Naigaga Hadijah among other staff.
		• Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 2 or else 0	0	The LLG submitted monthly staff attendance analysis reports to the CAO. This was confirmed by the receipt of these reports by the District Central Registry on a monthly basis. For example, the attendance report for April 2026 was submitted on May 3, 2026, and it indicated that the parish chiefs, attended work for 22 days during that month. However, there were no recommendations to CAO
		• CAO/Tc took action on recommendations; score 2 or else 0	0	There was no evidence of recommendations availed; hence no actions were taken.

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 utilized DDEG funds for eligible activities in the previous FY. This is evident in the FY2025/2026 AWPB, which outlines budgeted and implemented road maintenance and rehabilitation projects, such as the partial construction of administration block (15,000,000), construction of a 2 stance lined pit latrine at Walumbe landing site (15,047,516) among other DDEG projects implemented
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	2	The Annual Financial Statements (AFS) provided to the assessment team indicated that the LLG's budget execution remained within a +/-10% threshold for sectors. This was evident by comparing the budgeted amounts to the actual expenditures in the AFS. For example, the statutory sector had a total budget of shs. 25,090,000 and spent shs. 25,090,000, resulting in a budget absorption of 100%. On the other hand, administration achieved 99% budget absorption, with both the budgeted and actual expenditures amounting to shs. 58,100,691 and 57,879,999 respectively.

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.	0	There was no proof provided to the assessment team that the planned investments for the previous financial year were finished by the end of the year. No completion certificates or reports were presented.

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 provided evidence on the environmental, social, and climate change screening of the planned project implemented in previous FY25/26. This was confirmed by the environmental screening forms in place prepared by the Environmental Officer, Aramu Thomas for all of the implemented projects such as opening and grading of olive road, partial construction of SC council hall , installation of electric poles among other implemented projects
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 had adequate information regarding its grievance response mechanism and the designated person responsible for handling grievances. This was confirmed by the grievance case book, in place, grievance reporting mechanism pinned on the notice board, and designated the CDO Achieng Harriet as grievance contact person in the LLG.
		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	There was grievance redress mechanism posted on the notice board, and names of contact persons designated for grievance handling. Such as lukungu james (Area land committee chairperson) was for land issues, Achieng Harriet (CDO) was for GBV and child abuse etc

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	There is an expired land board / committee availed as evidenced by nominations a per minute 05/Bukeke/8/2026 with submission to CAO dated 7/ Sept/ 2026 but not yet constituted.

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 conduct awareness campaigns and mobilize parents regarding education services. This conclusion was reached by the assessment team due to the LLG's inability to provide any Education awareness report to the team.
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	1	The LLG conducted monitoring of schools per term evidenced by 4 quarterly reports provided to the assessment team such as term 1dated 2/4/25, term 2 dated 5/8/2025 and term 3 dated 20/11/2025. How ever in each of the report submitted, no private schools were monitored which gives a range of 60-79% schools monitored per term.
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	There was only evidence of all the 10 public schools minutes availed to the team with no private school minutes submitted.

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	The LLG failed to conduct awareness campaigns and mobilize community regarding primary health care. This conclusion was reached by the assessment team due to the LLG's inability to provide any PHC awareness report to the team.
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	4	The LLG conducted monitoring visits to health centers in previous FY. This was evidenced by the quarterly monitoring reports done by Health Assistant Kadondi Diana dated 22/12/2025, health inspection report of 18, December 2025 among others.
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 has functional Health Management Committees (HMCs) in the 3 health centers functional in the LLG. This was evidenced by the HMC minutes of all THE 3 Health centers provided to the assessment team forexample Kyando HC II HMC minutes dated 13/11/2025, Bukaleba HC III HMC minutes dated 22/11/25, Bukatube HC III HMC minutes dated 5/6/2026 among other minutes.

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 submitted water requests to DWO for consideration in current FY this was evidenced by water requests letter submitted to DWO asking for borehole in Bukatube sub county dated 27th March 2026.

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	0	The LLG SAS did not monitor /supervise aspects of water and environment services during the previous FY including review of water points and facilities this was concluded to by the assessment team not being able to be availed by the monitoring of water sources report conducted for the previous FY.
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	The LLG did not have evidence to prove the existence of functional water user committees (WUCs) for all its water sources. This conclusion was based on the LLG's inability to provide lists of WUCs associated with each water source to the assessment team
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	0	The LLG failed to provide evidence on the updated list of all water and sanitation lists in the LLG. This conclusion was based on the LLGs inability to provide the water and sanitation lists to the assessment team.

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 collected data and provided statistics on agriculture (crop, animal, fisheries) and were submitted to DPO, this was evidenced by the Fisheries quarterly statistics reports submitted to DPO prepared by fisheries officer Akunzi Saviour such as Q1 was on 17th/10/2024, Q2 was 10/01/2026, Q3 was 9/4/2026, and Q4 was 19/8/2026 and Quarterly crop statistical reports by Katabane Ronald such as Q1 dated 6/10/2025

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 by organizing farmer field days and awareness meetings. These activities were reported to the production office. This was evidenced by the sensitization reports on pelagic fishes and fishing methods dated December 9th, 2025 availed to the assessment team which included attendance lists and attached field photos among other reports from the other extension workers.
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	2	The LLG monitored agricultural activities related to crops, animals, and fisheries. This was evidenced by the quarterly crop monitoring reports submitted to the assessment team. Some of the reports provided include the Q3 Crop report dated March 29, 2025, on micro-scale irrigation, banana, and cassava farmers, and the Q2 report dated January 4, 2025, on mushroom farmers under the PDM program. All these reports were prepared by Katabane Ronald, the agricultural officer.
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 extension staff conducted training sessions for farmers on irrigated agriculture, pest and disease management. This was evidenced by the training and sensitization reports provided to the assessment team. For example, Akunzi Saviour, fisheries officer submitted a training report to DPO 5th April 2026 on pelagic fishes and fishing methods trainings dated February 9, 2026. Additionally, Katabane Ronald prepared an activity report on a cost-benefit analysis training for tomato enterprise farmers on July 2, 2025.
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 extension staff provided assistance to farmer groups in areas such as crop management, aquaculture, and animal husbandry. This was evidenced by the fisheries Officer, Mr. Akunzi Saviour Providing farm visit report dated 10, June 2026, the crop production officer,Mr.Katabane Ronald provided farm field visit report dated,5, April 2026 and the monitoring report of PDM beneficiaries by the veterinary officer, Mr. Tulibuza Shaful dated June 28, 2026, mong other reports for all the quarters