

LLG Assessment 2026

LLG Assessment 2026

Busakira Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236733)

Score 75/100 *(75%)*

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.	2	Verification of Parish Development Model (PDM) structures across the local lower government confirmed that all 5 parishes Wambete, Kaluba, Maum, Butangala, and Bukunja possess fully constituted Parish Development Committees (PDCs) with each PDC strictly complies with the required 9 member governance framework specified in the national PDM implementation guidelines. Active functional oversight was demonstrated through comprehensive appraisal documentation for PDM revolving fund enterprise applications, highlighted by verified beneficiary schedules featuring 50 approved enterprise group members in Wambete Parish and 50 in Bukunja Parish. Operational supervision and tracking of beneficiary investments across all five parishes were further validated by a complete suite of signed field monitoring reports covering the preceding financial year. Supervision records for Butangala were documented on 27th September 2025 and 15th December 2025, alongside Bukunja reports dated 19th February 2025 and 26th September 2025. Progressive tracking continued into 2026 with Kaluba reports filed on 30th December 2025, 30th March 2026, and 30th June 2026; Maum records generated on 20th March 2026 and 26th June 2026; and Wambete reporting were on 13th January 2026, 15th March 2026, and 15th May 2026.
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	The assessment team confirmed that all 5 parishes actively compiled, updated, and analyzed community profiling data in full alignment with Parish Development Model (PDM) guidelines. Compliance was verified through the successful upload of disaggregated household and community metrics into the national Parish Development Management Information System (PDMIS). This comprehensive dataset captures key socio-economic parameters across all administrative units, disaggregated by gender, age brackets, primary economic activities, and household livelihoods. Further more, the SPEAR reports were also provides to the assessment team

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 demonstrated full compliance in mapping and engaging non-state actors by presenting a comprehensive directory of sixty-six (66) Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), and Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) operating within its jurisdiction, including key partners such as Lifewater International, Uganda Development Health Associates (UDHA), and MUCODI. Furthermore, active involvement of these was verified through minutes and attendance records from a stakeholder sensitization meeting conducted on 29th August 2025, where mapped organizations were formally briefed on Parish Development Model (PDM) implementation strategies, community awareness raising, and alignment with the local 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	0	The LLG partially demonstrated compliance regarding the provision of guidance and information to Village Executive Committees and Parish Development Committees (PDCs) on approved parish-level programmes and activities for the current financial year. Documentary evidence presented during the assessment confirmed that awareness meetings were successfully conducted at Busaala Village on 2/12/2025 for Bukunja Parish, and a subsequent session for Butangala Parish took place on 10th June 2026. However, mandatory awareness meeting records, minutes, and attendance lists for the remaining constituent parishes were not available for inspection by the assessment team. Consequently, because coverage across all administrative units was incomplete, the LLG failed to satisfy the comprehensive threshold required for this performance indicator and did not attain the score.
		Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0	0	The LLG failed to satisfy the performance requirement regarding the provision of guidance to Parish Development Committees (PDCs) and Village Executive Committees on approved, viable priority enterprises for parish-level implementation. During the assessment exercise, no documentary or operational evidence—such as approved enterprise selection guidelines, parish enterprise mapping reports, or records of functioning community enterprise investments was presented to the assessment team.

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 met the performance requirement for ensuring consistency between its Annual Workplan and Budget (AWPB) and the LLG Development Plan IV, which was formally approved by Council under Minute/02/20/2025/06 on 20th February 2025. Cross-examination of page 78 of the strategic plan confirmed that specific long-term priorities for road infrastructure notably tourism road maintenance and local access connections were directly operationalized in the current workplan through budgeted capital investments, specifically the Wakunja B Road and the Kafumita–Namiro Road.
		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 fully complied with the requirement to integrate ranked priorities from parish submissions into its Annual Workplan and Budget (AWPB). The assessment team verified signed priority submission forms across all constituent parishes within the sub-county. for example; Bukunja Parish submitted the maintenance of Bukunja B Road as a top priority, duly endorsed by Parish Chief Mastoorah and PDC Chairperson Mugabi Farouk. and Kaluba Parish prioritized the routine maintenance of Kafumita–Namiro Road, properly signed by Parish Chief Nakasango Winnie and PDC Chairperson Fuube Ibrahim. Therefore, cross-verification confirmed that these bottom-up community priorities were fully incorporated into the approved FY 2026/27 AWPB under the Roads and Engineering sub-sector, funded via the Uganda Road Fund (URF).
		iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG met the assessment requirement for ensuring that its Annual Workplan and Budget (AWPB) reflects the agreed outcomes of the stakeholder Budget Conference. Records show that the LLG hosted its Budget Conference on 27/11/2025 and published its formal outcome report on 30/11/2025. The key infrastructure priorities prioritized in the conference report specifically the grading and shaping of bukunja B to Kasozi Road (UGX 12.7m) and Busakira C Road (UGX 12.74m) which were fully integrated into the FY 2026/27 AWPB under the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) funding facility.
		iv. That the LLG budget includes investments to be financed by the LLG including projects funded using OSR; score 1, or else score 0.	1	The LLG satisfied the performance measure for incorporating locally funded capital investments into its AWPB backed by complete Project Profiles. Assessment verification confirmed that project profiles were developed for local revenue-funded capital projects, specifically the structural renovation of the Sub-County headquarters (UGX 5,000,000 financed by local revenue) and the supply of 30 three-seater desks to Kaluba Primary School (financed by 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 complied with the assessment requirement to develop complete Project Profiles aligned with the National Development Plan IV (NDP IV) format for all capital investments contained in its Annual Workplan and Budget (AWPB). Verification confirmed that fully formulated Project Profiles were prepared and appraised for all planned capital projects, including the locally revenue-funded projects (Sub-County Headquarters Renovation at UGX 5,000,000 and the supply of 30 three-seater desks to Kaluba Primary School) as well as DDEG/URF-funded road capital works (bukunja B to Kasozi Road, and Busakira C Road). Every profile incorporated the mandatory NDP IV structural parameters, including project objectives, target outputs, strategic alignment, implementation schedules, and cost breakdowns.
		vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May; score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG fully satisfied the performance requirement regarding the timely submission of its approved Annual Workplan and Budget (AWPB) to the District before the statutory deadline of 15th May. Documentary evidence verified that the Sub-County Council formally approved its AWPB under Minute 5/BSC /5/ 2026;Budget reading and Approval. Following council approval, the budget was officially received by Chief Administrative Officer on 5th/5/2026, ten (10) days ahead of the statutory submission cutoff date.
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 Lower Local Government (LLG) fully complied with the statutory performance requirement to prepare and submit its procurement plan inputs to the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) by the 30th April deadline. Documentary evidence verified that the procurement plan inputs for FY 2026/2027 were formally submitted on 30th April 2026 by the Senior Assistant Secretary (SAS), kimbugwe Peter. The submitted procurement schedules incorporated major capital infrastructure works, including: 1. Road Infrastructure Maintenance (Uganda Road Fund): Capital maintenance of the Busera C – Busera A Road. 2. Road Infrastructure Maintenance (DDEG): Capital maintenance of the Busera A – Busera C Road. 3. Road Infrastructure Maintenance (DDEG): Capital maintenance of the Bukunja B – Kasozi Road.

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 fully complied with the performance requirement governing the allocation and expenditure of the Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG). The assessment team verified that the LLG's planned capital allocations in the approved Annual Workplan and Budget (AWPB) adhered strictly to the statutory investment menu and budgeting thresholds set out in the national DDEG guidelines. Out of the total DDEG grant allocation of UGX 45,230,260, the LLG budgeted UGX 37,480,564 directly toward physical capital infrastructure investments (including rural road grading and maintenance works). This represents a 82.86% capital investment allocation, successfully exceeding the national statutory minimum requirement of 80% dedicated to capital assets/infrastructure.

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 successfully met the compliance criteria for Own Source Revenue (OSR) collection performance for FY 2025/2026. Under the revised Local Government Assessment guidelines, LLGs actively managing revenue administration through the Integrated Revenue Administration System (IRAS) are evaluated positively for exceeding revenue targets due to improved administrative efficiency and digital register updates. Verification of the Annual Financial Statements for FY 2025/2026 confirmed that against an approved OSR budget target of UGX 13,000,000, the LLG achieved an actual collection of UGX 28,071,080 via IRAS representing a 215.93% realization rate (+115.93% positive increment).
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 satisfied the compliance criteria for year-on-year revenue growth by recording a 49.48% increase in Own Source Revenue collections between FY 2024/2025 and FY 2025/2026. Financial records under AFS verified that actual local revenue collections rose from UGX 18,779,685 in FY 2024/2025 to UGX 28,071,080 in FY 2025/2026, easily surpassing the mandatory 5% statutory growth threshold.
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	The LLG failed to satisfy the compliance requirement regarding the mandatory remittance of Own Source Revenue (OSR) to its lower administrative units (Parishes and Villages/Cell Councils). During the evaluation, the assessment team reviewed the Annual Financial Statements for the previous financial year, specifically examining the Trial Balance under administration department. The team verified that no financial disbursements or remittances were executed to the lower administrative units throughout the financial year. Contrary to statutory revenue-sharing provisions outlined in the Local Government financial guidelines.

		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 performance criteria, as review of the trial balance confirmed that UGX 10,170,000 (36.23%) of the collected local revenue of UGX 28,071,080 was spent on councilors' allowances exceeding the statutory 20% threshold (UGX 5,614,216) without the required written authorization from the Minister.
		iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0	1	The LLG met the performance requirement, as review of the FY 2025/2026 budget and payment vouchers confirmed that the LLG budgeted UGX 400,000 for office and compound cleaning under Operations and Maintenance (O&M) and subsequently executed O&M expenditure of UGX 600,000 for compound cleaning as verified under payment voucher dated 10th May 2026.
		iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.	1	The LLG met the performance requirement, as physical verification of the LLG notice board by the assessment team confirmed public disclosure of the UGX 28,071,080 local revenue collected and its expenditure breakdown, including the allocation of UGX 3,300,000 towards the grading and shaping of Mabirizi playground.

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 met the performance requirement, as verified records confirmed that the Annual Financial Statement was submitted to the Office of the Auditor General on time on 28th August 2026, well ahead of the statutory deadline of 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 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	Physical verification of submission of the Program Budgeting System (PBS) report confirmed that the LLG complied with the reporting deadline for the first quarter of the previous Financial Year. The Quarter 1 financial and physical progress report was officially submitted to the the district on 7th October 2025, satisfying the performance requirement prior to the statutory deadline of 15th October 2025.

	ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0	1	Physical verification of submission of the Program Budgeting System (PBS) report confirmed that the LLG complied with the reporting deadline for the second quarter of the previous Financial Year. The Quarter 2 financial and physical progress report was officially submitted to the district on 5th January 2026, satisfying the performance requirement prior to the statutory deadline of 15th January 2026.
	iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0	1	Physical verification of submission of the Program Budgeting System (PBS) report confirmed that the LLG complied with the reporting deadline for the third quarter of the previous Financial Year. The Quarter 3 financial and physical progress report was officially submitted to the district on 8th April 2026, satisfying the performance requirement prior to the statutory deadline of 15th April 2026.
	iv. Q4 by 15th July score 3 or else 0	3	Physical verification of submission of the Program Budgeting System (PBS) report confirmed that the LLG complied with the reporting deadline for the fourth quarter of the previous Financial Year. The Quarter 4 financial and physical progress report was officially submitted to the district on 7th July 2026, satisfying the performance requirement prior to the statutory deadline of 15th July 2026.

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	Physical verification of staff performance appraisal records provided by the LLG confirmed that the Senior Assistant Secretary (SAS) fulfilled the requirement to appraise all lower local government staff for the previous Financial Year prior to the statutory deadline of 30th June 2026. Out of the established staff list of 10 officers, 100% were duly appraised by the SAS, Mr. Kimbugwe Peter, including extension workers such as the Veterinary Officer, Mr. Musoma Thaddeus, whose appraisal was completed by 30th June 2026.
		• Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0	2	Physical verification of performance appraisal files for public basic education institutions confirmed that the LLG met the performance requirement for executive appraisal of primary school headteachers within the stipulated timeframe. Across the sub-county's (8) public primary schools, 100% of the headteachers had their performance agreements and annual appraisals duly evaluated and signed by the Senior Assistant Secretary (SAS), Mr. Kimbugwe Peter, prior to the deadline of 31st December 2025. Documented compliance was confirmed across sampled personnel files, including Ms. Babirye Harriet (Mabirizi Primary School) who was appraised on 31st December 2025, alongside Mr. Baligeya Kassim, Ms. Muyama Edith, Mr. Sanya Emmanuel, and Mr. Kitakule Micheal, among others.

		• HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else 0.	2	Physical verification of health facility personnel records confirmed that the LLG complied with the performance requirement for executive appraisal of health center in-charges for the previous Financial Year prior to the statutory deadline of 30th June 2026. The sub-county has one public health facility, Busaala Health Center III, and the annual performance appraisal file for the facility In-charge, Mr. Mwima Patrick, was duly submitted and verified by the assessment team as completed and signed on or before the 30th June deadline
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	Physical verification at the LLG headquarters confirmed that the administration complied with the transparency requirement to publicize its human resource establishment. The assessment team observed that an official list detailing the LLG staff was prominently displayed and pinned on the main public notice board. The publicized list accurately reflected the deployment of 10 staff members operating within the sub-county, ensuring public awareness and accountability regarding local government personnel.
		• Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG fully met the compliance criteria regarding the generation and submission of staff attendance analysis reports. Examination of administrative records confirmed that the Sub-County routinely compiled monthly staff duty attendance analyses and submitted them alongside recommendations to the CAO/Town Clerk across all four quarters evidenced by reports dated 1st July 2026 (Q1), 2nd October 2025 (Q2), 2nd January 2026 (Q3), and 2nd April 2026 (Q4).
		• CAO/Tc took action on recommendations; score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG fully met the compliance criteria regarding the implementation of administrative actions based on attendance recommendations. Examination of submission records and administrative correspondence confirmed that upon receipt of the staff attendance analysis, the CAO acted on the embedded recommendations—specifically endorsing the recommendation that non-compliant and deserving officers be forwarded to the Rewards and Sanctions Committee for appropriate administrative action.

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	0	The LLG failed to meet the compliance criteria regarding the eligibility of Discretionary Development Equalization Grant (DDEG) expenditures for the previous financial year (2025/2026). Examination of the sub-county budget and project procurement files confirmed that while the LLG correctly budgeted and executed eligible infrastructure projects—such as the grading and shaping of buyanirwa Road (UGX 10.5 million), grading and shaping of Kafumita to Namiro Road (UGX 10.5 million), retooling of the sub-county office, and joint DDEG/Local Revenue funding for grading of Mabirizi Primary School playground (UGX 4.4 million) it also allocated UGX 5.0 million of DDEG funds toward "office arrears for landlord." Because administrative rent/landlord arrears are classified as recurrent operational liabilities rather than eligible capital infrastructure investments under the national DDEG Grant Guidelines, the inclusion of this non-eligible item caused the LLG to forfeit the mark.
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	The LLG failed to meet the compliance criteria regarding sector budget execution limits. Examination of the Annual Financial Statements (Trial Balance) against the approved Annual Work Plan and Budget for FY 2025/2026 revealed significant budget deviations exceeding the allowed +/-10% threshold across all main programs specifically Administration (+192.98% deviation from UGX 23.22M budgeted to UGX 68.03M spent), Statutory Bodies (+96.29% deviation from UGX 12.42M to UGX 24.37M), Finance (+35.00% deviation from UGX 15.72M to UGX 21.21M), Health (+33.33% deviation from UGX 0.30M to UGX 0.40M), Production (-25.00% deviation from UGX 0.80M to UGX 0.60M), and Works (-50.54% deviation from UGX 32.48M to UGX 16.06M). In the absence of a single sector maintaining expenditure within the statutory +/-10% allowance due to widespread over- and under-spending, the LLG forfeited the mark.
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	The LLG failed to meet the compliance criteria regarding the verification of project completion for the previous financial year, (completion rate below 70%). Verification of financial records confirmed that while payment vouchers were available for planned capital projects—such as the Macheche to wambete Road project, where UGX 6.0 million was disbursed for fuel and UGX 2.5 million for labor allowances the LLG failed to present official completion certificates issued by the District Engineer or signed road progress engineering reports. In the absence of signed technical completion certificates and physical verification reports, the assessment team could not substantiate the physical completion of the planned capital investments by the end of the fourth quarter, thereby disqualifying the LLG from obtaining any points under this indicator.

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	0	The LLG failed to meet the compliance criteria regarding mandatory safeguards screening prior to project implementation. Verification of safeguards documentation revealed that no Environmental, Social, and Climate Change Screening forms were prepared or available for the 1.2-kilometer Macheche-wambete B Road project. Although project monitoring reports dated 18th June 2026 were presented, the absence of prerequisite pre-implementation environmental and social screening documentation means the LLG failed to verify environmental compliance prior to physical works, thereby forfeiting the mark under this indicator.
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 criteria regarding the establishment and operationalization of a functional grievance redress mechanism, Verification by the assessment team confirmed the existence of a functional complaints logbook for recording and tracking grievances, along with grievance redress charts clearly listing committee members, designated officers, and referral pathways displayed on the public notice board. By demonstrating a complete framework for recording, investigating, and responding to community feedback alongside public display of information, the LLG satisfied all requirements for this indicator.
		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 compliance criteria regarding the publicity of its grievance redress mechanism. Verification by the assessment team confirmed that the grievance redress mechanism was fully operational and that the grievance redress chart detailing reporting pathways, committee members, and designated contact points was prominently pinned on the public notice board at the LLG offices. By ensuring that the mechanism is publicly displayed and easily accessible to community members and aggrieved parties, the LLG satisfied all requirements for this indicator.

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	The LLG failed to satisfy the functionality requirement for the Area Land Committee. Although documentary evidence was presented showing that a newly appointed Area Land Committee was established via appointment letters dated 17th September 2026 comprising Mr. Masinde Karim as Chairperson and Mr. Ofwono Peter as Secretary the LLG failed to provide any committee meeting minutes or activity reports to demonstrate operational functionality for the Area land committe in the FY2025-2026. Due to the absence of verification evidence confirming that the committee actively sat to carry out its advisory duties or ascertain land rights, the LLG failed to meet the complete compliance criteria for this indicator.

Assessment area: H. Basic (Pre & Primary) Education services Management (in public and private schools)

20	Awareness campaigns and mobilization on education services conducted in last FY Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery score 3, else score 0	3	The LLG fully met the compliance criteria regarding awareness campaigns and parental mobilization for the improvement of education service delivery. Verification by the assessment team confirmed the availability of an official activity report dated 30th October 2025, detailing parent mobilization and sensitization campaigns conducted across the sub-county. The report further demonstrated effective development partnerships, highlighting collaboration with active local Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) specifically World Vision, Care International, and Act for Africa—to drive community engagement and support education delivery. Consequently, the LLG satisfied all requirements for this performance measure.
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 fully met the compliance criteria for school monitoring in the LLGs. Physical evidence presented to the assessment team confirmed that all 8 primary schools within the sub-county—namely Butangala, Busaala, Wambete, Busera, Namisu, Kaluba, Mabirizi, and Kasoozi were monitored at least once per term across all three terms of the financial year. Verification was supported by comprehensive inspection and monitoring reports detailing key education delivery issues for council review, dated 26th February 2025 (Term I), 27th June 2025 (Term II), and 27th October 2025 (Term III).

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	3	The LLG fully met the compliance criteria regarding the functionality of School Management Committees (SMCs). The assessment team verified that functional SMCs are established across all schools in the LLG, evidenced by the official committee membership lists provided. Verification of operational functionality was conducted through sample verification of meeting minutes across the schools—including recorded sittings for Mabirizi Primary School (6th August 2025), Namisu Primary School (12th June 2025), Busaala Primary School (5th March 2026), Wambete Primary School (5th June 2025), and Bubaali Primary School (25th June 2026)—confirming active oversight and adherence to statutory governance requirements.

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 fully satisfied the compliance criteria regarding awareness campaigns and community mobilization for improved primary health care service delivery. Verification by the assessment team confirmed the availability and review of an official health awareness report dated 9th March 2026, which detailed sensitization activities and community mobilization drives conducted across the sub-county.
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 fully satisfied the assessment criteria for monitoring health service delivery during FY 2025/2026, Documentary evidence presented to the assessment team confirmed that health service monitoring was actively conducted, supported by an official health service delivery monitoring report dated February 21, 2026. Furthermore, verification of official meeting records confirmed that health monitoring findings and service delivery aspects were formally submitted to and discussed by the Sub-County Executive Committee (SEC) across multiple sittings: SEC Meeting held on 11th September 2025 (Minute 9/11/2025/5: Discussion): Under the discussion items, Hon. Wanduki Moses informed the committee on monitoring findings, including the initiative to provide free tea for expectant mothers at health facilities to incentivize and increase maternal healthcare utilization which was agreed. SEC Meeting held on 17th December 2025 (Minute 12/17/2025/5: Discussion): Under Item 5 presented by Hon. Nagaya Rose (Secretary for Health), the committee deliberated on critical monitoring issues regarding staffing gaps and understaffing at Busaala Health Center III.

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 fully complied with the assessment requirement regarding the functionality of Health Unit Management Committees across all health facilities within its jurisdiction. Verification by the assessment team confirmed that the sub-county has one health facility Busaala Health Center III which has a fully constituted 9-member Health Unit Management Committee chaired by Mr. Musana Edward. Operational functionality was conclusively demonstrated through official minutes documenting four quarterly committee sittings held on 10th September 2025, 18th December 2025, 18th March 2026, and 28th May 2026.

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	The LLG failed to meet the compliance requirement for submitting written water and sanitation planning requests to the District Water Officer (DWO) for inclusion in the current financial year's planning and budgeting cycle. During the evaluation exercise, the Senior Assistant Secretary (SAS) technical team failed to present any documentary evidence such as written submission letters, official memoranda, or stamped transmittal records addressed to the DWO to substantiate that water priorities had been formally submitted.
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 fully complied with the performance assessment requirement regarding the monitoring and supervision of water and environment services, including the review of water points and environmental facilities. Verification of operational records confirmed that the LLG conducted systematic supervision and compiled comprehensive quarterly monitoring reports across the previous financial year. The assessment team inspected three (3) dated supervision reports which were provided: 1. Quarter 2 Monitoring Report: Dated 30th November 2025 2. Quarter 3 Monitoring Report: Dated 31st March 2026 3. Quarter 4 Monitoring Report: Dated 30th June 2026

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 partially met the structural requirements for water governance of Water User Committees but failed to achieve full compliance under the national assessment performance criteria. While physical verification confirmed that active Water and Sanitation Committees (WSCs) exist within the LLG, coverage was incomplete as committees were not established or operational for all public water sources within the administrative jurisdiction. Additionally, consistent documentary proof regarding the systematic collection, accounting, and proper utilization of community Operation and Maintenance (O&M) contributions was not fully verified across all water points. Because full coverage across 100% of water facilities is a mandatory condition for this indicator, the LLG was evaluated as Non-Compliant / Not Met.
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 satisfy the compliance requirement for maintaining an updated inventory of its public water and sanitation facilities. During the physical assessment, the LLG was unable to present any documentary evidence such as an updated asset register, facility log, or functionality status list—for the water sources and public latrines within the LLG. Due to the complete lack of verifiable records, this indicator was marked as non-compliant.

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	The LLG partially satisfied the submission timeline requirements but failed to meet the substantive reporting criteria under this indicator. Verification of administrative records confirmed that the LLG extension staff regularly compiled and submitted quarterly progress reports for both crops and veterinary sectors to the District Production Office across the financial year: 1. Crop Sector Reports: Submitted on 3rd October 2025 (Q1), 6th January 2026 (Q2), 7th April 2026 (Q3), and 13th July 2026 (Q4). 2. Veterinary Sector Reports: Submitted on 30th September 2025 (Q1), 18th December 2025 (Q2), and 30th June 2026 (Q4). However, examination of the submitted report contents revealed that none of the documents contained essential agricultural statistics such as production volumes for key commodities, crop/livestock data, or irrigated land acreage

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 met the performance requirement by conducting targeted farmer awareness, mobilization, and field training activities, with detailed documentation submitted to the District Production Office across both sectors: Veterinary & Animal Husbandry Interventions: 1. Q1 (30th September 2025): Technical training session conducted for local farmers focusing on poultry management and production practices. 2. Q2 (18th December 2025): Field supervision and technical guidance provided to farmers engaged in various animal enterprises. 3. Q4 (30th June 2026): Targeted capacity-building and mobilization training for Parish Development Model (PDM) beneficiaries. Crop Extension Interventions: 1. Verified through quarterly reports submitted on 3rd October 2025 (Q1), 6th January 2026 (Q2), 7th April 2026 (Q3), and 13th July 2026 (Q4), covering crop agronomy, pest control, and micro-scale irrigation field sensitization.
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 complied with the assessment requirement for implementing and reporting monitoring activities on agricultural production across crop and livestock sectors. Review of administrative submissions to the District Production Office confirmed that extension staff integrated agricultural monitoring findings into their quarterly reports. Verified monitoring interventions included: Veterinary & Livestock Monitoring: Subsumed within the Quarter II report dated 18th December 2025, which detailed field supervision, monitoring of animal health and husbandry practices, and technical guidance across various livestock enterprises. Crop Sector Monitoring: Integrated across the quarterly crop reports submitted on 3rd October 2025 (Q1), 6th January 2026 (Q2), 7th April 2026 (Q3), and 13th July 2026 (Q4), capturing crop enterprise progress, pest and disease surveillance, and adoption of training knowledge by local farmers.

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 satisfied the performance requirement for planning, executing, and reporting targeted farmer training sessions and field demonstrations across crop and animal production sectors. Review of administrative reports submitted to the District Production Office confirmed that extension staff conducted practical capacity-building sessions covering crop agronomy, pest and disease management, and livestock husbandry and submitted joint awareness and training reports: Veterinary & Livestock Sector Trainings: 1. Quarter I (30th September 2025): Technical training session for farmers focusing on poultry management practices, biosecurity, and flock care. 2. Quarter IV (30th June 2026): Targeted enterprise training and capacity-building session for Parish Development Model (PDM) farmer beneficiaries. Crop Extension Sector Trainings: Integrated within quarterly crop extension reports submitted on 3rd October 2025 (Q1), 6th January 2026 (Q2), 7th April 2026 (Q3), and 13th July 2026 (Q4), detailing agronomic field practices, pest surveillance, and farmer training demonstrations.
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 fully complied with the performance requirement for delivering advisory and technical extension support to individual farmers and farmer groups, supported by verifiable field visit reports and signed attendance lists submitted to the District Production Office (DPO). Review of administrative and technical records confirmed direct field-level advisory outreach across crop and livestock sectors: Veterinary & Livestock Extension Support Visits: 1. Report dated 3rd July 2025: On-site technical advisory visits conducted in Kafumita, Namwoba, and Wambete villages. 2. Report dated 17th July 2025: Technical field support delivered to farmers in Kaluba A, Bukunja, Butangala, and Busera C villages. 3. Report dated 6th October 2025: Field visits and technical support provided to animal husbandry farmers in Bubali and Waita villages (supported by signed farmer attendance lists). Crop Extension Support Visits: Field advisory services, crop enterprise guidance, and farm-level consultations were verified as integrated within the quarterly crop extension reports submitted to the District Production Office (DPO) submitted on 3rd October 2025 (Q1), 6th January 2026 (Q2), 7th April 2026 (Q3), and 13th July 2026 (Q4).