

LLG Assessment 2026

LLG Assessment 2026

Buwaaya Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236735)

Score 74/100 *(74%)*

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 has established and operational Parish Development Committees (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 parish. For example ,Kabuyingire Parish PDC minutes dated 23rd/12/2025, discussing the approval of PDM beneficiaries. but two parishes Nsango (musenze Ahamed), Isikoro (MUSENERO IRENE) And others missing monitoring reports
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	The parishes within the LLG collected, categorized, and analyzed data on community profiling. This was evidenced by the community profiling data extracted from the PDMIS system which was disaggregated by gender, age, economic activity, etc for all parishes provided to the assessment team all parishes have no evidence to prove that they handled spear data reports 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 Mapped NGOs, CBOs, and CSOs operating within the LLG and involved them in raising awareness about the Parish Development Model (PDM). This was evidenced by the list of NGOs operating in the LLG and the PDM awareness report prepared by CDO Makonje Grace on June 25, 2026, which indicated the involvement of JIACOFE lively minds Uganda coordinator in the sensitization meetings on PDM
		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 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 activities planned for implementation, dated 7th/03/2025 but some of the two (praishes)villages like (Nsango(musenze) and iskiro (musenero) didn't

		Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG shared with the assessment team a list of enterprises being implemented in the parishes. It was found that the LLG provided guidance to the Parish Development Committees (PDCs) through field visits and training sessions evidenced in the Enterprise trainings in cost based analysis conducted dated 26th/02/2026

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 AWPB for current FY and SCDPIV both included road maintenance projects to be implemented in the current FY. This alignment is evident in the SCDPIV, which lists grading and shaping of Namatale to KABAYINGIRE road 2Km
		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 five parishes, which were fully endorsed by their respective LC II chairpersons which were shared to the assessment team. For example Grading and shaping of Namatala to Kabayingire road 2km road section among others

iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0	1	The 2026/27 AWPB prioritizes investments outlined in the budget conference report dated 7th, October 2024. One such investment is the grading and shaping of Namatala to Kabayingire road 2km road of suggested by the community of Kabayingire parish as seen in the Budget conference report and funded by the DDEG program in the AWPB
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 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.	0	The LLG did not develop project profile as per NDPIII format for all the 3 planned investments to be implemented in the current FY
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 May 12th, 2025.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	0	The LLG did not submitte the procurement plan for the inputs to be procured for the current financial year, 2026/27,to the district and its receipt was not confirmed by the District Central Registry. This submission date violates the established deadline of no later than 30th Apri
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	0	The LLG AWPB for the current FY did not meet the investment criteria specified in the DDEG grant guidelines. This did not show any evidence in the Current FY Budget where the total DDEG budget was seen.

Assessment area: C. Own Source Revenue Mobilization and Administration

7	LLG collected local revenue as per budget (Budget realization) Maximum score is 1	Evidence that the LLG collected OSR for the previous FY within +/- 10% of the budget; score 1 or else score 0.	0	The LLG's did not have AFS for FY2025/2026 to show that budgeted OSR follow the actual 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	1	The LLG's own source revenue (OSR) collection increased from shs.3,644,500 in FY2024-2025 to shs. 4,876,555 in FY2025-2026, resulting in a surplus of shs.1miliion . This represents a 10.7% increase, which meets 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.	1	The LLG remitted OSR funds to LCI and LCII administrative units, totaling 600,000. This was supported by voucher payments availed to the assessment team, such as voucher no.24/05/25 dated may 24th, 2026 among others.
		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.1,400,000, representing 37.2% of the total revenue collected (4,876,555 Uganda Shillings). This falls above the accepted limit of 20% OSR usage for councilor allowances. This was proved by Payment vouchers expenditure such as voucher no. 3/3/2025 dated March 03, 2025, voucher no. 24/05/2025 dated may, 24, 2026 among others
		iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0	1	The LLG budgeted and used OSR for Operational and maintenance(O&M) in previous FY worth shs.500,000 this was evidenced by the O&M payment vouchers on compound cleaning in Voucher no31/10/2026 dated 31/10/2026 worth 600,000 among other vouchers that were presented

		iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.	1	The LLG publicly disclosed the OSR collected in the previous fiscal year. This was confirmed by the revenue collection sources verified by the Senior Assistant Secretary and posted on the sub-county notice board, along with the disbursement of funds to various departments

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 submitted its Annual Financial Statement to the Auditor General (AG) on 12Tth August 2026 which is on time before before 31st August
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 13th/Oct/2025.

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 08th/Jan/2026
iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG submitted the previous FY's Q3 PBS financial and physical progress reports, including PDM funding, to the Accounting Officer. This was confirmed by the Q3 progress report provided to the assessment team, with submission acknowledgments dated 04th/April/2026
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 10th/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	The LLG provided a staff list containing 11 staff members, including extension workers. All staff members were appraised by SAS Mutesi by June 30, 2026. This was confirmed by staff appraisal reports such as the one of the office in department of animal production Officer, who was appraised on June 30, 2026. And others like parish chiefs who were appraised on June 30, 2026
		• 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 to support that the LLG (SAS) evaluated primary school head teachers by December 31st(30th/06/2026). This conclusion was reached due to the LLG's provided performance appraisal for head teachers and their reports for the available schools to the assessment team.
		• HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else 0.	2	The assessment team found evidence to support the that the LLG (SAS) evaluated Health incharges by June 30th. This conclusion was reached by providing the Health incharge appraisal reports for the available Health Facilities to the assessment team.
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 LLG as this was evidenced by the list of 11 staff members pinned on the sub county notice board for example Musenze Ahmed , a parish chief among others

		• Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG provided evidence to the assessment team of monthly staff attendance analysis submitted to the Accounting Office
		• CAO/Tc took action on recommendations; score 2 or else 0	0	The LLG did not provide any evidence to the assessment team that took action on recommendations by CAO office
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 FY2024/2025 AWPB, which outlines budgeted and implemented road maintenance and rehabilitation projects, such as the opening and shaping of NamataleKabayingire road at 16,600,000shs among other projects
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 AFS provided to the assessment team revealed that the LLG deviated from budget execution in certain sectors, exceeding or falling short of the +/-10% threshold. The production sector underspent by 62.4%, with a budget of shs.2,500,000 and spending of shs. 300,000. In contrast, the finance and works sectors overspent. Finance overspent by 16%, with a budget of shs.19,273,636 and spending of shs. 22,519,417 among others. These deviations violate the budget execution guideline of +/-10%.

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 investments projects planned in the previous FY were finished by the end of the year. This was evidenced by the Q4 completion report for the works in FY25/26 by District Engineer

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 provide evidence on the environmental, social, and climate change screening of the planned project implemented in previous FY25/26. This was confirmed by the LLG not having environmental screening forms in place for the 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 provided adequate information regarding its grievance response mechanism and the designated person responsible for handling grievances. This was confirmed by presenting of a grievance book, reporting mechanism, or a designated grievance handler within 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	0	There was no grievance redress mechanism posted on the noticeboard, as the LLG formal redress mechanism and a designated person to handle grievances.

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 have an active Area Land Committee in place, which serves as an advisory body on land-related matters. This was confirmed by the sets of Area land minutes such as Minutes dated 21/5/2025 discussing issues affecting land owners in the sub county

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 conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized parents regarding education services. This conclusion was reached by the assessment team after the LLG provided the Education awareness report in St joseph Buwolya parish where school dropout rate was high dated30/12/2026
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 Q2 dated 30/12/, Q3 dated 30/03/26, Q4 dated 26/06/26. How ever in each of the report all the 11 schools were not monitored for example in Q1 only 7 schools were monitored, Q2 only 4 schools were monitored, in Q3 only 8 schools were conducted, and Q4 only 5 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	3	The LLG was able to prove the existence of functional School Management Committees (SMCs) in the operating schools within the Sub county. This conclusion was reached by the assessment team due to the LLG's ability to provide the minutes of each SMC for the available schools as dated 26th/06/2025,16/8/2025,1/6/2026

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 awareness campaigns and mobilized communities regarding primary health services. This was evidenced by the awareness report of family planning in Buwolya dated 29/9/2025, sensitization report son hygiene at dated 11/8/2024, and Community sensitization on malaria and mosquito net usage dated 30/12/2025 all by Pauline Mulugo, the Health Assisstant
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 Buwaiswa Health Assistant dated 25/09/2025, health inspection report of Buwaiswa p/s dated 20/12/2025 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 health centers functional in the LLG. This was evidenced by the HMC minutes of all Health centers provided to the assessment team for example HMC minutes dated,15/9/2025, 22/12/2025,16/03/2026, 30/06/2026, 27/6/25 among others

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 dated 10/03/2026.

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	3	The LLG monitored water and environment services in the previous FY including water points as this was evidenced by the monitoring report by health assistant dated24/6/2026, 17/03/2026 and 10/09/2025among other reports.
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 have functional water user committees (WUCs) for all its water sources. This was evidenced by the list of WUCs for all water sources provided in tabular form with the respective water sources with WUC members available, minutes were also available and contributions were as well done dated 30/09/2025, 04/04/2026
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 animals quarterly statistics reports submitted to DPO prepared by animal husbandry Officer Kapeyi Andrew such as Q1 was on 30th/09/2025, Q2 was 30/12/2025, Q3 was 30/12/2026, and Q4 was19/8/2025 and Quarterly crop statistical reports such as Q1 dated 22/01/2026 among other reports

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 animal awareness reports dated 30/12/2025,30/9/2025 availed to the assessment team which included attendance lists and attached field photos
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 extension staffs did not monitor activities on agricultural production for all the quarters. This was concluded by the LLGs inability to provide provide monthly/quarterly farmer monitoring reports to the assessment team
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 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 Jan /22/2025, on micro-scale irrigation, banana, and cassava farmers, and the Q2 report dated 30 /3/ 2026, on mushroom farmers under the PDM program. All these reports were prepared by the agricultural officer.

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 farm visit report dated march 30, 2026, the crop field visit report dated 25/4/2026, and the monitoring report of PDM beneficiaries by the veterinary officer dated 20/4/2026 provided to the assessors. It was also noted that diaries were not being supplied but the staff used note books for activity schedules for FY25/26