

LLG Assessment 2026

LLG Assessment 2026

Jaguzi Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236737)

Score 46/100 *(46%)*

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 6 parishes, only sagiti parish provided evidence of PC minutes dated 22/7/25 duly signed by the chair, PDC minutes dated 11/7/25 but with no monitoring and supervision report on implementations of PDDM activities.
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 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.
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 enough evidence that (NGOs), (CBOs), and (CSOs) operating within the LLG were involved in awareness campaigns concerning the Parish Development Model (PDM) and the planning cycle. This conclusion was reached because the LLG produced a mapping report dated 5/6/25 but t did not raise awareness about PDM and planning cycle.

		Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on:		
		ii. Approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY score 2, else score 0	0	The LLG did not provide guidance to Village Executive Committees (VECs) and Parish Development Committees (PDCs) on the programs and activities to be implemented within their respective parishes.
		Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0	0	There was no evidence of Priority enterprises through at least one of the following: demos, field visits, field days and competitions among others in the LLG

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	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	0	The LLG has no development plan IV that was aviailed to the assessment team
	Maximum score is 6			
		ii. Incorporates ranked priorities from all its respective parish submissions which are duly signed by the Parish Chief and PDC Chairperson; score 1 or else 0.	0	Only sagitu parish submitted ranked priorities out of the 5 parishes in the LLG. Also they were not signed by the PDC Chair
		iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0	0	The LLG Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current financial year lacked supporting evidence to show that the prioritized investments were the direct result of the budget conference. This conclusion was reached due to the LLG's failure to provide the budget conference minutes or report to the assessment team.
		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 current FY Budget includes investments to be financed by the LLG. This was evidenced by the LLG budgeting for PROCURING DESKS to Jaguzi P/S at 14m from OSR funding

		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 4 projects whose profiles were developed includes; procurement of iron sheets to Kaaza ps, procurement of office furniture, construction of shade t masolya HCIII
		vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May; score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG A11WPB for the current FY24/25 was delivered to the district and its receipt was acknowledged by the District central registry on May 12th, 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	0	The assessment team found no evidence that the LLG submitted inputs to the procurement plan for the current FY to the CAO this was confirmed by the absence of any submitted procurement plan provided to the assessment team.
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	There was no evidence showing if prioritized investment complies to the DDEG Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines investment menu since no DDEG guidelines were availed to the assessors.

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	Page 34 of 25/26 shows OSR for LLG as 9,500,000 and page 25 of 26 final accounts show LLG OSR collection as 9,001,439, thus being 94% collection.

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	Page 25 of 2026 final accounts show LLG OSR collection as 9,001,439, but that of 2025 was not provided to the team.
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 no receipt of funds by LCs but sone vouchors of no 4/10/25 of 250,000 and one of 7/10/25 of 500,000 were 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	0	No local revenue was spent on councilors allowances since no evidence was availed.
		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 no. 05/02/26
		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 FY2024/2025. 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 AFS for FY2025/2025 to the Auditor General on August 26, 2026. This submission falls within the acceptable timeframe of not exceeding August 31st.

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	it was submitted on 5/10/2025
		ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0	1	it was submitted on 4/Jan/2026
		iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0	1	it was submitted on 4/April/2026
		iv. Q4 by 15th July score 3 or else 0	3	it was submitted on 2/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	A submission letter dated 25/06/2026 with 11 staffs was availed to the team and all the staff were appraised by the SAS. For example, Mpaata Edmond the Fisheries Officer was appraised on 1/06/2026 mong other staff
		• Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0	2	All headteachers of government schools were appraised by 25/06/2026 by the SAS.
		• HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else 0.	2	All incharges were appraised by the SAS as evidenced with a submission letter dated 25/06/2026
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	Staff list was displayed on the notice board by name, title and contact. example Mahadi Aramathan the SAA, MUSASIZI GODFREY the parish chief among other staff
		• Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 2 or else 0	2	Quarterly analysis report dated 30/6/2026 was availed to the assessment team
		• CAO/Tc took action on recommendations; score 2 or else 0	0	No actions on recommendations were availed

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 FY2025/2026BAWPB, which outlines budgeted and implemented projects, such as the PROCUREMENT OF OFFICE FURNITURE, PROCUREMENT OF IRON SHEETS AT kAAZA ps, repair of borehole at Masolya PS among other DDEG 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 Annual Financial Statements (AFS) provided to the assessment team indicated that the LLG's budget execution deviated within a +/-10% threshold for any of the sectors/programs. This was evident by comparing the budgeted amounts to the actual expenditures in the AFS. For example, the roads sector had a total budget of shs. 5280000 and spent shs. 9,500,000, resulting in a budget absorption of 79.9% exceeding the required +/-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.	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 construction of a patients waiting shed at Masolya HCIII

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	0	The LLG did not provide adequate information regarding its grievance response mechanism and the designated person responsible for handling grievances. This was confirmed by the absence 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	1	Grieveance redress committee was displayed on the notice board
19	The LLG has a functional land management system Maximum score 1	If the LLG has a functional Area Land committee in place to assist the LG Land board in an advisory capacity on matters relating to land, including ascertaining rights on the land score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG have an active Area Land Committee with 5 members 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 discussing issues affecting landowners 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	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	2	The LLG conducted monitoring only government schools per term as evidenced by Quarterly reports provided to the assessment team such as reports dated 9/4/26, 17/7/25, 10/10/25 and 9/10/26. However, private schools were no monitored
22	Existence and functionality of School Management Committees Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools; score 3, else score 0	0	The LLG was unable 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 inability to provide the minutes of each SMC for the available schools.

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	0	The LLG failed to conduct at least one monitoring visit to health services in previous FY. The assessment team concluded this due to the LLG's inability to provide any PHC service delivery monitoring reports.

25	Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG; score 3, else score 0	0	The LLG was unable to prove the existence of functional Health Management Committees (HMCs) in the health facilities operating within the Sub County. This conclusion was reached by the assessment team due to the LLG's inability to provide the minutes of HMCs for all the health facilities except for Jaguzi HCIII dated 15/12/2025, 15/8/25 among other minutes but with no attendance lists.

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 avail evidence that water requests were submited to DWO to be considered in the current FY. This was concluded by the LLG`s inability to provide water request submissions to the assessment team.
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 submited to DPO, this was evidenced by the Fisheries quarterly statistics reports submited to DPO prepared by fisheries officer Mpaata Edmond such as Q1 was on 17th/10/2025, Q2 was 10/01/2025, Q3 was 9/4/2026, and Q4 was 19/8/2026 and Quarterly crop statistical reports by Onzi Emmanuel 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.
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, 2026, on mushroom farmers under the PDM program. All these reports were prepared by Onzi Emmanuel, the crop 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, Mpaat Edmond fisheries officer submitted a sensitization report to DPO on pelagic fishes and fishing methods trainings dated February 9, 2026. Additionally, Onzi Emmanuel prepared an activity report on a cost-benefit analysis training for tomato enterprise farmers on July 2, 2026.
38	The LLG has provided hands-on extension support to farmers and farmer organizations / groups Maximum score is 2	If the LLG extension staff have provided extension support to farmers and farmer groups on crop management, aquaculture, animal husbandry, irrigation, Operation and Maintenance of equipment, postharvest handling, value addition, marketing etc. reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG 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 31/12/2025, the crop field visit report dated 3/11/2025, and the monitoring report of PDM beneficiaries by the veterinary officer dated 31, march 2026 provided to the assessors.