

LLG Assessment 2026

LLG Assessment 2026

Kigandalo Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236739)

Score 50/100 *(50%)*

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 6 parishes and below is the analysis for each parish. 1. Kigulu Parish PDM List not evidenced though PDC Minutes dated 5th Jan 2026, 3rd Feb 2026 and 20th Oct 2025 were evidenced, Monitoring Reports dated 12th Oct 2025 were evidenced too, List of proposals seen but evidence of its submission for the revolving fund was lacking. 2. Kigandalo Parish PDM List not evidenced though PDC Minutes dated 5th Feb 2026 were evidenced, Reports dated 20th June 2026, 4th Dec 2025 were evidenced just that they were not PDM monitoring reports but rather PDM reports on activities carried out and performance reports, List of proposals seen but evidence of its submission for the revolving fund was lacking. 3. Kyoga parish PDM List not evidenced though PDC Minutes dated 26th June 2026, 8th Dec 2025 and 18th Sept 2025 were evidenced, Q1 & Q2 PDM reports were evidenced but these reports had no dates indicated and were not addressed to anyone for action , List of proposals seen but evidence of its submission for the revolving fund was lacking. 4. Bugondo Parish PDM List not evidenced though PDC Minutes dated 28th Aug 2025, 10th Dec 2025, 10th March 2026 and 4th June 2026 were evidenced, Quarterly Reports (not monitoring reports) signed on by both the PDM SACCO and the parish chief dated 30th Sept 2025, 25th June 2026, 30th April 2026, 5th March 2026 and 5th Jan 2026 were evidenced too, List of proposals seen but evidence of its submission for the revolving fund was lacking. 5. Maleka Parish PDM List not evidenced though PDC Minutes dated 5th June 2026 were evidenced, Monitoring Reports dated 30th Dec 2025 and 14th Jan 2026 signed by both the PDM SACCO and

				the parish chief were evidenced too, List of proposals seen but evidence of its submission for the revolving fund was lacking. 6. Isenda Parish PDM List not evidenced though PDC Minutes dated 27th March 2026 and 16th June 2026 were evidenced, Monitoring Reports dated 20th Sept 2025, 15th Dec 2025, 20th March 2026, 19th June 2026 and 2rd March 2026 were evidenced too, List of proposals seen but evidence of its submission for the revolving fund was lacking. Still to note the LLG had no PDM guidelines, Evidence of submission of monitoring report to the LLG Council was not evidenced
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	SPEAR data reports for all the 6 parishes were evidenced
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 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 0	A list totaling to seven number of NGOs, CBOs and CSOs operating in the LLG was provided but their involvement in raising awareness about the PDM and planning cycle wasn't evienced Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on Approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY wasn't provided

	Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0	0	Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on Priority enterprises that can be implemented in their respective parishes was not provided

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	0	LLG development plan IV was evidenced but there was no consistency with the LLG Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY. For example all projects in LLG Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY were not seen in the LLG approved development plan IV
	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	From the parish submitted lists, only 1 parish (kyoga) had one of its priorities considered in the LLG AWPB I.e. Buhego-Kigulamu road the rest didn't appear
	iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0	0	Minutes or Report of LLG Budget Conference not evienced
	iv. That the LLG budget includes investments to be financed by the LLG including projects funded using OSR; score 1, or else score 0.	0	As evidenced from the LLG budget, there was no projects funded using OSR by the LLG. OSR allocation was only on recurrent expenitures
	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	Project profiles for all capital investments in the AWP and Budget as per format in NDP IV were not seen
	vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May; score 1 or else 0	1	LLG submitted its AWPB for the current FY on 13th May 2026

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	LLG procurement plan was evidenced but it was not submitted to the CAO and PPDU in particular
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	DDEG Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines were provided but LLG budget for the current FY don't comply to the DDEG Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines investment menu. For example the LLG spent 40% of its DDEG on infrastructure projects instead of 80% as per the Guidelines investment menu

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	Shs 20,000,000 was budgeted for as OSR in FY 2025/26 as evidenced in the submitted LLG AWP & Budget for FY 2025/26 while shs 7,813,115 was LLG total OSR collections for FY 2025/26 as evidenced on page 42 of the LLG's final financial statement 2026 thus collection being less by 39.06%
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	2026 final accounts page 42 has OSR collection as 7,813,115 while 2025 final accounts page 36 has OSR collection as 7,813,115 thus maintaining the same OSR collection for 2 years.
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 evidence on the mandatory remittance of OSR to the administrative units by the LLG

		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	Voucher number K/0002= shs 600,0000 Cheque numbers 218= shs 1,200,000 Cheque numbers 224= shs 600,000 Cheque numbers 205= shs 600,000 Totaling to shs 3,000,000 was allocations of OSR to councilors allowances. Thus being 38.3%
		iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0	0	LLG budget for previous FY as evidenced O&M wasn't budgeted for and still there was no any payment voucher on the same by the LLG
		iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.	0	LLG evidence on publication of OSR was not observed on the LLG notice boards

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	LLG submissions of AFS to Auditor General was on 26th May 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	Q1 was submitted on 3/ Oct/2025
		ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0	1	Q2 report was submitted on 9/Jan/2026
		iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0	1	Submitted on 15th April 2026
		iv. Q4 by 15th July score 3 or else 0	3	Submitted on 9th 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	0	All staffs were appraised but the 2 Extension staffs of Agriculture and Veterinary plus parish chiefs were appraised in july
		• Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0	2	All the 13 Head teachers of public schools were appraised by 12/12/2026
		• HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else 0.	0	5 Health staffs were appraised late i.e at 20th july 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 displayed on public notice board with 12 staffs by tittle, contact and name was evidenced
		• Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 2 or else 0	2	Monthly analysis of staff produced for 12 months with average attendance of 86% was provided
		• CAO/Tc took action on recommendations; score 2 or else 0	0	There was no evidence on recommendations and action taken by the SAS

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	LLG spent its DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects and activities were as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines for example maintenance of Nakasero-Bugunda road, Kyoga-Buyego road 3km, procurement of desks among others
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	Budget for FY 2025/26 availed 9 main programs together with the AFS. However, the AFS does not match with the budget as per the main programs. There was a big divergence between budget allocation and expenditures in AFS

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	Evidence of Certificates of completion and Progress Reports not provided

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	No Environmental and social screening forms from the SAS evidenced as no Environmental and social screening activities were conducted on their Road works projects of Kyoga-Buyengo road 4.2km, Nakazigo-Namalege 4kms and Nakiddubuli-Namasaka-Namugolo 5.2 km
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	CDO is the focal person responding to grievance, complaints logbook was in place though not effectively used to fill in information and publication on the same were on the LLG notice board
		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	Grievance redress mechanisms in place designed with the help of IPS like World vision however it is not displayed publically

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	Area Land committee in place with 5 members. Evidence of minutes dated 19th Jan 2026 concerning a land dispute between Mr. Batwaula Alimafesi and 2 families of late Hasacha and late Kamya. another invitation for a meeting on 1st July 2026

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	No Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery provided
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	All the 13 public schools were monitored once a term. God's Grace Nursery and primary school, All stars Nursery and primary school were monitored too
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	Only 8 of the 13 public schools SMC Minutes, Lists of members of SMC were evidenced i.e Peterson Memorial PS, Nanvunano PS, Bugulu PS, Nakidubuli PS, Isenda PS, Walukuba PS, Buyaga PS and Maleeka PS

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	Mobilization for mass polio immunization dated 12th Dec 2025 evidenced, a report on revitalization of wash and IPC committees dated 20th Jan 2026 seen, a report on campaign to eliminate open defecation in May 2026 seen and yellow fever vaccination campaign dated 18th Oct 2025 evienced too
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	Quarterly health monitoring reports for all quarters dated 28th Jan 2026, 23rd June 2026, 24th Sept 2025, and 10th Oct 2025 evidenced
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 5 Health centers provided to the assessment team forexample Kigandalo HCIV HMC minutes dated 26 My 2026, Kyoha HII HMC minutes dated 20TH Nov 2025, Bwalula HC II HMC minutes dated 2/12/2025, Bugulu HC II HMC minutes dated 2/09/2025 and Namalege HCII HMC minutes dated 4/09/2025 among other minutes.

Assessment area: J. Water & Environment Services Management

26	Evidence that the LLGs submitted requests to the DWO for consideration in the current FY budgets Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the SAS submitted in writing requests to the DWO for consideration in the planning of the current FY score 3, else score 0	3	The LLG 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	3	The LLG monitored water and environment services in the previous FY including water points this was evidenced by the monitoring report by Wiswa Simon health assistant dated 30/6/2026 among other monitoring reports for Q1,Q2 AND Q3
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 and animal), since they have no fisheries officer in place and were submitted to DPO, this was evidenced by the Animal quarterly statistics reports submitted to DPO prepared by animal production officer such as Q1 was on 17th/10/025, Q2 was 10/01/2026, Q3 was 9/4/2026, and Q4 was 19/8/2026 and Quarterly crop statistical reports by the crop productoion officer such as Q1 dated 6/10/2025 among other report that were submitted.

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 better farming 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 and animals. 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, 2026, on micro-scale irrigation, banana, and cassava farmers, and the Q2 report dated January 4, 2025, on mushroom farmers under the PDM program. All these reports were prepared by the agricultural officer.
37	Farmer trainings through training farmer field schools and demonstrations organized and carried out Maximum score is 2	If the LLG extension staff has carried out farmer trainings on irrigated agriculture, agronomy, pests and diseases management, operation and maintenance of equipment, linkage to markets etc. through for example farmer field schools, demonstrations, and field training sessions, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0.	2	The LLG extension staff conducted training sessions for farmers on irrigated agriculture, pest and disease management. This was evidenced by the training and sensitization reports provided to the assessment team. For example, Agriculture officer submitted a sensitization report to DPO on good farming methods trainings dated February 9, 2026. Additionally, he prepared an activity report on a cost-benefit analysis training for tomato enterprise farmers on July 2, 2025.
38	The LLG has provided hands-on extension support to farmers and farmer organizations / groups Maximum score is 2	If the LLG extension staff have provided extension support to farmers and farmer groups on crop management, aquaculture, animal husbandry, irrigation, Operation and Maintenance of equipment, postharvest handling, value addition, marketing etc. reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG extension staff provided assistance to farmer groups in areas such as crop management and animal husbandry. This was evidenced by the crop farm visit report dated April 9, 2026, the crop field visit report dated December 14, 2025, and the monitoring report of PDM beneficiaries by the veterinary officer dated June 30, 2026 provided to the assessors