

LLG Assessment 2026

LLG Assessment 2026

Malongo Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236729)

Score 85/100 *(85%)*

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	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 7 members for each parish. For example, Namdhi Parish PDC minutes dated 19/9/2025, 26/06/2026 discussing the approval of PDM beneficiaries. And 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.	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 evidence that (NGOs), (CBOs), and (CSOs) operating within the LLG were mapped or involved in awareness campaigns concerning the Parish Development Model (PDM) and the planning cycle. This conclusion was reached because the LLG could not produce NGO mapping reports or sensitization meeting minutes involving these organizations

		Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on:		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.
		ii. Approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY score 2, else score 0	2	
		Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0	2	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 best analysis conducted dated 12/10/2025 by the fisheries officer
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	The LLG's Current FY 2026/2027 budget lacked evidence of consistency with the SCDP IV, this was concluded by the assessment team not being in position to be availed with the updated Development Plan IV despite the LLG not having the council miunte to prove that it was approved
		ii. Incorporates ranked priorities from all its respective parish submissions which are duly signed by the Parish Chief and PDC Chairperson; score 1 or else 0.	1	The LLG AWPB for the current FY incorporated prioritized investments identified by the individual parishes. This was reflected in the comprehensive parish priorities provided by all four parishes, which were fully endorsed by their respective LC II chairpersons which were shared to the assessment team. for example, Malongo parish priorities incorporated need for shaping the road 1km under under works which also appears in the current AWPB with a cost from DDEG program

		iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0	1	The 2026/27 AWPB investment priorities were as a result of the Budget conference. This was evidenced by the Budget conference report dated 7th/Nov/2025, highlighting resolution to implement grading and shapping of Bulabadho road 2km. This was not only highlighted in the report but is also explicitly budgeted and funded within the AWPB via the URF program.
		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 grading and shaping of Namasonko to Bakiziza Bwondha road 1.0km funded by OSR seen in the works AWPB for current FY26/27.
		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 NDPIV format for the planned investments to be implemented in the current FY, the LLG developed project profile of 11projects among which included; Maintenance of roads and purchase of some of related things needed under DDEG.
		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 FY26/27 was delivered to the district and its receipt was acknowledged by the District central registry on 13/5/2026.This suits within the agreed submission dates of 15th may
5	Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the LLG prepared and submitted inputs into the procurement plan for all the procurements to be done in a LLG for the current FY) to the CAO/TC by the 30th April of the previous FY, Score 2 or else score 0	2	The LLG submitted the procurement plan for the inputs to be procured for the current financial year, 2026/27,to the district and its receipt was confirmed by the District Central Registry on14/4/2026. This submission date confirms the established deadline of no later than 30th April.

6	Compliance of the LLG budget to DDEG investment menu for the current FY Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the investments in the approved LLG Budget for the current FY comply with the investment menu in the DDEG Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines, score 2 or else score 0	2	The LLG AWPB for the current FY meets the investment criteria specified in the DDEG grant guidelines. This evident was observed in the Current FY Budget where the total DDEG budget of shs.106,623,697 includes shs. 85,298,958for infrastructure investments, which amounts to 80% of the total DDEG Funds. This meets the minimum investment requirement of 80%

Assessment area: C. Own Source Revenue Mobilization and Administration

7	LLG collected local revenue as per budget (Budget realization) Maximum score is 1	Evidence that the LLG collected OSR for the previous FY within +/- 10% of the budget; score 1 or else score 0.	1	The LLG collected OSR for previous FY within +/-10% of the budget this was evidenced by the LLG's AFS forFY2025/2026 presented to the assessment team which shows there vised budgeted OSR was shs.48,000,000, while actual revenue collection amounted to shs.64,397,000.This translates to a 100% 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 for previous FY 2024/2025 decreased from that of the previous FY but one FY2023/2024, this was evident in the AFS where shs. 43,332,360 was collected in FY2023-2024 and shs.64,397,000 in FY2025-2026, resulting in a increase of shs.16,397,000 . This represents a 5% increase , which meet the required increase of over 5%
9	The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY Maximum score 4	Evidence that the LLG: i. Has remitted OSR to the administrative units, score 1 or else score 0. 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 1	The LLG remitted OSR funds to LCI and LCII administrative units, totaling . This was supported by examining the AFS under finance trial balance on pg.48 showing LCI &LC II 30% remittance of shs. 19,319,100 and LCIV 5% remittance of sh.965,955 The LLG's expenditure on councilorallowances amounted to shs.12,879,400,representing 20% of the total revenue collected (sh.64,397,000). This violates the acceptable limit of 20% OSR usage for councilor allowances. This was seen in the AFS trial balance on page 48 under Council

		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 2025/2026 worth shs.5,622,000 this was evidenced in the AWPB of the LLG budgeting for O&M on training head teachers shs. 822,000 by the O&M which also reflected in the AFS with shs.6,444,000 spent under OSR.
		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 FY2025/2026. This was confirmed by the revenue collection sources of shs. 64,397,000 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 forFY2025/2026 to the Auditor General on August 31, 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	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/10/2025.This suits within the acceptable submission timeframe of by 15thOctober.
		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 13th/01/2026. This suits within th acceptable submission timeframe of by 15thJanuary.

		iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG submitted the previous FY's Q3PBS 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 14th/04/2026. This suits within the acceptable submission timeframe of by 15th April.
		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 14th /07/202. This suits within the acceptable submission timeframe of by 15th June

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 of members, including extension workers. All staff members were appraised by SAS Wajokerana Fred by June 30, 2026. This was confirmed by staff appraisal reports such as the one for mugonahasa paul town agent, who was 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 LLG SAS/Town Clerk appraised Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) this was evidenced by the performance apprisals of headteachers soon for the schools operating in the LLG
		• 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 claim that the LLG (SAS) evaluated Health incharges by June 30th. This conclusion was reached due to by the LLG submitting the 2 appraisal reports of the 2 HCs in the LLG among which included Kabala Edward Mangeni incharge Namoni HCII and Buyinza Joel In charge Malongo HC III appraised by SAS on 30th june 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	The LLG publicized the staff list of staffs working in the local government this was evidenced by the list of staff members pinned on the sub county notice board

		• Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG submitted monthly staff attendance analysis reports to the CAO. This was confirmed by the receipt of these reports by the District Central Registry on a monthly basis. For example, the attendance report for all months in the year 2025/2026
		• CAO/Tc took action on recommendations; score 2 or else 0	0	The LLG submitted monthly staff attendance analysis reports to the CAO. and recommendations made but no evidence to show that SAS took 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	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 Magoolo - Wamala assess Road 1km at shs.10,321,775 maintenance of Namavurdu to Kyonda 2km, Wamala to Bulungu 3km and 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	2	The Annual Financial Statements (AFS) provided to the assessment team indicated that the LLG's budget execution remained within a +/-10% threshold for sectors. This was evident by comparing the budgeted amounts to the actual expenditures in the AFS. For example, in the AFS, shs, 310,822,477 was spent visa vi the budgeted shs.310,822,477 which gives a budget absorption rate of 99% hence givinadefit of -1% falling within the required creterian of within+/-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 in the AFS of the FY2025/2026 in statement of performance which highlighted projects all completed with their specific works done per project

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 District Natural resource officer Lubanga Musa for all of 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. Despite the existence of the of a grievance book, reporting mechanism or a designated grievance handled 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	There was grievance redress mechanism posted on the notice board, 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	0	The LLG did not have an active Area Land Committee in place, which serves as an advisory body on land-related matters. This was confirmed by assessment team's inability to access the Area land sets of minutes despite its Membership composition in place

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 general parents meetings awareness report at Namadhi p/s, Nango p /s,& Bukatabira p/s. dated 10th/10/2025
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 of schools per term evidenced by 3 termly reports provided to the assessment team. How ever in each of the report only primary schools in the LLG were not monitored leaving out the one secondary school of malongo ss which gives a range of 80-99% schools monitored per term. and 2 private schools monitored as per reports and no recommendations where forwarded for action to DEO
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 has functional School Management Committees (SMCs) in the schools operating in the LLG. This was evidenced by the Schools SMC minutes of all primary schools provided to the assessment team. like Buluuta P/S 17th/2/2026,Nakigo 2/6/2026

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	0	The LLG conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities regarding primary health services. This was evidenced by the health awareness campaign report by SAS to CAO in place dated Q4 dated 29/6/2026 and 20/5/2026 but missing other quarters like Q1,Q2,Q3
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 supervision reports dated 21/01/2026 and 26/6/2026 by Senior Assistant Secretary (SAS) including the HCII and HCIII in the LLG
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 for both HCII and HCIII with their appointment letters seen and sitting minutes dated 5//3/2026,18/12/2025,26/9/2025,24/06/2026

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	3	The LLG submitted water requests to DWO for consideration in current FY this was evidenced by water requests letter submited to DWO asking for borehole dated 13th/02/2026

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 this was evidenced by the general monitoring report which mentioned issues of water points dated 20/6/2026, also report dated 29/06/2026 highlighting the water sources monitored in the Sub county and verfication report for living water international dated 20th/05/2026
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 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 indicating water &sanitation committees with some collecting user fees. How ever the list provided was not update to match FY2025/2026, the assessment team were availed with FY2023/2024 WUCs hindering the assessors to verify the functionality of WUCs in FY2025/2026.
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 did not have updated list of all its water and sanitation facilities. as there was no evidence by the list for all water sources mentioned in the general monitoring reports provided in tabular form 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 fish catch assessment report dated 30th/9/2025,and 17th/03/2026 on crop sector show group production statistic for soya, report dated 30th/06/2026 indicating soya bean

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 fisheries report about capacity building dated 30th/06/2026, awareness report in UCSATP dated 3/5/2026.
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 monitoring reports submitted to the assessment team. Some of the reports provided include Monitoring report of 30th/06/2026 by Animal production officer, and monitoring of PDM beneficiaries by the fisheries officer dated 30/6/2026
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, the fisheries officer had training report on pests and diseases management dated 7th/01/2026nand monitoring report on micro scale equipment dated 27th/03/2026
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 training reports of 31/03/2026 under live stock by Ntende Sadiki APO , post harvest handling training in report of 30th/06/2026 aquaculture activities embedded in all the four quarterly activity reports of FO-Nayenga including vists to fish farmers eg a vist dated 8/10/2025, 4/2/2026,12/3/2026