

LLG Assessment 2026

LLG Assessment 2026

Mayuge Town Council

(Vote Code: 236736)

Score 68/100 *(68%)*

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 4 wards Kasugu ,Kavule , Ikuwe, Kyebendo ,All the wards produced PDCs, reports with munities, and attendance for the sitting but lack monitoring reports to prove the score
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 wards within the LLG collected, categorized, and analyzed data on community profiling. This was evidencedby 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.but no spear data reports to award a mark
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: ii. Approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY score 2, else score 0	2	The LLG provided guidance to Village Executive Committees (VECs) and Paris 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.
		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 best analysis conducted dated 9/3/2026 by the fisheries office
Assessment area: B. Planning and Budgeting				
4				
	The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines Maximum score is 6	Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY: i. Is consistent with the LLG approved development plan IV; score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG's Current FY 2026/2027 budget had evidence of consistency with the TCDP IV, this was concluded by the assessment team not being in position to be availed with the updated Development Plan IV despite the Town council providing the four Town council development plan III (TC DP III) for FY2025/2026-2029/2030
		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 parish priorities provided, which were fully endorsed by their respective LC II chairpersons shared to the assessment team. for example, Bulamu road in Kavule totaling shs.20,000,000 ranked parish priorities dated 1st/07/2025 highlighted need which reflected in the Town Council AWPB under DDEG program.
		iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0	1	The 2026/27 AWPB is investment priorities were as a result of the Budget conference. This was evidenced by the Budget conference report dated 20th//11/2025, highlighting resolution to procure desk top by Mukisa ashafa. This was not only highlighted in the report but is also explicitly budgeted and funded within the AWPB via the DDEG program with an allocation of shs.1,600,000

		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 projects to 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 some projects among which included; Maintenance of Bulamu road 20,000,000 under URF.
		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 FY2026/2027 was delivered to the district and its receipt was acknowledged by the District central registry on March 17th, 2025.This suits within the agreed submission dates of15th 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 on 28th April, 2025. 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 meets the investment criteria specified in the DDEG grant guidelines. This evident was observed in the Current FY 2026/2027 Budget where the total DDEG budget of shs. 18,921,330 includes infrastructure investments, which amounts to 80% of the total DDEG Funds. This initiates 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 for FY2026/2027 presented to the assessment team which shows the budgeted OSR was shs.107,375,800,while actual revenue collection amounted to shs.107,376,586. This translates to a 92.2% 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 2025/2026 increased from that of the previous FY but one FY2024/2025, this was evident in the AFS where shs. 107,376,586 was collected in FY2024-2025 and collected shs.120,092,041 , resulting in a increase of shs. 12,715,455 . This represents a 11.3% 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.	0	The LLG there is no prove that it remitted OSR funds to LCI and LCII administrative units.
		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 used less than 20% of the OSR on councilors allowances in previous FY, this was evidenced in the AFS Council trial balance where the expenditure on councilor allowances amounted to shs. 7,337,000 representing 30% of the total revenue collected (120,092,041).This is within the acceptable limits of 20% OSR usage for councilor allowances
		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 on compound cleaning this was evidenced by the O&M payment vouchers 9/12/2025 and others.
		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 total shs. 120,092,041 verified by the Tow Clerk posted on the town council 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 FY2025/2026 to the Auditor General on August 28th, 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 15th/10/2025.This suits within the acceptable submission timeframe of by 15th October
		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 the acceptable submission timeframe of by 15thJanuary
		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 14th/4/2026.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/07/2026.This suits within the acceptable submission timeframe of by 15th July.

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 Principle town clerk by June 30, 2025. This was confirmed by staff appraisal reports such as the one for town agent, who was appraised on June 30, 2025.
		• 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 principle 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 appraisals 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.	0	The assessment team found no evidence to support the claim that the LLG (Town Clerk) evaluated Health incharges by June 30th. This conclusion was reached due to the LLG's failure to provide 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 local government this was evidenced by the list of staff members pinned on the town council notice board.
		• Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 2 or else 0	0	The LLG did not submit monthly staff attendance analysis reports to the CAO.
		• CAO/Tc took action on recommendations; score 2 or else 0	0	The LLG did not took action on recommendations made by CAO on officers reason he did not submit attenadnce

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 FY2025/2026 AWPB,which outlines budgeted and implemented payment of furniture dated 14th/02/2026
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. resulting in a budget absorption of -13.4% 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	The LLG's investments projects planned in the previous FY2025/2026 were completed by the end of the FY (fourth quarter). This was evidenced by the progress reports provided to the assessment team for example in Q4 progress report but no evidence was given to assessment team to prove the completion of projects because was not in the office.

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 10 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	0	The LLG did not provide 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 handler within the LLG was missing
		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 notice board, as the LLG lacked a 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 the 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	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	4	The LLG conducted monitoring of schools per term evidenced by the termly monitoring reports which included the government and private schools provided to the assessment team like dated 24/11/2025,02/07/2025 and others
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 composition lists and minutes of ikiulwe p/s provided to the assessment team. Among them included SMC minutes of 5/12/2025, 15/9/2025, and 13/7/2025,15/8/2025

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 health awareness reports dated 30/4/2026,30/5/2026,24/10/2026,17/11/2026, 30/9/2026. further more community sensitization dated 28/10/25,30/3/2025 .
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 the LLG in previous FY. This was evidenced by the 2 sets of inspection reports on Ebola out break dated 30/6/2026,30/1/2026,26/2/2026, and 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 existence of the HUMC composition and dated minutes 18/09/2025,16/12/2026,06/03/2026,12/06/2026.

Assessment area: K. Urban Planning and Management (Applicable to Town Councils and Divisions only)

30	Development of the Physical Development Plans as per guidelines Maximum score 2	If the LLG has a functional Physical Planning Committee in place that: (i) is properly and fully constituted; (ii) considers new investments/ application for development permission on time; and (iii) has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD; Score 1 or else 0	0	The LLG provided evidence on the existence of the Physical Planning Committee by providing the committee's member list and the building plan registration book to the assessment team. However, the LLG failed to provide at least four sets of physical planning committee minutes, leaving a gap in the functionality of the committee and its actual involvement in approving the registered building plan seen in the Building plan register book

		If the LLG has detailed physical development plan(s) or/and area action plan(s) approved by the Council. covering at least the percentage below; Score 1 or else 0: 20% in 2022/23 30% in 2023/24 40% in 2024/25 50% in 2025/26	0	The LLG could not prove evidence on the existence of a detailed physical development plan and corresponding action plan(s) approved by the Council. This conclusion was reached because the LLG was unable to provide to the assessment team with the Approved Town Council (TC) physical development plan.
31				
	Implementation of the physical planning and building control measures as per guidelines Maximum score 3	If all infrastructure investments implemented by the LLG in the previous FY: (i) are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan; and (ii) have a planning compliance certificate issued by MoLHUD. Score 1 or else 0	0	There was inconsistency between the LLG's previous FY (2025/2026) implemented infrastructure investments and the approved physical developmentplan. The assessment team could not confirm compliance because the LLG did not produce the required planning compliance certificate submitted to MoLHUD by 30th october, nor did they provide Physical Planning Committee minutes documenting the approval of these infrastructures that were existing in the LLG
		Evidence that the LLG has named streets, numbered plots, surveyed and demarcated roads as planned (90% or more implemented) in the previous FY score 1 or else 0	0	The LLG does not have named streets, numbered plots, surveyed and demarcated roads as planned in the previous FY, this was concluded by the LLGs inability to provide the roads inventory survey report to the assessment team
		Evidence that the LLG has a functional Development Control Team score 1 or else 0	0	The LLG failed to prove the functionality of Development Control Team. The assessment team could not verify its existence because the LLG did not provide evidence of its required composition (at least one physical planner, engineer, and building inspector). Furthermore, there was no evidence of its functionality, as documentation such as meeting minutes, the Annual Work Plan, and the Annual Progress Report (covering activities like identifying illegal developments, post-approval inspections, or issuing penalties) was missing
32				
	The LLG has developed and implemented a solid waste management plan Maximum score 2	If the LLG has prepared status report on the implementation of the approved solid waste management plan during the previous FY score 1 or else 0	0	The assessment team could not verify whether the LLG prepared a status report on the solid waste management plan's implementation in the previous FY2025/2026. This was due to the absence of both the approved Solid Waste Management Plan and any corresponding status reports detailing its execution within the LLG.

		If the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns on the management of solid waste during the previous FY score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG conducted awareness campaigns on solid waste management during FY 2025/2026, this was evidenced by the provision of the solid waste monitoring progress reports dated 17/11/2025,24/10/2025,30/10/2025 and 28/3/2026 to the assessment team.
33	Operation and Maintenance of infrastructure Maximum score is 3	If the LLG has prepared Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey report; score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG prepared Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey report as evidenced 30/06/2026
		If the LLG has prepared an O&M Annual Plan which is based on the Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey score 1 or else 0	0	The LLG failed to prove on the preparation of an O&M Annual Plan which is based on the Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey report of previous FY, this was concluded upon by the LLG's inability to provide an Annual infrastructure inventory report which contains the plan for O&M of the current FY.
		If the LLG has spent own source revenues of not less than 20% on O&M score 1 or else 0	0	The LLG failed to meet the requirement to budget and spend not less than 20% of its Own Source Revenue (OSR) on Operational and Maintenance (O&M). A review of the Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) and Final Accounts showed the LLG only budgeted.

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) and were submitted to DPO, this was evidenced by the agriculture officer statistics reports on the about inputs 20/12/2025 captures submitted to DPO. Crop and Animal on meat inspection statistics dated 17/2/2026, 20/4/2026 report dated 13/6/2025 and data on irrigational land dated 24/4/2026.

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 awareness meetings for trainings farmers on irritrack dated 20/11/2025 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. This was evidenced by the Monitoring and farm visit reports submitted to DPO among which included, Monitoring the performance of farmer and farmer groups by Animal production officer report dated 30/6/2026, Farm vists reports dated20/4/2026, among others
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, a report dated 22/10/2025 on training of farmers and farmer groups on Good animal production practices dated 30/6/2026,20/5/2026

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 Farm visit report to the farmers and farmer groups on coco planting dated 25/4/2026, and PDM cost benefit dated 22/10/2025.