

LLG Assessment 2026

LLG Assessment 2026

Wairasa Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236728)

Score 67/100 *(67%)*

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: A. Functionality of Parish Administrative Structures				
1	The LLG has ensured that there are functional PDCs/WDCs in all their respective Parishes/Wards Maximum score is 2	• Evidence that the LLG has duly constituted PDCs/WDCs with composition in accordance with the PDM Guidelines, and that PDCs are fully functional as evidenced by: (i) appraisal of all proposals submitted for the revolving funds; and (ii) monitoring and supervision of PDM investments; to ensure effective utilization of PDM funds by beneficiaries; during the previous FY for all parishes; score 2, else score 0.	0	The LLG has established and operational Parish Development Committees (PDCs) in accordance with the Parish Development Model (PDM) guidelines. This was confirmed by the availability of PDC meeting minutes and a list of nine members for each parish. For example ,wandago Parish PDC minutes dated DEC 29, 2025, discussing the approval of PDM beneficiaries. but lacked effective monitoring and supervsion reports in all parishes
2	LLG has ensured that all Parish Chiefs/Town Agents have collected, compiled, and analyzed data on Parish/community profiling as stipulated in the PDM Guidelines. Maximum score is 2	Evidence that all the Parishes/Wards in a LLG have compiled, updated, and analyzed data on community profiling disaggregated by village, gender, age, economic activity among others as stipulated in the PDM Guidelines, score 2 else score 0.	0	The parishes within the LLG did not collect data, categorized, and analyzed data on community profiling using spear data formate . This has no evidence 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 did not involve Mapped NGOs, CBOs, and CSOs operating within the LLG and involved them in raising awareness about the Parish Development Model (PDM). This has no evidence by the list of NGOs operating in the LLG and the awareness report prepared by CDO on NAWOU CHILD PROTECTION on September, 15, 2026, which indicates the conidiation but without involvement of coordinator in the sensitization meetings and educating the community on keeping children
		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 Parish Development Committees (PDCs) on the programs and activities to be implemented within their respective parishes. This was confirmed by the approved parish priorities shared with the assessment team, such as the misoli parish activities planned for implementation, dated August , 24, 2025, 13th /07/2026
		Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG shared with the assessment team a list of enterprises being implemented in the parishes. It was found that the LLG provided guidance to the Parish Development Committees (PDCs) through field visits and training sessions evidenced in the Enterprise trainings in cost based analysis conducted dated 10/5/2025 .

Assessment area: B. Planning and Budgeting

4	The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines Maximum score is 6	Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY: i. Is consistent with the LLG approved development plan IV; score 1 or else 0	1	The AWPB for current FY and SCDPIV both included road maintenance projects to be implemented in the current FY. This alignment is evident in the SCDPIV, which lists grading and shaping of Ntinkulu store quarry road, Nalubale road 2km
		ii. Incorporates ranked priorities from all its respective parish submissions which are duly signed by the Parish Chief and PDC Chairperson; score 1 or else 0.	1	The LLG AWPB for the current FY incorporated prioritized investments identified by the individual parishes. This was reflected in the comprehensive parish priorities provided by all four parishes, which were fully endorsed by their respective LC II chairpersons which were shared to the assessment team. For example Grading and shaping of Ntinkulu store quarry road, Nalubale road 2km among others
		iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0	1	The 2025/26 AWPB prioritizes investments outlined in the budget conference report dated 7th, November 2025. One such investment is the grading and shaping Mulanja road of suggested by the community of Misoli parish as seen in the Budget conference report and funded by the DDEG program in the AWPB.
		iv. That the LLG budget includes investments to be financed by the LLG including projects funded using OSR; score 1, or else score 0.	0	The AWPB for the current FY did not show any evidence of capital investments being funded by the LG's own source revenue, suggesting that the LLG did not plan to finance any investments using these funds.

		v. Evidence that the LLG developed project profiles for all capital investments in the AWP and Budget as per format in NDP IV; score 1, or else score 0.	1	The LLG has developed project profile as per NDPIV format for all the planned investments to be implemented in the current FY
		vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May; score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG AWPB for the current FY25/26 was delivered to the district and its receipt was acknowledged by the District central registry on April 30th, 2025.This suits within the agreed submission dates of 15th may
5	Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the LLG prepared and submitted inputs into the procurement plan for all the procurements to be done in a LLG for the current FY) to the CAO/TC by the 30th April of the previous FY, Score 2 or else score 0	2	The LLG submitted the procurement plan for the inputs to be procured for the current financial year, 2025/26,to the district and its receipt was confirmed by the District Central Registry on 28th April, 2025. This submission date violates 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	0	The LLG AWPB for the current FY meets the investment criteria specified in the DDEG grant guidelines. But this doesn't show any evidence in the budget as per planning time

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's AFS for FY2025/2026 shows that budgeted OSR was shs.18,581,800, while actual revenue collection amounted to shs.18,540,800. This translates to a 98.5% revenue collection rate, which satisfies the +/- 10% criterion
8	Increase in LLG own source revenues from last financial year but one to last financial year. Maximum score 1	Evidence that the OSR collected increased from previous FY but one to previous FY by more than 5 %, score 1 or else score 0	1	The LLG's own source revenue (OSR) collection increased from shs.13,573,461 in FY2024-2025 to shs. 18,581,800 in FY2024-2025, resulting in a deficit of shs.4,967,339 . This represents a 6% increase, which meets the required increase of over 5%
9	The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY Maximum score 4	Evidence that the LLG: i. Has remitted OSR to the administrative units, score 1 or else score 0.	1	The LLG remitted OSR funds to LCI and LCII administrative units, totaling 3,615,000. This was supported by voucher payments availed to the assessment team, such as voucher no.1/10/2025 dated 2/10/2025 among others

ii. Did not use more than 20% of the OSR (that was remitted to the LLG by the HLG) on councilors allowances in the previous FY (unless authority was granted by the Minister), score 1, else score 0	1	The LLG's expenditure on councilor allowances amounted to shs.3,623,451, representing 47.2% of the total revenue collected (12,078,170 Uganda Shillings). This falls above the accepted limit of 20% OSR usage for councilor allowances. This was proved by Payment vouchers expenditure such as voucher no. 1/10/2025 dated March 19, 2025, voucher no. 2/10/2025 among others
iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0	1	The LLG budgeted and used OSR for Operational and maintenance(O&M) in previous FY worth shs.100,000 this was evidenced by the O&M payment vouchers on chair repair in Voucher no 18th/0ct/2025 dated 11th /oct/2025 worth 200,000 among other vouchers that were presented
iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.	1	The LLG publicly disclosed the OSR collected in the previous fiscal year. This was confirmed by the revenue collection sources verified by the Senior Assistant Secretary and posted on the sub-county notice board, along with the disbursement of funds to various departments

Assessment area: D. Financial Management

10	The LLG submitted annual financial statements for the previous FY on time Maximum score is 4	Evidence that the LLG submitted its Annual Financial Statement to the Auditor General (AG) on time (i.e. by August 31), score 4 or else score 0	4	The LLG submitted its Annual Financial Statement to the Auditor General (AG) on 31st /August/ 2026 which is on time before before 31st August
11	The LLG has submitted all 4 quarterly financial and physical progress reports for the previous FY on time and in the prescribed format Maximum score is 6	Evidence that the LLG submitted all four quarterly financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer on time: i. Q1 by 15th October score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG submitted the previous FY's Q1 PBS financial and physical progress reports, including PDM funding, to the Accounting Officer. This was confirmed by the Q1 progress report provided to the assessment team, with submission acknowledgments dated 3rd /Oct/2025
		ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG submitted the previous FY's Q2 PBS financial and physical progress reports, including PDM funding, to the Accounting Officer. This was confirmed by the Q2 progress report provided to the assessment team, with submission acknowledgments dated 09th/Jan/2026

	iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG submitted the previous FY's Q3 PBS financial and physical progress reports, including PDM funding, to the Accounting Officer. This was confirmed by the Q3 progress report provided to the assessment team, with submission acknowledgments dated 10th/April/2026
	iv. Q4 by 15th July score 3 or else 0	3	The LLG submitted the previous FY's Q4 PBS financial and physical progress reports, including PDM funding, to the Accounting Officer. This was confirmed by the Q4 progress report provided to the assessment team, with submission acknowledgments dated 8th/July/2026

Assessment area: E. Human Resources Management for Improved Service Delivery

12 Appraisal of all staff in the LLG in the previous FY Maximum score is 6	Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG: • All staff in the LLG including extension workers (where applicable) in the previous FY (by 30th June): score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG provided a staff list containing 11 staff members, including extension workers. All staff members were appraised by SAS KASIMBA MUSA by June 13, 2025. This was confirmed by staff appraisal reports such as the one for HAKIZA TOM, the PRAISH CHIEF IK Officer, who was appraised on June 30, 2025. And others like parish chiefs who were 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 assessment team found no evidence to support the claim that the LLG (SAS) evaluated primary school head teachers by December 31st. This conclusion was reached due to the LLG's providing the head teacher appraisal reports for the available schools for the assessment team. But in reaction for the marks we agreed that the office of DEO received the document for appraisal
		• HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else 0.	2	The assessment team found no evidence to support the claim that the LLG (SAS) evaluated Health incharges by June 30th. This conclusion was reached due to the LLG's to providing the Health incharge appraisal reports for the available Health Facilities to the assessment team. But in reaction for the marks we agreed that the office of DHO received the document for appraisal
13	Staff duty attendance Maximum score is 6	Evidence that the LLG has • Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG publicized the staff list of staffs working in the LLG as this was evidenced by the list of 11 staff members pinned on the sub county notice board for example HAKIZA TOM , a parish chief among others
		• Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG provided evidence to the assessment team that monthly 11 staff attendance analysis had been submitted to the Accounting Officer
		• CAO/Tc took action on recommendations; score 2 or else 0	0	The LLG did not provide any evidence to the assessment team that SAS took action on the recommenadation

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 road maintenance and rehabilitation projects, such as the opening and shaping of ABDUM ROAD 2KM 9,000,000shs among other projects
15	The LLG spent the funds as per budget Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the execution of budget in the previous FY does not deviate for any of the sectors/main programs by more than +/-10%: Score 2 or else 0	0	The AFS provided to the assessment team revealed that the LLG deviated from budget execution in certain sectors, exceeding or falling short of the +/-10% threshold. The production sector underspent by 82.4%, with a budget of shs. 2,500,000 and spending of shs.200,000. In contrast, the finance and works sectors overspent. Finance overspent by 16%, with a budget of shs.18,273,645 among others. These deviations violate the budget execution guideline of +/-10%.
16	Completion of investments as per annual work plan and budget Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the investment projects planned in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of FY (quarter four) : Note 3: Refer to the completion rate computation table at the end of the Manual If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3 If 70% -90%: Score 2 If less than 70 %: Score 0.	0	The investments projects planned in the previous FY were finished by the end of the year. This was evidenced by the Q4 completion BOQS for the works in FY25/26 But missing completion reports by District Engineer and promised to present

Assessment area: G. Environmental and Social Safeguards

17	The LLG has implemented Environmental and Social Safeguards during the previous FY Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the LLG carried out Environmental, Social and Climate Change Screening where required, prior to implementation of all planned investments/ projects, score 2 or else score 0	0	The LLG failed to provide evidence on the environmental, social, and climate change screening of the planned project implemented in previous FY25/26. This was confirmed by the LLG not having environmental screening forms in place for the implemented projects
18	The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling Mechanism Maximum score is 2	If the LLG has specified a mechanism for i) recording, ii) investigating and iii) responding to grievances which includes a designated person to coordinate response to feed-back, complaints logbook with clear information and reference for onward action, a defined complaints referral path, and public display of information at LLG offices Score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG provided adequate information regarding its grievance response mechanism and the designated person responsible for handling grievances. This was confirmed by presenting of a grievance book, reporting mechanism, or a designated grievance handler within the LLG.
		If the LLG has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress score 1 or else 0	1	There was grievance redress mechanism posted on the notice board, with members as the LLG formal redress mechanism and a designated person to handle grievances.
19	The LLG has a functional land management system Maximum score 1	If the LLG has a functional Area Land committee in place to assist the LG Land board in an advisory capacity on matters relating to land, including ascertaining rights on the land score 1 or else 0	1	The LLG have an active Area Land Committee in place, which serves as an advisory body on land-related matters. This was confirmed by the sets of Area land minutes such as Minutes dated 18th/08/2024 and 4th/10/2024 discussing issues affecting land owners in the sub county

Assessment area: H. Basic (Pre & Primary) Education services Management (in public and private schools)

20	Awareness campaigns and mobilization on education services conducted in last FY Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery score 3, else score 0	0	The LLG conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized parents regarding education services. This conclusion was reached by the assessment team after the LLG provided the Education awareness report in Misoli parish(Buyemba primary school where school dropout rate was high dated 16/10/2025
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	0	The LLG conducted monitoring of schools per term evidenced by 4 quarterly reports conducted, and Q4 only 4 schools were monitored. which gives a range of 60% schools monitored per term
22	Existence and functionality of School Management Committees Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools; score 3, else score 0	3	The LLG was able to prove the existence of functional School Management Committees (SMCs) in the operating schools within the Sub county. This conclusion was reached by the assessment team due to the LLG's providing the minutes for each SMC for the available schools. Like Misoli P/S dated 16th/04/2026, 8th/6/2026 and 13th/04/2026 Busuyi P/S dated 24th/08/2025,4th/03/2026, Ntinkalu P/S 24th/2/2026,27/03/2026 and among others

Assessment area: I. Primary Health Care Services Management

23	Awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery score 3, else score 0	3	The LLG conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities regarding primary health services. This was evidenced by the awareness report of family planning in dated 30th/6/2026, sensitization reports on WASH, Immunization, and Community dialogo
24	The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY Maximum score is 4	Evidence that LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY , score 4 or else score 0	4	The LLG conducted monitoring visits to health centers in previous FY. This was evidenced by the quarterly monitoring reports done by Health Assistant dated 15/06/2026, among others.
25	Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG; score 3, else score 0	3	The LLG has functional Health Management Committees (HMCs) in the health centers functional in the LLG. This was evidenced by the HMC minutes of all Health centers provided to the assessment team for example HMC minutes dated 22/9/2025, 3/11/2025, 7/5/2026 among others

Assessment area: J. Water & Environment Services Management

26	Evidence that the LLGs submitted requests to the DWO for consideration in the current FY budgets Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the SAS submitted in writing requests to the DWO for consideration in the planning of the current FY score 3, else score 0	0	The LLG did not submit water requests to DWO for consideration in current FY 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 did not monitor water and environment services in the previous FY including water points and facilities
28	Existence and functionality of Water and Sanitation Committees Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the LLG have functional Water and Sanitation Committees (including collection and proper use of community contributions) score 2, else score 0	2	The LLG have functional water user committees (WUCs) for all its water sources. This was evidenced by the list of WUCs for all water sources provided in tabular form with the respective water sources with WUC members available, minutes were also available and contributions were as well done
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	2	The LLG provided evidence on the updated list of all water and sanitation lists in the LLG. with functional water sources 18 and only 14 are functional

Assessment area: L. Production Services Management

34	Up to date data on agriculture and irrigation collected, analyzed and reported Maximum score is 2	If the LLG extension staff have collected, analyzed and reported data on agriculture (i.e. crop, animal and fisheries) and irrigation activities including production statistics for key commodities, data on irrigated land, farmer applications, farm visits etc as per formats, the reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office; score 2 or else 0.	2	The LLG collected data and provided statistics on agriculture (crop, animal, fisheries) and were submitted to DPO. This was evidenced by the animals quarterly statistics reports submitted to DPO prepared by animal husbandry Officer(fishers) such as 24th/7/2025, 7/8/2025 and Q4 was 19/06/2026 and vaccination statistics among others
35	Farmer awareness and mobilization campaigns carried out through farmer field days and awareness meetings Maximum score is 2	If the LLG has carried out awareness and mobilization campaigns on all aspects of agriculture through farmer field days and awareness meetings, exchange visits, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0	2	The LLG conducted agricultural awareness and mobilization campaigns by organizing farmer field days and awareness meetings. These activities were reported to the production office. This was evidenced by the sensitization reports on animal(8/1/2026), 24/7/2025, 7/8/2025,19/6/2026 awareness reports dated availed to the assessment team which included attendance lists and attached field photos.
36	The LLG has carried out monitoring activities on production activities for crops, animals and fisheries Maximum score is 2	If the LLG extension staff has implemented monitoring activities on agricultural production for crops, animal and fisheries covering among others irrigation, environmental safeguards, agricultural mechanization, postharvest handling, pests and disease surveillance, equipment installations, farmers implementing knowledge from trainings, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office; score 2 or else 0	0	The LLG extension staffs did not monitor activities on agricultural production for all the quarters. This was concluded by the LLGs inability to provide provide monthly/quarterly farmer monitoring reports to the assessment team

37	Farmer trainings through training farmer field schools and demonstrations organized and carried out Maximum score is 2	If the LLG extension staff has carried out farmer trainings on irrigated agriculture, agronomy, pests and diseases management, operation and maintenance of equipment, linkage to markets etc. through for example farmer field schools, demonstrations, and field training sessions, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0.	2	The LLG monitored agricultural activities related to crops, animals, and fisheries. This was evidenced by the quarterly crop monitoring reports submitted to the assessment team. Some of the reports provided include the Crop report dated 30th/12/2025, and 30th/06/2026, 1/4/2026,14th/5/2026 training reports and fishers training 14th/06/2026
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 25th/07/2025, the crop field visit report dated 27th/09/2025, and the monitoring report of PDM beneficiaries by the veterinary officer dated 24th/03/2026 provided to the assessors. It was also noted that diaries were not being supplied but the staff used note books for activity schedules for FY24/25