



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Kirewa Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236985)

Score 38/100 (38%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score Justification
Assessment area: A. Functionality of Parish Administrative Structures			
1	<p>The LLG has ensured that there are functional PDCs/WDCs in all their respective Parishes/Wards</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>		<p>There was evidence PDCs composition and PDM guidelines for all the parishes.</p> <p>PDC composition for Katandi parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chairperson – Oyweyo Lowo Clumbas 2. Secretary – Amali Sarah 3. NRM – Mayanja Wilson 4. PWD –Oburu Joseph 5. Eldery – Ochieng paul 6. Youth – Onyango paul <p>PDC composition for senda parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chairperson – Ochwo Valentine 2. Secretary – Owor Milton 3. Women – Awino Irene 4. PWD – Okoth Joseph 5. Eldery – Oloka Christopher 6. Youth – Mayanja Kusaini 7. NRM – Ochola Jacob <p>PDC composition for Tindo Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chairperson – Obonyo Richard 2. Secretary – Owere George Cosmas 3. NRM – Othieno Moses

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 mobilization of beneficiaries within a parish/ward, appraisal of all proposals submitted for the revolving funds during the previous FY for all parishes, score 2, else score 0.

0

4. PWD –Okello Francis
5. Eldery – Owere Valitano
6. Youth – Owor Rogers
7. Women – Adikin Agnes

PDC composition for Kirewa Parish

1. Chairperson – Okoth John
2. Secretary – Munaba Rebecca
3. NRM – Ondhoro Dominic
4. Women – Katono Peves
5. PWD –Owere Omony
6. Eldery – Oketcho Constantino
7. Youth – Odoi Moses

Minutes of community mobilization for individuals and groups to participate not seen

List of proposals for the revolving funds per parish in place

Kirewa parish

Poultry, piggery and cassava growing

Tindo parish

Poultry, cassava, maize and piggery

Katandi parish

Poultry, piggery and cassava

Senda Parish

Poultry, cassava and piggery

Vetting/ appraisal meetings held for three parishes.

Katanda parish

			meeting held on 28/6/2024
			Senda parish meeting held on 28/6/2024
			Tindo Parish meeting held on 5/8/2024
			The LLG did not provide minutes for Vetting/ appraisal meeting
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 Data is missing on the column of economic activity
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	2 Mapping report of NGO, CBO and SCO dated on the 13/10/2023 for Kirewa child development centre, Hope for kids international, Africa water solution and world vision
		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 This evidence was not provided
		Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on: iii. Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0	0 No evidence of meeting held to provide guidance and information to the village executive and the PDCs; on approved enterprises to be implemented

Assessment area: B. Planning and Budgeting

4	<p>The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p>	<p>Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:</p>	0	<p>In the annual work plan, purchase of 50 three desk seaters for Senda and Katandi p/s, Construction of a five stance pit latrine at Wikus on page 7. However, these projects are not in the development plan</p>
		<p>i. Is consistent with the LLG approved development plan III; score 1 or else 0</p>		
		<p>Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:</p>	0	<p>Minutes of meetings from parishes not seen to ascertain whether the LLG ranked priorities were incorporated in the AWPB</p>
		<p>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.</p>		
		<p>Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:</p>	0	<p>Budget conference report not availed during assessment</p>
		<p>iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0</p>		
		<p>iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0</p>	1	<p>In the budget on page 23 has construction of 5 stance pit latrine</p>
		<p>v. Evidence that the LLG developed project profiles for all capital investments in the AWP and Budget as per format in NDP III Score 1 or else score 0</p>	0	<p>Project profiles not prepared</p>
		<p>vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0</p>	1	<p>There was evidence to show that the LLG submitted the budget to CAO's office on the 10/5/2024 which is within the timeframe.</p>
5	<p>Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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</p>	0	<p>There LLG did not prepare a procurement plan for the current FY</p>

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	Projects in the annual workplan include Opening of Senda-Nyambulie-Nyamaliga – Kirewa ss 0.6km community access road
---	---	--	---	--

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	Total budget - 43,450,000 Actual collection OSR - 6,137,976 Budget Performance - 14% Variation - 86% The LLG OSR collection is not within the +/-10%
---	--	---	---	--

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	Actual OSR collection for 2023/20234 - 6,137,976 Actual OSR for 2022/2023 - 5,915,000 The LLG realized an increment in OSR by only 3.7%
---	---	---	---	---

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	No remittance of Local revenue made to the administrative units. 20% of 5,915,000 = 1,183,000
		Evidence that the LLG: ii. Did not use more than 20% of the OSR on councilors allowances in the previous FY (unless authority was granted by the Minister), score 1, else score 0	0	Actual spent on council allowances 8,120,000. This expenditure was above the 20%

Evidence that the LLG:		No evidence of expenditure on operational and maintenance
iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0	0	

Evidence that the LLG:		OSR not posted on the notice board
iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.	0	

Assessment area: D. Financial Management

10	<p>The LLG submitted annual financial statements for the previous FY on time</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>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</p>	4	<p>Final Accounts submitted to Auditor General on 30/8/2024.</p>
11	<p>The LLG has submitted all 4 quarterly financial and physical progress reports including finances for the Parish Development Model (PDM), for the previous FY on time and in the prescribed format</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG submitted all four quarterly financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time:</p> <p>i. Q1 by 15th October score 1 or else 0</p>	0	<p>Submission of quarterly financial statement and physical report for Q1 and Q2 to CAOs office</p> <p>Q1 submitted on 20/10/2023 which was beyond the deadline</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LLG submitted all four quarterly financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time:</p> <p>ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0</p>	1	<p>Q2 report submitted on 8/01/2024</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LLG submitted all four quarterly financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time:</p> <p>iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0</p>	0	<p>Q3 progress report missing</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LLG submitted all four quarterly financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time:</p> <p>iv. Q4 by 30th July score 3 or else 0</p>	0	<p>Q4 progress report missing</p>

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

12	<p>Appraisal of all staff in the LLG in the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p>	<p>Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:</p> <p>(i) All staff in the LLG including extension workers in the previous FY (by 30th June): score 2 or else 0</p> <p>Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:</p> <p>(ii) Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0</p> <p>Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:</p> <p>(iii) HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else 0</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>The LLG appraisal form show that staff appraisal was conducted in the July instead of June</p> <p>Appraisal of Health In- charge of Kirewa HCIII not done</p> <p>Appraisal of school Head Teachers not done</p>
13	<p>Staff duty attendance</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG has</p> <p>(i) Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 3 or else 0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>Staff structure and staff list not displayed on the office notice board</p> <p>Monthly staff attendance analyzed as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. June 2024 report dated 3/7/2024 received on the 7/07/2024 2. May 2024 report dated 3/6/2024 received on the 6/06/2024 3. April 2024 report dated 3/05/2024 received on the 6 /05/2024 4. March 2024 report dated 2/04/2024 received on the the 5 /04/2024 5. February 2024 3/03/2024 report dated received on the 4/04/2024 6. January 2024

Evidence that the LLG has

(ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0

0

report dated 2/02/2024 received on the 2/02/2024

7. December 2023 report dated 2/1/2024 received on the 3/01/2024

8. November 2023 report dated 1/12/2023 received on the 01/12/2023

9. October 2023 report dated 3/11/2023 received on the 03/11/2023

10. September 2023 report dated 4/10/2023 received on the 4/10/2023

11. August 2023 report dated 03/08/2023. not submitted to CAO's office

12. July 2023 report dated 3/08/23 received on the 3/08/2023

August report missing

Assessment area: F. Implementation and Execution

14	The LLG has spent all the DDEG funds for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities	Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the LLG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/ activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines: Score 2, or else score 0	2	There was evidence to show that the LG spent all the DDEG funds on capital investments; Maintenance of Pamadolo-Pomalla Olowo 3.3km Community Access Road
					Maintenance of Wikus - Paskula via Po Omalla Sam 2.7kmCommunity Access Road
					Kirewa - Tinge -Po Oketch Opera 0.7km Community Access Road
					Maintenance of Pamadolo to Pomalla olowo 3.3km CAR.
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	0	Total budget - 120,570,188 Actual - 80,083,634 Performance - 66.4% Variation - 33.6%
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) :	0	One of the projects had not been implemented. Implementation was 56%
			If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3		
			If 70% -90%: Score 2		
			If less than 70 %: Score 0.		

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 environmental and climate change screening form for Pamodolo-pomalla olo-Nyafumba road.
18	The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling System Maximum score is 2	(i) If the LLG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a designated a person to coordinate response to feed-back, complaints log book 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	This evidence was not provided
		(ii) 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	Grievance redress mechanism displayed
19	The LLG has a functional land management system Maximum score 1			Appointments letters members dated 27/9/2023 for the following members seen.
		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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Majanga Alex 2. Okello Charles Wangolo 3. Awori Jessica 4. Olo Daniel 5. Owere John Martin
				One minutes of area land committee meeting seen. Meeting was held on the 07/07/2023
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	This evidence was not provided

21	Monitoring of service delivery in basic schools Maximum score is 4	According to the monitoring reports, the LLG monitored all its schools. However, monitoring was not conducted on termly basis as of the manual. Senda p/s – 29/05/2024 Katandi – 29/05/2024 Milembe p/s – 29/05/2024 Kirewa p/s – 29/05/2024 Monitoring reports for Wikus, Pamadole and Agowik p/s not seen
	Evidence that the LLG has monitored schools 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

22	Existence and functionality of School Management Committees Maximum score is 3	The SMC meeting minutes availed are as shown below Milembe p/s - 01/03/24 Wikus p/s 21/11/23, 4/08/2023 Senda p/s – 13/10/2023, 7/03/2024g.
	Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools; score 3, else score 0	0

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 of awareness creation and mobilization to improve PHC not availed during assessment. Report was submitted to CAO's office on 10/03/2024
	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery score 3, else score 0	3

24	The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY Maximum score is 4	Evidence that LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY , score 4 or else score 0	0	This evidence was not provided
25	Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG; score 3, else score 0	0	Composition of HUMC not seen Evidence of HUMC meetings for Kirewa HCII. Q3 conducted on 15/05/2024

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	Request for bore holes seen, report submitted to CAO's office on 14/08/24 and received on 15/08/2024
27	The LLG has monitored water and environment services delivery during the previous FY Maximum score is 3	Evidence that SAS/ATC 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	Monitoring report of water and environment protection seen. Report dated 31/08/2023
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	Composition of water use committee seen Minutes of water user committee of four water source seen There was evidence of community contribution towards the maintenance of water sources not seen

29	Functionality of investments in water and sanitation facilities Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the SAS has an updated lists on all its water and sanitation facilities (public latrines) and functionality status. Score 2 else 0	2	This evidence was not provided
----	---	--	---	--------------------------------

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	There was evidence that production statistics data was collected, analyzed and submitted to DPO Q1 and Q2 data submitted on 19/1/2024.
----	--	--	---	---

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 sensitization on farmers and farmer groups on PDM, Rabbits prevention and control. Report submitted to DPO on 05/8/2024 Attendance list attached
----	--	---	---	---

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	Monitoring report of PDM farmers, PRDP and individual farmers seen. Report submitted to DPO on 19/07/2024
----	---	--	---	---

37	Farmer trainings through training farmer field schools and demonstrations organized and carried out	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 participated in training on farmers and farmer groups. All reports were submitted to DPO on 19 /7/2024 Attendance lists seen and training programs attached Demo on establishment of piggery unit at Othieno Centurio's home
38	The LLG has provided hands-on extension support to farmers and farmer organizations / groups	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	There was evidence of field reports on extension support to farmers. Reports not submitted to DPO on 19/07/2024