



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Sopsop Subcounty

(Vote Code: 236989)

Score 52/100 (52%)

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			There was evidence that all the four parishes in Sop-sop sub-county had PDCs duly constituted as per the PDM guidelines. The list of PDCs by parish (Nabowa, Namwendia, Perper and Sopsop) is attached.
	Maximum score is 2			<p data-bbox="946 499 1469 553">The composition of PDCs at Sop-sop sub-county was as follows:</p> <p data-bbox="946 584 1161 613">Nabowa Parish</p> <p data-bbox="946 640 1465 694">Onyango Patrick Baligwa Bawereze, LC2 Chairperson</p> <p data-bbox="946 725 1485 779">Adikin Yerusa, Chairperson Parish Women Council</p> <p data-bbox="946 810 1453 864">Olwenyi Fred, Chairperson Parish Youth Council</p> <p data-bbox="946 896 1437 949">Ochieng Valentino, Chairperson Parish Disability Council</p> <p data-bbox="946 981 1465 1012">Okoth Stephen, Chairperson Parish NRM</p> <p data-bbox="946 1043 1453 1097">Kipenji Moses, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council</p> <p data-bbox="946 1128 1302 1160">Awor Innocent, Parish Chief</p> <p data-bbox="946 1191 1214 1220">Namwendia Parish</p> <p data-bbox="946 1252 1347 1283">Ojwang Jacob, LC2 Chairperson</p> <p data-bbox="946 1314 1433 1368">Achieng Christine, Chairperson Parish Women Council</p> <p data-bbox="946 1400 1481 1453">Owori Valentine Wangamba, Chairperson Parish Youth Council</p> <p data-bbox="946 1485 1417 1538">Odoi John Bosco, Chairperson Parish Disability Council</p> <p data-bbox="946 1570 1469 1601">Ochieng Sidoru, Chairperson Parish NRM</p> <p data-bbox="946 1632 1469 1686">Onyango Anthony Mulondo, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council</p> <p data-bbox="946 1718 1302 1749">Owere Charles, Parish Chief</p> <p data-bbox="946 1780 1150 1809">Per-per Parish</p> <p data-bbox="946 1841 1394 1872">Ombaga Geofrey, LC2 Chairperson</p> <p data-bbox="946 1904 1437 1957">Apio Rose, Chairperson Parish Women Council</p> <p data-bbox="946 1989 1469 2042">Okama Moses, Chairperson Parish Youth Council</p> <p data-bbox="946 2074 1433 2128">Nyanjeye Francis, Chairperson Parish Disability Council</p> <p data-bbox="946 2159 1469 2190">Onyango Amos, Chairperson Parish NRM</p>
	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		

2, else score 0.

Angura Henry, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council

Okello Godfrey Nyeko, Parish Chief

Sop-sop Parish

Odaga Rashid, LC2 Chairperson

Awino Grace, Chairperson Parish Women Council

Okello Clement, Chairperson Parish Youth Council

Nyaketcho Immaculate, Chairperson Parish Disability Council

Othieno Disuza, Chairperson Parish NRM

Okoth Godian Odoi, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council

Owor Michael, Parish Chief

There was also evidence that the PDCs were functional by holding quarterly meetings in line with what they were supposed to do in their respective parishes. For example, review of the minutes showed that Sop-sop PDC held 3 meetings on 23/9/2023, 15/12/2023 and 18/6/2024; Nabowa PDC held 3 meetings on 20/9/2023, 12/12/2023 and 20/6/2024; Per-per PDC held 3 meetings on 14/8/2023, 14/12/2023 and 20/6/2024; and Namwendia PDC held 3 meetings on 11/12/2023, 18/12/2023 and 20/6/2024 where all PDCs discussed on issues to do with PDM, among other development activities in their parishes.

However, there was no evidence of minutes presented to proof that PDCs appraised all proposals submitted for revolving funds. This was because the appraisal of proposals for the revolving funds was no longer the responsibility of the PDCs but it was the responsibility of the PDM SACCO Loan Committees.

2	<p>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.</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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.</p>	0	<p>Although all the four parish chiefs of Sop-sop had compiled parish data through PDMIS, there was no evidence of updated data and their analysis disaggregated by village, gender, age and economic activity, among others.</p>
3	<p>The LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and PDCs on strategies for the development of the parish</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG:</p> <p>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</p> <p>Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on:</p> <p>ii. Approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY score 2, else score 0</p> <p>Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on:</p> <p>iii. Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0</p>	0	<p>Although mapping of NGOs, CBOs and CSOs was done and mapping report of NGOs, CBOs and CSOs produced on 6th May 2024, there was no evidence, for example, where any of the following NGOs, CBOs and CSOs indicated on the mapping report (CARITAS Tororo, World Vision Uganda, Africa Water Solutions, and UWESO) were involved in the raising awareness about PDM and planning cycle..</p>
			2	<p>Although all 4 parishes of Sop-sop did not have parish development action plans for FY 2024/2025, there was an approved sub-county work plan and budget for FY 2024/25 by Council under minute 07/05/2024 in the meeting held on the 15th May 2024.</p>
			2	<p>All the 4 parishes had their respective parish priority enterprises, which were as follows: Nabowa parish (Cassava, Maize and Poultry); Namwendia parish (Cassava, Rice and Poultry); Per-per parish (Piggery, Cassava and Poultry); and Sop-sop parish (Cassava, Piggery and Poultry).</p>

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> <p>i. Is consistent with the LLG approved development plan III; score 1 or else 0</p>	1	<p>Maintenance of Nicholas to the sub county then from the sub county to Pandikola Bere road via Naweyo West to Corner Po Obora road, Opening of Pabala East road via Leju Maria to Po Odiye road in the development plan Pg76, AWP Pg 9 and budget Pg 5 so the documents are aligned.</p>
---	---	---	---	--

Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:

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.

Priorities from the four parishes of Namwendia, Sopsop, Nabowa and Perper were presented and ranked priorities were incorporated in the planning and budgeting process eg planting of trees in government schools identified by Namwendia parish was budgeted for.

Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:

iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0

The budget conference was held on 6/10/2023 and the issues discussed were incorporated in the planning & budgeting process eg planting of trees in government schools identified by Namwendia parish was budgeted for.

iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0

No investments to be financed by the LLG as well as other funding sources

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

The LLG developed the the project profiles for capital invesments eg Maintenance of Nicholas to the sub county then from the sub county to Pandikola Bere road via Naweyo West to Corner Po Obora road, Opening of Pabala East road via Leju Maria to Po Odiye road in the development plan Pg76,

vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0

The approved budget was submitted on 13/5/2024

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

The procurement plan 2024/2025 was submitted on 23/4/2024 for opening of Pabala East via leju Maria to Po Odiye CAR at shs 15,073,181.

6	Compliance of the LLG budget to DDEG investment menu for the current FY	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	Total Project investments (Culvert installation, Furniture, tree seedlings cost shs 15,161,330 out of the budget of shs.18,951,661 hence performing at 80% complying with DDEG guidelines.
	Maximum score is 2			

Assessment area: C. Own Source Revenue Mobilization and Administration

7	LLG collected local revenue as per budget (Budget realization)	Evidence that the LLG collected OSR for the previous FY within +/- 10% of the budget score 1 or else score 0.	0	<p>🔗 Budget for previous FY signed and submitted to relevant authorities but does not specify different sources of local revenue rendering it incomplete budget.</p> <p>🔗 There is variation between the Total budget figures FY 2023/24 and the figures reported in AFS FY 2023/24.</p> <p>🔗 Availed Annual Financial Statements for previous FY with evidence of submission to AG dated 30th/08/2024.</p>						
	Maximum score is 1									
8	Increase in LLG own source revenues from last financial year but one to last financial year.	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	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;">OSR Actual for last FY</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>3,981,393</u> x 100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>OSR Actual for FY but one</td> <td style="text-align: right;">4,845,736</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">82%</td> </tr> </table> <p>A percentage decrease by 18%</p>	OSR Actual for last FY	<u>3,981,393</u> x 100%	OSR Actual for FY but one	4,845,736		82%
OSR Actual for last FY	<u>3,981,393</u> x 100%									
OSR Actual for FY but one	4,845,736									
	82%									
	Maximum score 1									
9	The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY	Evidence that the LLG:		🔗 No evidence of OSR remittance to the District or Local Councils						
	Maximum score 4	<p>i. Has remitted OSR to the administrative units, score 1 or else score 0.</p> <p>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</p> <p>Evidence that the LLG:</p> <p>iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0</p>	0	No evidence of 20% of OSR used on councilors allowances						
			1	Budgeted OSR and funds used on operation & maintenance (VR 6/11)						

Evidence that the LLG:

iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0. 1

Publicized OSR on Notice board and how OSR was spent.

Assessment area: D. Financial Management

10

The LLG submitted annual financial statements for the previous FY on time

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

Availed Annual Financial Statements for previous FY with evidence of submission to AG dated 30th/08/2024

Maximum score is 4

11

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

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: 1

Availed a signed copy of PBS Q1, submitted to CAO's office on 11th/10/2023 and to other relevant authorities.

i. Q1 by 15th October score 1 or else 0

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 including on the funding for the PDM on time: 1

Availed a signed copy of PBS Q2, submitted to CAO's office on 09th/01/2024 and to other relevant authorities.

ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0

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: 1

Availed a signed copy of PBS Q3, submitted to CAO's office on 09th/04/2024 and to other relevant authorities.

iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0

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: 3

Availed a signed copy of PBS Q4, submitted to CAO's office on 05th/07/2024 and to other relevant authorities.

iv. Q4 by 30th July score 3 or else 0

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>0</p>	<p>4 parishes i.e Namwendya, Peipei, Sopsop and Nabra. 4 parish chiefs, Cdo is and Vet are assigned, Agriculture and Accounts fully posted. 6 staff in place and 4 were appraised with an exception of Namwendya parish for he has never submitted his appraisals despite several attempts by Sub county chief. Submission for the other staff made on the 26th/06/2024</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>0</p>	<p>Head teachers appraised but agreements and reports could not be accessed though a submission was made on the 29th/12/2023</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</p> <p>0</p>	<p>In charge appraised but no performance plan and submission made</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>3</p>	<p>Staff list presented and publicized. There were 6 staff on the list.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LLG has</p> <p>(ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>7 monthly analysis of staff attendance prepared ie August 2023 submitted on 11th/12/2023, September 2023-submitted 11th/December/2023, October 2023-submitted on 03rd/11/2023, Nov 2023 submitted 08th/12/2023, December 2024-submitted 12th/01/2024, January 2024 submitted on 01/03/2024, February 2024 submitted on 09/03/2024, March 2024 submitted on 8th/04/2024, April 2024 submitted on 15th/05/2024 June 2024-submitted on 10th/07/2023. Comments made to CAO</p>

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	Total investment for (culvert installation, tree planting, purchase of furniture, BoQ preparations etc) cost shs 15,358,000 out of 18,951,661 performing at 81% hence complying with the DDEG guidelines.
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	2	All the funds were utilized as planned eg shs.18,951,661 for DDEG was used as planned.
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) : If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3 If 70% -90%: Score 2 If less than 70 %: Score 0.	3	Installation of culverts, procurement of trees, maintenance of Nicholas road via Chemi Pawendo to Padikola road etc were done within the FY.

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	E&S screening forms were filled for maintenance of Nicholas road to the sub county on 28/6/2024
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 feedback, 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	1	The grievance redress log book maintained with the latest case registered on 15/7/2024 and referral points were police, RDC, Land office, LCI, Court, Community leaders, CDO, ALC.

(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

The LLG has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms on the Notice Board.

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

6 members of ALC were sworn in on 30/6/2022(Onyango Jimmy-chairperson, Onderi Lodovic odoi-member, Okello Benard-member, Achola Rose-member & Nahiry Peace-secretary)

The minute of a meeting held on 7/9/2023 showed a meeting on land inspection, & planting of boundaries.

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

AGM held on the 21st/06/2024 under min 11/21/06/2024 ie amounts of feeding to be paid

21

Monitoring of service delivery in basic schools

Maximum score is 4

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

No reports availed

22

Existence and functionality of School Management Committees

Maximum score is 3

Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools; score 3, else score 0

0

Meetings held but no action plan and extent of implementation.

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	No reports for awareness creation meetings conducted
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	No reports availed
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	1st meeting held on 22nd/08/2023 ie issues of absenteeism discussed, 2nd meeting held on the 20th/12/2023 ie security at the facility being questionable and 3rd meeting on the 6th/04/2024 budget allocation and 4th on 20th/03/2024 ie reports mechanisms should be improved. Action plan and extent of implementation not provided.

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	Submission of request submitted to CAO in regards to un funded priorities in the areas of water, health and production on 15th/01/2024 and not copied to DWO.
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	0	No evidence of monitoring water sources

28 Existence and functionality of Water and Sanitation Committees Evidence that the LLG have functional Water and Sanitation Committees (including collection and proper use of community contributions) score 2, else score 0 0 No evidence provided
 Maximum score is 2

29 Functionality of investments in water and sanitation facilities Evidence that the SAS has an updated lists on all its water and sanitation facilities (public latrines) and functionality status. Score 2 else 0 0 No evidence provided
 Maximum score is 2

Assessment area: L. Production Services Management

34 Up to date data on agriculture and irrigation collected, analyzed and reported 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. 0 Although there was a production statistics report produced and submitted to LG Production Office on 20/8/2024, it was not comprehensive and analysed.
 Maximum score is 2

35 Farmer awareness and mobilization campaigns carried out through farmer field days and awareness meetings 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 0 There was no evidence on file where an awareness report on all aspects of agriculture was produced. However, found on file was a photocopy an attendance sheet purported to be for the awareness and mobilization campaigns through a sensitization meeting held on 17th May 2024 and 24 (9 female) attended it.
 Maximum score is 2

36	The LLG has carried out monitoring activities on production activities for crops, animals and fisheries	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	One out of 12 monthly monitoring reports by extension staff was found on file but it lacked proof of its submission to LG production office; and the SAS did not have any supervision report related to production services on file.
	Maximum score is 2			
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	There was evidence on file that LLG extension workers such as Ofamba Peter (Assistant Agricultural Officer) and Okoth Simon Peter (Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer) carried out farmer trainings as per attendance sheets on training reports submitted to LG Production office on 9/5/2024 and 20/8/2024,
	Maximum score is 2			
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 were field reports on extension support found on file that were submitted to LG Production office on 12/8/2024. For filled agricultural extension diaries, MAAIF abolished hard copies of extension diaries and introduced e-extension diaries app in the FY 2022/2023 and in the FY 2023/2024, the app developed a problem whereby it failed to update data to-date.
	Maximum score is 2			