



## **LLG Performance Assessment**

LLG Performance Assessment

Nyakashashara Subcounty

(Vote Code: 237105)

**Score** 88/100 (88%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
<b>Assessment area:</b> 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>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.</p>	2	<p>There was evidence that Nyakashashara Subcounty constituted PDCs with composition of 7 members for each of the 4 Parishes i.e Nyakahita Parish, Kyakabunga Parish, Bijubwe Parish and Rurambira Parish in accordance with the PDM Guidelines. The PDCs are fully functional as evidenced by Mobilisation of beneficiaries within each of the four parishes. The Minutes for mobilization meetings and reports for each of the three parishes were on file together with lists of the beneficiary enterprise groups and membership as follows: Nyakahita Parish (25 groups), Kyakabunga Parish (24 groups), Bijubwe Parish (25 groups) and Rurambira Parish (10 groups).</p> <p>All this Evidence was obtained from a file code named PDM Nyakashashara S/C Red in colour.</p> <p>The LLG was compliant.</p>
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>No evidence was presented</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 &amp; CSO operating in the LLG and involved them in raising awareness about the PDM and planning cycle: score 2, or else 0</p>	2	<p>Nyakashashara Subcounty conducted mapping exercise for all NGOs, CBOs, and SCOs as per the mapping report dated 13th Oct, 2022 titled "NYAKASHASHARA S/CTY NGOS AND CSOs Mapping report" THE EXERCISE WAS CONDUCTED BETWEEN 18TH – 26TH March 2022. some of the NGOs on the list of 8 include; African wildlife foundation, KKOTTONGNAE house of Love and KKOTTONGNAE house of Angels dealing with Child protection.</p> <p>The representatives of these CBOs and NGO participated in the meetings as evidenced in the minutes of the meetings and the report of the awareness creation. The representatives as evidenced from the minutes rallied people of Nyakashashara to embrace the PDM and interest themselves in planning for the development of</p>

their Parishes and subcounty at large by following up government projects, programs and funds like Road fund, UPE and USE capitation grants as well as PHC for health facilities. The attendance lists were on file as well as the mapping report. The Parish Chiefs provided this evidence in form of Minutes where these representatives were given opportunity to speak and rally support for the PDM.

The LLG was compliant.

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

There was Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY 2022/2023. The Subcounty Chief (SAS) wrote to all Village executive committees and PDCs on 13th July 2022 (Letter on file and was also on Notice board by the time of Assessment. The letter which was titled clearly indicated all the Six approved projects as follows:

1. Opening and Grading of Karengo-Katoma CAR (6km) to be funded by URF.
2. Fencing of Rushoga Market and construction of a 4-stance pit latrine to be funded by DDEG
3. Rehabilitation of a Ferro-Cement Water harvesting Tank at the sub-county Headquarters using LLR.
4. Construction of a staff house at Kakyera Community P/School funded by UWA-Revenue Sharing
5. Construction of a staff house at Karengo Community P/School to be funded by UWA-Revenue sharing
6. Construction of a staff house at Rurambiira HC III

The LLG was compliant.

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

2

There was evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish. The SAS communicated to all village executive committees and all PDCs on the priority enterprise in a letter dated 15/05/2022 which was on file. The reports on follow up on the enterprises by the agriculture extension workers such as field demos and farmer trainings were also provided as evidence for this.

The LLG was compliant.

#### Assessment area: B. Planning and Budgeting

4

The LLG conducted Annual Planning

The Assessor accessed the LLG development plan III, The approved Budget for FY 2022/2023 and the approved AWP for FY 2022/2023 and established linkage of the 3

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:

1

i. Is consistent with the LLG approved development plan III; score 1 or else 0

approved projects namely:

1. Opening and Grading of Karengo-Katoma CAR (6km) to be funded by URF.
2. Fencing of Rushoga Market and construction of a 4-stance pit latrine to be funded by DDEG
3. Rehabilitation of a Ferro-Cement Water harvesting Tank at the sub-county Headquarters using LLR.

All these projects were on page page 109 of the LLG development plan III, page 4-5 of the AWP and page 2&3 of the Approved Budget Estimates.

The LLG was compliant.

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.

1

The LLG provided evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY 2022/2023 Incorporates ranked priorities from all its respective parish submissions which are duly signed by the Parish Chief and PDC Chairperson. The assessor established that all the 4 Parishes submitted their ranked priorities to SAS as follows: Nyakahita Parish (on: 24/11/2021), Kyakabunga Parish (on: 16/11/2021), Bijubwe Parish (15/11/2021 and Rurambiira Parish (on: 11/11/2021). All the major projects in the approved AWP and Budget were seen on the lists of the submissions from the Parishes which were dully endorsed by the Parish chiefs and LC2 Chairpersons (PDC Chairpersons).

The LLG was compliant.

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

1

The LLG presented evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY 2022/23 were based on the outcomes of the budget conference. The Budget conference report dated 28/10/2021 was in place and the ranked priorities from each parish were presented and discussed in the budget conference which was held on 28/10/2021. Budget conference report had all the three projects in the approved Annual Work plan and Budget for the current FY 2022/23.

The LLG was compliant.

Analysis of Nyakashashara LLG Approved workplan and budget for FY 2022/2023 established inclusion of investments to be financed by the LLG. Namely

1. Opening and Grading of Karengo-Katoma CAR (6km) to be funded by URF.
2. Fencing of Rushoga Market and construction of a 4-

	<p>iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0</p>	1	<p>stance pit latrine to be funded by DDEG</p> <p>3. Rehabilitation of a Ferro-Cement Water harvesting Tank at the sub-county Headquarters using LLR.</p> <p>4. Construction of a staff house at Kakyera Community P/School funded by UWA-Revenue Sharing</p> <p>5. Construction of a staff house at Karengo Community P/School to be funded by UWA-Revenue sharing</p> <p>6. Construction of a staff house at Rurambiira HC III</p> <p>The LLG was compliant.</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>	1	<p>LLG developed project profiles for all the six capital investments in the AWP and Budget as per format in NDP III and were annexed to the budget and the annual workplan as one document.</p> <p>The LLG was compliant.</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>The LLG budget was submitted to the District before 15th May 2022. The assessor was provided with evidence of submission letter dated 13/05/2022 which on file. The Letter was stamped received by Chief Administrative Officer's Office and by the District Planner on 13/05/2022.</p> <p>The LLG was Compliant.</p>
5	<p>Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	2	<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> <p>The LLG presented 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: 2022/23 to the CAO by the 30th April of the previous FY 2021/22. The submission letter was in place and dated 4th April 2022 stamped received by CAOs Office and Procurement and Disposal Unit on 14th April 2022. The copy was also received by PDU on the same date.</p> <p>The LLG was Compliant.</p>
6	<p>Compliance of the LLG budget to DDEG investment menu for the current FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	2	<p>Nyakashashara Subcounty was allocated DDEG totaling to UGX: 19,073,267/= for the FY 2022/2023. The analysis of the approved Budget for FY 2022/23 for Nyakashashara Subcounty provided evidence that the investments to be funded by DDEG i.e Fencing of Rushoga Market and construction of 4-stance pit Latrine at Rushoga Market at a total of UGX 15,258,614/= which was equivalent to (80%) of the total DDEG IPF provided. This was in line with the provision of up to 80% of DDEG being spent on Capital works. The remaining funds were spent on Investment servicing Costs UGX: 1.907,326/= (10%) and UGX 1.907,326/= (10%) on Support to Parish Planning</p>

score 2 or else score 0

including data collection, monitoring all projects and programs in parish as per DDEG guidelines for FY 2022/2023. On Page 7.

The LLG was compliant.

**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.	1	the llg collected 80.2% of the budgeted OSR as per the approved budget of FY 2021/22 as evidenced by the budget and AFS
	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	1	the OSR collected increased by 10% from previous FY but one as evidenced in the AFS
	Maximum score 1			
9	The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY	Evidence that the LLG: i. Has remitted OSR to the administrative units, score 1 or else score 0.	1	the llg remitted OSR to administrative units as evidenced by transfer vouchers: 3/6/22=5% to parishes totaling 1,540,000/= and 2/6/22 to villages with 25%
	Maximum score 4	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	1	the llg spent 19.1% of OSR on councilors allowance as evidenced in the AFS
		Evidence that the LLG:  iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0	0	the llg used 6.5% of OSR on O&M as evidenced in the AFS but the assessor did not see the transfer vouchers
		Evidence that the LLG:  iv. Publicised the OSR and how	1	the llg had displayed the collected and expenditure of

it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.

OSR on the llg noticeboard

**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 AFS on 31/8/2022 as evidenced by the hard copy of AFS stamped by the auditor general
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  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:  i. Q1 by 15th October 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:  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:  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:  iv. Q4 by 30th July score 3 or else 0	1  1  1  3	the llg submitted 1st quarter on 8/10/2021 evidenced by the submission letter stamped by planning and CAO'S office  the llg submitted 2nd quarter on 3/1/2022 evidenced by the submission letter stamped by planning and CAO'S office  the llg submitted 3rd quarter on 2/4/2022 evidenced by the submission letter stamped by planning and CAO'S office  the llg submitted 4th quarter on 4/8/2022 evidenced by the submission letter stamped by planning and CAO'S office

**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>2</p>	<p>Staff structures Staff lists Performance plan Appraisal reports and Personnel files</p> <p>All staff in the LLG including extension workers in the previous FY were appraised by 30/6/2022.</p> <p>forexample Kamwine Winfred (SAA) Boonabana Molly(parish chief)Taremwa Alex(parish chief).</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>2</p>	<p>The subcounty has 11 public primary schools.</p> <p>Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year. All head teachers at the LLG were appraised by 31/12/2021 .</p>
		<p>Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:</p> <p>(iii) HC III &amp; II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else</p> <p>0</p>	<p>The subcounty has 3 health centres.</p> <p>All in-charges were not appraised by 30/6/2022.</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 structures, Staff lists ,Performance plan, Appraisal reports, and Staff performance reports were all available.</p> <p>The LLG publicized the list of their staff dated 30/6/2022 on the notice board.</p>
		<p>Evidence that the LLG has</p> <p>(ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC</p> <p>score 3 or else 0</p> <p>3</p>	<p>The LLG has produced the monthly analysis reports and submitted to CAO and recommendations by SAS are there.</p>

**Assessment area:** F. Implementation and Execution

14 The LLG has



<p>spent all the DDEG funds for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>No evidence was provided.</p>
---	--	----------	----------------------------------

<p>15</p> <p>The LLG spent the funds as per budget</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>No evidence was provided to determine the deviation %tages</p>
--	--	----------	---

<p>16</p> <p>Completion of investments as per annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>Evidence that the investment projects planned in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of FY (quarter four) :</p> <p>If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3</p> <p>If 70% -90%: Score 2</p> <p>If less than 70 %: Score 0.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>Reports were not provided yet</p>
---	--	----------	--------------------------------------

**Assessment area:** G. Environmental and Social Safeguards

<p>17</p> <p>The LLG has implemented environmental and social safeguards during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>the llg screened the the fencing of S/C HQ project on 29/03/2022 as evidenced in the screening form and certificate of completion showed that the project started on 2/4/2022-5th/4/2022. that was the only project implemented in the FY 21/22</p>
---	---	----------	--

<p>18</p> <p>The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling System</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>(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</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>the llg had GRS and a log book which had 16 cases at the time of assessment. the referral path was pinned on the llg public notice board. the llg had formal discription of GRS</p>
---	---	----------	--

	(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 had posted on the noticeboard the grievance handling mechanism	
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 appointed area land committee in the council that sat on 14th/6/2021 under min.06/06/2021 as seen from council minutes, appointment letters and the approval letter from CAO. also the committee minutes that sat on 13/6/2022.
<b>Assessment area: H. Basic (Pre &amp; Primary) Education services Management (in public and private schools)</b>				
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	A report on activities of awareness raising and Mobilization in education sector involving education stakeholders in different primary schools as dated 17/1/2022 and stamped.
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	4	LLG monitored all schools as evidenced Q3 monitoring report dated 7/4/2022 and stamped on 25/4/2022, Q4 report on schools supervision and inspection, Q2 report on school supervision and inspection dated 13/1/2021 and stamped and Q1 report on supervision and inspection dated 13/10/2022. There specific reports as well for each school as follows.  1. Huguka Primary school was monitored and data captured on 20/06/2022  2. Nyakashashara Primary school was monitored on 10/06/2022 and data on learners and teachers were captured  3. Bijubwe Primary school was monitored on 13/6/2022  4. Birunduma primary school was monitored on 10/06/2022 and 9/3/2022  5. Kamarya Primary school was monitored on 13/6/2022  6. Karengo Primary school was monitored on 10/6/2022 and 9/3/2022  7. Ryakyenda Primary school was monitored on 20/06/2022 and 10/3/2022  8. Nyakahita primary school was monitored on 15/6/2022

and 9/3/2022

9. Rurambira primary school was monitored on 9/3/2022 and 10/6/2022

10. Kyakabunga primary school was monitored on 14/6/2022 and 10/3/2022

11. Kyeera Primary school was monitored on 10/03/2022 and 23/6/2022

22

Existence and functionality of School Management Committees

Maximum score is 3

All the following 11 schools have functional school management committees as evidenced by the minutes of the meeting, action plan and attendance lists.

Huguka Primary school held SMC meetings on 17/01/2022, 21/5/2022 and 2/9/2022

2. Nyakashashara Primary school held SMC meetings on 24/5/2022 and 14/01/2022

3. Bijubwe Primary school held SMC meetings on 21/7/2022, 2/2/2022 and 28/4/2022

4. Birunduma primary school held SMC meetings on 31/6/2022 and 20/1/2022

5. Kamarya Primary school held SMC meetings on 21/7/2022, 05/3/2022 and 20/1/2022

6. Karengo Primary school held SMC meetings on 9/9/2022, 15/6/2022 and 21/01/2022.

7. Ryakyenda Primary school held SMC meetings on 13/9/2022, 27/5/2022 and 2/2/2022.

8. Nyakahita primary school held SMC meetings on 5/9/2022,

15/6/2022 and 27/01/2022.

9. Rurambira primary school held meetings on 20/5/2022, 15/2/2022, 14/9/2021 and 28/11/2019.

10. Kyakabunga primary school held SMC meetings on 24/5/2022, 18/1/2022 and 14/4/2021.

11. Kyeera Primary school held SMC meetings on 13/9/2022, 8/6/2022 and 25/1/2022.

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

3

### 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

Mobilisation and awareness on PHC activities dated 26/05/2022 was reviewed as well as the one held on 20/12/2021, awareness on covid-19 on 24/9/2021 and health awareness in schools done on 28/6/2022.

24	<p>The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>Evidence that LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY , score 4 or else score 0</p>	4	<p>SAS received monitoring report on 13/8/2021 , a performance report on 25/4/2022, a quarterly report on 2/8/2021 and health aspects of monitoring on 13/07/2021.</p>
25	<p>Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG; score 3, else score 0</p>	3	<p>All health Centers have HUMC committees with composition of 7 members according to minute 6 of the meeting held on 9/3/2020.</p> <p>Nyakashashara sub-county has three health centres and the HUMCs of these HCs have conducted meetings as follows;</p> <p>1.Nyakashashara Health Centre III held HUMC meeting on 9/6/2022, 18/3/2022, 8/12/2021 and 27/9/2021</p> <p>2.Nyakahita Health Centre HUMC meeting on 8/6/2022, 30/03/2022, 17/11/2021 and 22/9/2021</p> <p>3. Rurambira Health Centre HUMC meeting on 10/11/2022, 22/2/2022 and 12/5/2022</p> <p>The committees are functional as evidenced by the minutes of the above meetings.</p>
<b>Assessment area: J. Water &amp; Environment Services Management</b>				
26	<p>Evidence that the LLGs submitted requests to the DWO for consideration in the current FY budgets</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>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</p>	3	<p>The subcounty has the writing requests dated 28/4/2022 and submitted to the DWO for consideration in planning for this current FY. The requests were for the borehole facilities in some villages like kakyeeera ,akasheshero and Rushonga.</p>
27	<p>The LLG has monitored water and environment services delivery during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>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</p>	3	<p>SAS monitored all aspects of water and environment services on a quarterly basis quarter 1 on 20/7/2021 quarter 2 9/12/2021 and quarter 4 25/4/2022 and stamped 27/5/2022.the general observation was that all water sources were not fenced. The subcounty monitored all projects of water and environment services in subcounty.</p>

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	2	<p>The composition of all water sources are in place .The subcounty has 56 water sources 35 are functional and 17 water sources have the water user committees.ie kyakabunga p/s borehole,rwisiru borehole ,Nyakashashara HCIII water tank standard nursery and p/s rain water harvest tank among others. Standard nursery and p/s water harvest tank has a functional committee which sit regularly on 30/8/2022,dec 2021 and they have minutes for the sittings and and the action plan like they have accountability of community contributions for water facilities.</p> <p>-Nyakashashara seed school tank collected 9500 and used it to slash around the tank and clean inside the tank.</p> <p>-Nyakashashara HCII tank also collected 600000 = and used it on purchasing the tank.</p> <p>-Kamarya institional tank collected 18000 and used it to buy a lock for a tap.</p>
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	<p>The subcounty has the list of all updated water sources with functionality and their status and a report submitted to the DWO.The report submitted to the DWO is dated 8/3/2022.</p>

**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	<p>the llg collected, analyzed and submitted the production statistics report to lg production office evidenced by the DPOs stamp dated 3/6/21 and 29/6/22</p>
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	<p>the llg carried out awareness campaign on FMD, PPR and African army worm evidenced by the compiled reports with attendance lists attached and stamped by DPO dated on 3/2/2022 and 29/6/2022 respectively</p> <p>distribution lists of FMD, PPR vaccines, beans, maize seedlings and banana suckers were seen.</p>

36	<p>The LLG has carried out monitoring activities on production activities for crops, animals and fisheries</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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</p>	2	<p>The Agriculture Officer, Animal Husbandry Officer and Fisheries Officer all had the monthly monitoring reports combined and submitted to LG Production Office.</p>
37	<p>Farmer trainings through training farmer field schools and demonstrations organized and carried out</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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.</p>	2	<p>the llg carried out trainings on BBW, Coffee establishment, post harvest handling, effective use of acaricide, and group formation formation and fish folk. this was evidenced by the reports submitted to lg production office. the assessor was also able to see the training programs stamped by DPO</p>
38	<p>The LLG has provided hands-on extension support to farmers and farmer organizations / groups</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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</p>	2	<p>the extension workers extended support on BBW, coffee management and tick control as seen in the famer field reports and household visits stamped by the DPO</p> <p>Nyamucungira Godfrey was Sampled On 0774110212 among the famers supported</p>