



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Rwenshande

(Vote Code: 273486)

Score 78/100 (78%)

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>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 RWESHANDE Subcounty constituted PDCs with composition of 7 members for each of the 3 Parishes i.e Kanyanya Parish, Akabaare Parish, and Ifura 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:</p> <p>Ifura Parish (22 groups-434 members),</p> <p>Akabaare Parish (24 groups -402 members), and</p> <p>Kanyanya Parish (19 groups-256 members).</p> <p>All this Evidence was obtained from Parish Chief files and PDM file for CDO of Rwenshande sub-county</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	no evidence
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</p>	0	<p>no evidence</p> <p>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</p>

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

2022/2023. The Subcounty Chief (SAS) wrote to all Village executive committees and PDCs on 30th April 2022 and clearly indicated the only approved project to be implemented in FY 2022/23 which was:

1. Grading of Ekijigija-Akabaare Road at UGX 3.436,585 funded by DDEG and 1 Million from LRR.

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 17/05/2022 which was on file. The letter indicated different priority enterprises for each of the respective three parishes. 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 and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines

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 III; score 1 or else 0

0

development plan was not seen

Maximum score is 6

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 3 Parishes submitted their ranked priorities to SAS as follows: Kanyanya Parish (on: 05/09/2021), Akabaare Parish (on: 08/09/2021) and Ifura Parish (on: 25/09/2021). The project in the approved AWP and Budget was seen on the list of the submissions from the Parishes specifically Akabaare Parish. All Submissions 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:	0	budget conference report not seen
	iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0		
	iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0	1	<p>Analysis of Rweshande LLG Approved workplan and budget for FY 2022/2023 established inclusion of investments to be financed by the LLG. Namely:</p> <p>1. Grading of Ekijigija-Akabaare Road at UGX 3,436,585/= to be funded by DDEG 2.436,585/= and 1 Million to be funded by LRR.</p> <p>The LLG was compliant.</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	1	<p>LLG developed project profiles for all the one capital investment in the AWP and Budget as per format in NDP III and was annexed to the budget and the annual workplan as one document. The LLG was compliant.</p>
	vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0	1	<p>The LLG budget was submitted to the District before 15th May 2022. The assessor was provided with evidence of submission letter dated 11th May 2022 which on file. The Letter was stamped received by Chief Administrative Officer's Office and by the District Planner on 11/May/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>	<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>2</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 28th April 2022 stamped received by CAOs Office and Procurement and Disposal Unit on 28th April 2022.</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>	<p>Evidence that the investments in</p>	<p>Rweshande Subcounty was allocated DDEG totaling to UGX: 3,045,731/= for the FY 2022/2023. The analysis of the approved Budget for FY 2022/23 for Rweshande Subcounty provided evidence that the investments to be funded by DDEG i.e Grading of Ekijigija-Akabaare Road at UGX 3,436,585/= was to be funded by DDEG 2.436,585/= and 1 Million to be funded by LRR.</p>

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

UGX 2,436,585/= 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: 304,573/= (10%) and UGX 304,573/= (10%) on Support to Parish Planning 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)
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

The llg collected 82.8%=13,568,500/= of the revised budgeted =16,390,500 evidenced in the revised budget and AFS. however, the minute revising the budget was not seen

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

N/A
the llg become operational effective 1/7/2021

9

The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY
Maximum score 4

Evidence that the LLG:
i. Has remitted OSR to the administrative units, score 1 or else score 0.

0

The llg remitted 21.7% as remittance to lower administrative units as evidenced by transfer vouchers: 3/4=54000, 1/6=1560,000, 3/3=47500, 2/12=79,176, 3/12=395,878 and 4/11=139947

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 13.27%=1,170,000/= on councilors' allowances as evidenced in the AFS under trial balances and transfer payment vouchers: 12/12=400,000 dated 23/12/2021, 1/4=310000 dated 5/4/2022 and 10/5=460000 dated 31/5/2022

Evidence that the LLG:
iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0

1

the llg spent 10.2% of OSR on O&M evidenced by the payment voucher: 05/5=900,000/= dated 16/5/2022

Evidence that the LLG:

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

there was no evidence that the llg publicized collection and expenditure of OSR on the noticeboard

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

the llg submitted AFS on 31/8/2022 as evidenced by the hard copy of submission letter stamped by auditor general

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

the llg submitted quarterly reports from previous FY;
quarter One: 10/10/2021 as evidenced by a hard copy of submission letter stamped by planner and CAO

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

the llg submitted quarterly reports from previous FY;
quarter two: 06/1/2022 as evidenced by a hard copy of submission letter stamped by planner and CAO

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

the llg submitted quarterly reports from previous FY;
quarter three: 8/4/2022 as evidenced by a hard copy of submission letter stamped by planner and CAO

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

the llg submitted quarterly reports from previous FY;
quarter three: 14/7/2022 as evidenced by a hard copy of

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

submission letter stamped by planner and CAO

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: (i) All staff in the LLG including extension workers in the previous FY (by 30th June): score 2 or else 0 Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG: (ii) Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0 Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG: (iii) HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else 0	0 0 0	No evidence that all LLG staff were appraised including extension workers. The Ilg has 3 public primary schools and there is no evidence that head teachers were appraised in the stipulated time. The subcounty has only one health centre but there is no evidence that he was appraised.
13	Staff duty attendance Maximum score is 6	Evidence that the LLG has (i) Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 3 or else 0 Evidence that the LLG has (ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0	3 0	The Ilg has a staff list publicised on the notice board stamped 16/8/2022. The Ilg has no evidence that SAS produced monthly analysis reports and with recommendations submitted to CAO.

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	The LLG was new and did not have DDEG IPFs in FY 2021/22 when the LLG started. Therefore there was no expenditure incurred which hence could not be termed as Not eligible.
----	--	---	---	---

15	The LLG spent the funds as per budget			Rweshande subcounty provided evidence that the budget execution in FY 2021/2022 did not deviate from +/-10% for sectors/main programs. The analysis of final accounts showed that out of the revised budget of UGX 46,979,492/=, a total of 46,522,866/= (99%) was realized at. All sectors performed at 100% except Administration which performed at 97.168%
	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	The LLG was complaint since no deviations in excess of +/-10% were recorded.
16	Completion of investments as per annual work plan and budget	Evidence that the investment projects planned in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of FY (quarter four) :		Rweshande Sub-was a new LLG which purely operated on Locally raised revenues for its first year of operation as no Central Government Funding was obtained. Towards the end of the Financial Year (May 2022) the subcounty received start up funds which had clear guidelines that majorly were recurrent in nature. The LLG used part of these funds to procure office furniture at a total of UGX 5 Million as evidenced by Vouchers: v/8/5, v7/5, v5/5, v5/6, v9/6 and v13/6 totaling 5 million UGX. All the procured items were seen in the office premises being used. Completion of procurement and supply of all these office assets was therefore done fully at 100%.
	Maximum score is 3	If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3 If 70% -90%: Score 2 If less than 70 %: Score 0.	3	

Assessment area: G. Environmental and Social Safeguards

17	The LLG has implemented environmental and social safeguards during the previous FY	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	No Screening was done as no projects were implemented in the Previous FY
	Maximum score is 2			
18	The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling System	(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		
	Maximum score is 2	(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

19	The LLG has a functional land management system	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	<p>the llg had a function area land committee as evidenced by the committee minutes that sat on 4/6/2022, 10/6/2022 and 14/7/2022 and the appointment letters of area land committee:</p> <p>Katushabe Agnes-C/P</p> <p>Rutinampora stephen-v/p</p> <p>Nyesiga Charles- member</p> <p>Kusasira Stephen-member</p> <p>Natukunda Edhance-member. t</p> <p>the committee was appointed by the llg council that sat on 28/9/2021 underr MIN:007/RCC/09/2021</p>
----	---	---	---	---	---

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	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	Monitoring report of Rwenshande primary school on awareness raising and mobilization activities in the education sector compiled on 29/3/2022 and 26/6/2022 with the attached attendance lists.
21	Monitoring of service delivery in basic schools	4	<p>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:</p> <p>If all schools (100%) - score 4</p> <p>If 80 – 99% – score 2</p> <p>If 60 to 79% score 1</p> <p>Below 60% score 0</p>	4	Monitoring and supervising of all schools in Rwenshande sub-county compiled on 21/01/2022. schools monitored are Rwenshande Primary School on 19/05/2022. Akabaare primary school on 6/6/2022. Kanyanya Primary School on 15/6/2022. Shield of faith Primary school 15/6/2022 was monitored on 14/6/2022. Kagunga memorial school was monitored on 10/6/2022.
22	Existence and functionality of School Management Committees	3	Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools; score 3,	3	<p>Rwenshande LLG schools have school management committees in place and are functional as evidenced by the minutes of the meetings in place.</p> <p>1) Kanyanya primary school Joint meeting held on 12/5/2022 and 8/3/2022 with action plan and extent of implementation</p>

else score 0

2) Rweshande Primary school minutes of the meeting held on 24/6/2022 with 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	3	A report on awareness campaigns and community Mobilization for improvement of PHC compiled on 28/6/2022. A report on Task force activities in the sub-county compiled on 30/09/2021 as per minutes of the meetings held on 20th 26th 20th and 6th of September against Covid-19. A report on surveillance of covid-19 and attendance lists.
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	4th Quarter report on health performance indicate that the facility was monitored as activities highlighted, the report was compiled on 28/6/2022. Also 3rd quarter report compiled on 23/04/2022, in the second quarter report on health performance report compiled on 26/11/2021.
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	HUMC is in place. It is composed of 9 committee members as resolved by the sub-county sitting on 28/9/2021 under min 007/RCC/09/2021. All HUMC members have appointment letters. All HUMC minutes have action plans. Meetings were held on 8/6/2022, 12/4/2022, 7/1/2022 and 12/10/2021.

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	The llg has a writing request submitted to the DWO for consideration in this current FY The submission request was dated 20/5/2022. The water request was for Kanyanya A requesting for a water tank.
27	The LLG has			

	monitored water and environment services delivery during the previous FY	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	SAS monitored all aspects of water and environment services on a quarterly basis. The reports cover both the new and old facilities covered. The reports are quarter 1 20/8/2021, quarter 1/11/2021, however the CDO water focal person produced three reports in only 4th quarter 15/6/2022.
	Maximum score is 3			
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	The subcounty has 12 water sources and they all have water user committees composed of 7 members. fore example rwekoboro sat on 31/12/2021 with minutes .Rwenshande HCIII water tank sat on 29/10/2021 led by Twijukye Robert. Akabare borehole has minutes that sat on 4/12/2021 led by Ashaba Wilber. They opened an account with Rushere Sacco for their community contributions.
	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	2	The subcounty has an updated list of all water sources with their functionality status dated 20/7/2022.
	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.	2	A report on production statistic for Coffee seen dated 28/06/2022 and statistic analysis for Coffee, Banana and fruits done and submitted to DPMO on 01/07/2022 complied by the AO. report on production statistics for livestock population done dated 14/06/2022 and an analysis done of 21354 cattles, 37,243 goats and 9548 sheep in the sub county list of milk cooler in the subcounty dated 30/06/2022 and recieved by DVO on 30/06/2022, prepared by the DVO
	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	2	Report on awareness on African Army warm dated 11/04/2022, received by the DPMO on 13/04/2022 and an attendance list of 46 people attached. Distribution list for Pesticides for African Army warm , 25 litres distributed to 22 beneficiaries in all parishes of the sub county in place. Distribution list for 1245 doses for vaccination of FMD to 19 beneficiaries in place to all parishes in the sub county the Awareness report for Animal Husbandry not in place.
	Maximum score is 2			

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>	0	<p>Only five monitoring report were in place</p> <p>22/04/2022- Monitoring farmers affected by hailstorms recieved by DPMO on 30/3/2022</p> <p>30/06/2022- Monitoring coffee farmers</p> <p>17/11/2021- Monitoring farmers affected by Banana Rust disease and submitted to DPMO on 17/11/2021</p> <p>11/5/2022- Monitoring farmesr affected by crop pests and diseases recieved by DPMO on 11/5/2022</p> <p>13/04/2022monitoring on effective use of acaricides recieved by the DVO on 13/4/2022</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>Training program prepared by the AO, dated 5/3/2022 and recieved by the DPMO on 01/7/2022 for a period between 28/03/2022 and 26/06/2022.</p> <p>Report on training farmers on how to control BBW dated 29/06/2022 and recieved by the DPMO on 29/06/2022 with an attendance list of 30 people.</p> <p>Report on training Model farmers dated 29/06/2022 recieved by DPMO on 29/06/2022 with an attendance list of 60 persons</p> <p>Training report for farmers on imprvemet of yields nd enhancing technologies dates 28/01/2022 with an attendance list of 80 people recieved by the DVO on 23/02/2022</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>Report on extension support for coffee farmers on agronomic management practices dated 22/05/2022 and received by DPMO. 4 farmers visited ie Kibuka scovia, Kishunju Charles, Rushambuza John, and Musasizi Herbert.</p> <p>report on training farmers on pasture planting and management dated 13/05/2022 and recieved by DPMO on 13/05/2022. 3 farmers visited Musheruzi Wilber, Tumurebire Elly and Mugabi Appolo visited.</p>