



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Rwetamu

(Vote Code: 273487)

Score 96/100 (96%)

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 Rwetamu Subcounty constituted PDCs with composition of 7 members for each of the 4 Parishes i.e Rwetamu Parish, Kanitsya Parish, Akajumbura Parish and Bugweiraro 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 four parishes were on file together with lists of the beneficiary enterprise groups and membership as follows: Rwetamu Parish (15 groups-254 members), Kanitsya Parish (08 groups -94 members), Akajumbura Parish (15 groups and 228 members) and Bugweiraro Parish (11 groups-228 members).</p> <p>All this Evidence was obtained from a file code named CDO PDM File 2022-20223 green 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	No data seen
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>	2	<p>Rwetamu Subcounty held a PDM awareness and sensitization meeting which was attended by a number of CBOs among others; Rwetamu Dairy Cooperative, Akajumbura Youth Development Association, Kashongi Farmers SACCO. The representatives of these CBOs participated in the meetings as evidenced in the minutes of the meetins and the report of the awareness creation. The representatives as evidenced from the minutes rallied people of Rwetamu to embrace the PDM and interest them selves in planning for the development of 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 wel as the mapping report.</p> <p>The LLG was compliant.</p>

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 30th May 2022 (Letter on file and was also on Notice board by the time of Assessment. The letter which was titled "Approved projects for Rwetamu S/C FY 2022/2023" clearly indicated all the three approved projects as follows:

1. Grading and shaping of Nyakayaga-Nayikondo Road funded by DDEG
2. Grading and Shaping of Nyakayanga-Rwetamu P/S CAR funded by DDEG and
3. Disilting of Nyakayaga Public Dam funded by 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 14/03/2022 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 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:

1

Maximum score is 6
i. Is consistent with the LLG approved development plan III; score 1 or else 0

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 approved projects namely:

- 1-Grading and shaping of Nyakayaga-Nayikondo Road funded by DDEG
- 2-Grading and Shaping of Nyakayanga-Rwetamu P/S CAR funded by DDEG and
- 3-Disilting of Nyakayaga Public Dam funded by LRR.

All these projects were on page 68 of the LLG development plan, page 6 of the AWP and page 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: Rwetamu Parish (on: 02/09/2021), Kanitsya Parish (on: 24/08/2021), Bugweiraro Parish (on: 01/09/2021) and Akajumbura Parish (on: 01/09/2021). All the three projects in the approved AWP and Budget were seen on the lists of the submissions from the Parishes which were duly 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: 1

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

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 was in place and the ranked priorities from each parish were presented and discussed in the budget conference which was held on 10/09/2021. Budget conference report (page 2) had all the three projects in the approved Annual Work plan and Budget for the current FY 2022/23.

The LLG was compliant.

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

Analysis of Rwetamu LLG Approved workplan and budget for FY 2022/2023 established inclusion of investments to be financed by the LLG. Namely Disiliting of Nyakayaga Public Dam using Locally raised revenue among other investments to be funded by DDEG namely: 1-Grading and shaping of Nyakayaga-Nayikondo Road funded by DDEG

2-Grading and Shaping of Nyakayanga-Rwetamu P/S CAR funded by DDEG.

The LLG was compliant.

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

LLG developed project profiles for all the three 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.

The LLG was compliant.

vi. That the LLG budget was

The LLG budget was submitted to the District before 15th May 2022. The assessor was provided with evidence of submission letter dated 09th May 2022 which on file code named Budget File. The Letter was stamped received by

	submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0	1	Chief Administrative Officer's Office and by the District Planner on 9/May/2022. The LLG was Compliant.
5	Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement Maximum score is 2	Evidence that the LLG prepared and submitted inputs into the procurement plan for all the procurements to be done in a LLG for the current FY) to the CAO/TC by the 30th April of the previous FY, Score 2 or else score 0	2 The LLG 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. The LLG was Compliant.
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 Rwetamu Subcounty was allocated DDEG totaling to UGX: 3,045,751 for the FY 2022/2023. The analysis of the approved Budget for FY 2022/23 for Rwetamu Subcounty provided evidence that the investments to be funded by DDEG i.e 1-Grading and shaping of Nyakayaga-Nayikondo Road and 2-Grading and Shaping of Nyakayanga-Rwetamu P/S CAR all at a total of 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 7-9. 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.	1 The llg collected 100% of OSR budgeted. Evidenced by the revised budget of FY 21/22 under minute 09/4/2022 in the council that sat on 29th/4/2022. The locally raised revenue was revised from 11m to 34.111m and from AFS 34.111m was collected
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 N/A: the llg become operational on 1/7/2021

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 Ilg remitted 25% and 5% of OSR to the villages and parishes respectively as evidence from vouchers and trial balance in AFS

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

14% of OSR was spent on councilors allowance-evidence AFS

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 Ilg spent 13% of OSR on O&M evidenced on transfer vouchers.

Evidence that the LLG:

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

the Ilg publicized collection and expenditure of OSR on the Ilg 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 Ilg submitted AFS on 30th/8/2022

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

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

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

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.

Q1: 5/10/2021

Q2: 7/1/2022

Q3: 8/4/2022

Q4: 11th/7/2022

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:

1

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

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.

Q1: 5/10/2021

Q2: 7/1/2022

Q3: 8/4/2022

Q4: 11th/7/2022

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

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

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.

Q1: 5/10/2021

Q2: 7/1/2022

Q3: 8/4/2022

Q4: 11th/7/2022

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

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

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.

Q1: 5/10/2021

Q2: 7/1/2022

Q3: 8/4/2022

Q4: 11th/7/2022

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

12

Appraisal of all staff in the LLG in the previous FY

Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:

Maximum score is 6

(i) All staff in the LLG including extension workers in the previous FY (by 30th June): score 2 or else 0

2

The staff list, staff structure, performance plan ,appraisal reports are all in place.

-SAS appraised all the LLG staff including extension workers by 30/6/2022.

Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:

The subcounty has only 2 public primary schools ie

(ii) Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0

2

Akajumbura p/s and Rwetamu p/s.

The two schools have head teachers and were all appraised by 27/12/2021.

Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:

2

-The subcounty has only one health in-charge and he was appraised by stipulated dates.

(iii) HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else

-The appraisal forms were dated 30/6/2022.

13

Staff duty attendance

Evidence that the LLG has

Maximum score is 6

(i) Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 3 or else 0

3

Publicized the LLG staff on the subcounty notice board dated 30/6/2022.

Evidence that the LLG has

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

3

LLG did monthly analysis reports for all staffs at the subcounty with recommendations 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

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

Maximum score is 2

The LLG had no DDEG allocation for FY 2022/2023 and as such the LLG was awarded a free score since there was no expenditure regarded as not eligible.

15

The LLG spent the funds as per budget

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

Maximum score is 2

Rwetamu 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 revised budget of UGX 63,356,300/= was realized fully 100%. All sectors performed at 100%.

The LLG was complaint since no deviations 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) :

Maximum score

Rwetamu Subcounty executed the following projects:

1-erecting of a metallic Flag pole in front of the rented Office premises.

2-Procurement of Office equipment, furniture and a metallic

is 3	If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3	3	lockable shelf.
	If 70% -90%: Score 2		All these were fully acquired using the Start-up-funds and Locally raised revenues. The procured items were all in place seen and being utilized for their purposes as required.
	If less than 70 %: Score 0.		Completion rate was at 100%.

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	The llg had not planned to implement any project in previous year (2021/22). The llg became operational effective July 2021.
	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 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 llg appointed Kanyesigye Amon to coordinate response to feedback, had a log book, formal description of GRS posted on noticeboard
	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	1	The llg had GRS posted on sub-county noticeboard
19	The LLG has a functional land management system	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 a council that sat on 9th/8/2022, approved in the district council that sat on 29th/03/2022 under MIN:KFC/5/03/22 as evidenced by the approval letter from CAO, appointment letters and the committee minutes dated 24/8/2021, and 5/11/2021
	Maximum score 1			

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

20	Awareness campaigns and mobilization on education services	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness		Rwetamu conducted awareness campaigns and mobilization activities with as evidenced by reports on
----	--	---	--	---

conducted in last FY	campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery	3	Schools that is 4/3/2022 at Rwetamu Primary school and 2/6/2022 at Akajumbura primary school. The awareness was done with joint school management committees PTA and SMCs, the subcounty officials as the stakeholders.
Maximum score is 3	score 3, else score 0		

21	Monitoring of service delivery in basic schools	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:	4	Rwetamu sub-county has Monitored primary schools as evidenced by the monitoring reports for each school(1) Promise primary school monitored on 16/06/2022 with details such as student teacher ratios for all classes (2) Happy hours Model primary school monitored on 8/6/2022 (3) Rwetamu primary school monitored 6/6/2022 (4) Akajumbura primary school monitored 17/06/2022. There was also a general report for quarter 1,3 and 4 on monitoring and supervision of schools with a list of issues to present to the council.
Maximum score is 4	If all schools (100%) - score 4	If 80 – 99% – score 2		
	If 60 to 79% score 1			
	Below 60% score 0			

22	Existence and functionality of School Management Committees	Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools;	3	Rwetamu sub-county has functional school Management committees for all schools. This was evidenced by minutes of the schools committees. (1) Akajumbura primary school PTA and SMC joint meeting minutes of meeting held on 31/05/2022 with their respective attendance list, action plan and extent of implementation. (2) Rwetamu Primary school SMC meeting minutes of the meeting held on 4/3/2022 with respective action plan and extent of implementation and attendance list, another SMC meeting was held on 10/6/2022 with the attendance list, as well as action plan. (3) Happy hours model primary school Rwetamu minutes of the SMC meeting held on 25/3/2022 with the action plan and extent of the implementation. (4) Promise primary school general parents meeting held on 11/02/2022 with the action plan and extent of implementation.
Maximum score is 3	score 3, else score 0			

Assessment area: I. Primary Health Care Services Management

23	Awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery	3	Rwetamu Sub-county conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities as evidenced by reports on (1) community awareness about covid-19 second wave which started June 2021 carried out on 5/7/2021 at Rwetamu sub-county. (2) There was a community awareness on Immunization in Rwetamu sub-county on 12/11/2021 at Akajumbura Catholic church. (3) There was also community awareness about sanitation and Hygiene campaign held on 18/05/2022.
Maximum score is 3	score 3, else score 0			

24 The LLG

<p>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>	<p>4</p> <p>Rwetamu LLG has one health centre III called Rwetamu Health centre III. Reviewing reports of quarter one done on 27/09/2021 with detailed activities done in the quarter highlighting challenges and Recommendations as well as 4th Quarter Performance reports for the health centre indicate that monitoring was done in addition to other several monitoring reports to the executive committee dated 20/01/2022.</p>
--	--	--

<p>25</p> <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>	<p>3</p> <p>The health unit management Committee (HUMC) is composed of 9 committee members. From the HUMC minutes of the meeting held at the unit on the 13/9/2021,30/12/2021 , 18/03/2022 and 25/05/2022 were reviewed each with the participants list and the action plan as well as extent of the implementation.</p>
--	---	--

Assessment area: J. Water & Environment Services Management

<p>26</p> <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>	<p>3</p> <p>The subcounty has submitted the writing requests dated 30/5/2022 to the DWO for consideration in the planning of the current FY.</p>
---	---	--

<p>27</p> <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>	<p>3</p> <p>There is evidence that SAS monitored all aspects of water and environment services .the subcounty did its monitoring on quarterly basis ie quarter 1,quarter 2,quarter 3 and quarter 4.</p>
---	---	---

<p>28</p> <p>Existence and functionality of Water and Sanitation Committees</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG have functional Water and Sanitation Committees (including</p>	<p>The WUC are constituted with 9 members and there is evidence that the water user committees are functional and there some extent of implementation .The subcounty has 4 water sources and all of the have committees that are functional ie Nyakayanga borehole sat on 17/11/2021 and their chair person is mr Turyatunga Arther. They also had the action of their community contributions showing the break down.they collected 425000.</p> <p>-fencing -250000</p>
---	---	--

collection and proper use of community contributions) score 2, else score 0

2

Labour -100000

Lunch -55000

Slashing -20000

-Another water user committee of Bugweraro borehole also has minutes dated 7/6/2022

-Akajumbura borehole as minutes dated 12/2/2022 and the chair person is Kiiza Godfrey.

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 the all water sources and sanitation facilities and their functionality status dated 29/6/2022.

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

The assessor was able to see a hard copy report of updated crop, livestock and baseline micro scale irrigation statistical data submitted to production office and stamped as of 18th/7/2022

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

The llg had hard copies of distribution lists of FMD, PPR vaccines, maize and dudu cypermethrine pesticide distributed on 18th/11/2021 and 9th/3/22 respectively

As well the llg had submitted sensitization reports to DPO on post-harvest handling, pest and disease control, farm technologies and sse of modern crush with attendance lists attached

Maximum score is 2

36

The LLG has carried out monitoring activities on production activities for

If the LLG extension staff has implemented monitoring activities on agricultural production for crops, animal and fisheries covering among others irrigation, environmental

The extension workers submitted monitoring reports on

<p>crops, animals and fisheries</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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>	<p>0</p>	<p>profiling famers on pasture management-18th/11/2021, post-harvest of coffee 29/11/2021 and also from SAS the assessor obtained two supervision reports dated 7/11/2022 and 3/6/2022. However the monitoring reports were not reported monthly as required from the manual</p>
<p>37</p> <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>	<p>2</p>	<p>The llg carried out trainings on postharvest handling, appropriate farm technologies, famer profiling and use of modern crush to control ticts as observed in training reports stamped by DPO with attendance lists attached and also as planed in the training program</p>
<p>38</p> <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>	<p>2</p>	<p>The extension worker carried out farmer field visits in December 2021 and April 2022 on livestock treatment, silage, and modern crush, and the agriculturalist demonstrated coffee spraying as of 30th/6/22, soil fertility-12/5/2022 as observed in the field visit reports stamped by DPO</p> <p>Sampled farmer: Kasiri John-0774513746</p> <p>The extension workers never had extension dairies as they were not provided in year 20/21and the information from LG Production office, they will soon be replaced with e-diaries.</p>