



THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA

OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER

LOWER LOCAL GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT MANUAL

MAY, 2022



The Republic of Uganda

OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER

**LOWER LOCAL GOVERNMENT
PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT
MANUAL**

MAY, 2022

Table of Contents

Foreword	iii
Acronyms/Abbreviations	v
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background to the Performance Assessment System	1
1.2 Overview of the Performance Assessment and Improvement Framework	2
1.3 Principles and Scope for the design of the LLG performance assessment system ...	4
2 Elaboration of the Process and Organization of the LLG PA	6
2.1 Preparatory Activities by LLGs	6
2.1.1 Submission of Reports by LLGs to LGs	6
2.1.2 Internal Mock Assessment	6
2.2 LLG Performance Assessment by LG	6
2.2.1 Collection of Information	6
2.2.2 Compiling and Internal Quality Assurance of the LLG PA Reports	7
2.2.3 Grievance Redress Procedures	7
2.2.4 Internal Endorsement of the Performance Assessment Results	7
2.2.5 Presentation and Submission of the LLGs PA Results	8
2.3 Independent Verification, Approval and Use of the Results	8
2.3.1 Verification of Results and Sanctioning False Reporting	8
2.3.2 Joint Review and Verification of Results	8
2.3.3 Final Approval of the Results	8
2.3.4 Use of the Performance Assessment Results to allocate part of the DDEG	8
2.3.5 Dissemination of LLG PA Results and Implications	9
2.3.6 Use of the results for development and implementation of PIPs	9
2.4 Overview of Timing/Scheduling of Activities	9
3 Indicators and Assessment Procedures	11

Foreword

Government of Uganda is implementing the Intergovernmental Fiscal Transfer Reforms (IGFTRs) with the objective of: (i) improving the adequacy, equity and increasing discretion in the financing of local service delivery; and (ii) improving Local Government performance in the management of local service delivery. This implies that the efficiency and effectiveness of the Lower Local Government (LLGs) is of critical importance for local development and the well-being of the citizens. To achieve the above objectives, Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) has coordinated and designed a comprehensive Performance Assessment System for LLGs. The assessment system is a set of combined performance areas of focus and dimensions across sectors that has been developed as a basis for elaborating the LLG performance assessment system. This assessment is the first of its kind under the UGIFT program particularly under the component of improvement in service delivery.

The manual has been developed through a review of existing LLG reporting arrangements, lessons learnt from the Local Government Performance Assessment (LGPA), consultations with respective MDAs and selected LGs/LLGs as well as field testing and refinement. In addition, this manual has been presented to the Fiscal Decentralization Technical Committee which has provided technical guidance at every stage of development. This has allowed for refinement and final approval by the FDTC to disseminate and orient all LGs and their LLGs on the organization and process of the manual.

I trust that this manual will be efficiently utilized in order to contribute to efforts to improve LLG performance and service delivery. I also encourage LGs and their LLGs to embrace this manual as a key tool to not only prepare for the assessment process but also use it as a basis for continuous improvements in the execution of their mandated roles and responsibilities.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all representatives from the various MDAs and LGs that made compilation of this manual possible. These include; Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development; Ministry of Local Government; Local Government Finance Commission; Ministry of Education and Sports; Ministry of Health; Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries; Ministry of Water and Environment; Ministry of Public Service; National Environment Management Authority and Local Governments.

My office also acknowledges the technical and financial support received through the Overseas Development Institute-Budget Strengthening Initiative (ODI-BSI) and the World

Bank. I look forward to further collaboration with all stakeholders in improving service delivery in the country.

For God and my Country.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a series of loops on the left and a long horizontal stroke ending in a small hook on the right.

Geoffrey Sseremba

For; Permanent Secretary

Acronyms/Abbreviations

AFS	Annual Financial Statement
AWP	Annual Work Plan
AWPB	Annual Work plan Budget
ATC	Assistant Town Clerk
BCC	Budget Call Circular
CAO	Chief Administrative Officer
CG	Central Government
DDEG	Discretionary Development Equalization Grant
DWO	District Water Officer
DTPC	District Technical Planning Committee
EMIS	Education Management Information System
EOI	Expression of Interest
ESCC	Environment Social and Climate Change
FDTC	Fiscal Decentralization Technical Committee
FY	Fiscal Year
GAPR	Government Annual Performance Report
GRC	Grievance Redress Committee
HLG	Higher Local Government
HMIS	Health Management Information System
HRM	Human Resource Management
IGFTR	Intergovernmental Fiscal Transfer Reforms
IPFs	Indicative Planning Figures
IVA	Independent Verification Agent
LGPA	Local Government Performance Assessment
LGs	Local Governments
LLGs	Lower Local Governments
LGMSD PA	Local Government Management of Service Delivery Performance Assessment
LG TPC	Local Government Technical Planning Committee
MDAs	Ministries, Departments, and Agencies
MOFPED	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
MOLHUD	Ministry of Lands Housing and Urban Development.
MIS	Management Information System
MLGs	Municipal Local Governments
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NATs	National Assessment Teams
CBOs	Community Based Organizations
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations

O&M	Operation and Maintenance
OPM	Office of the Prime Minister
OTIMS	Online Information Transfer Management System
OSR	Own Source Revenue
PBS	Programme Budgeting System
PDC	Parish Development Committee
PDM	Parish Development Model
PDU	Procurement and Disposal Unit
PIP	Performance Improvement Plan
QA	Quality Assurance
USMID	Uganda Support to Municipal Infrastructure Development
SAS	Senior Assistant Secretary
SMC	School Management Committee
TC	Town Council
WSCs	Water Source Committees
WSS	Water Supply and Sanitation Services
WDC	Ward Development Committees

Note that the terms below are used interchangeably in the manual across the different types LGs

Rural LGs	Urban LGs
Village	Cell
Parish	Ward
Parish Chief	Town Agent
PDC	WDC

INTRODUCTION

1

1.1 Background to the Performance Assessment System

Government of Uganda is implementing Intergovernmental Fiscal Transfer Reforms (IGFTRs) with the objectives of: (i) improving the adequacy, equity and increasing discretion in the financing of local service delivery; (ii) improving Central Government performance in the oversight, management, and delivery of LG services; (iii) improving LG performance in the management of local service delivery; and (iv) improving the effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery by frontline providers.

To achieve objectives (ii)-(iv) above the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) is coordinating the design and implementation of a comprehensive Performance Assessment System encompassing three levels as follows:

- Level 1 - Service Delivery Facility and LLG Performance focusing on incentivizing improvement in the performance of schools, health and LLGs.
- Level 2- LG Management of Service Delivery focusing on incentivizing improvements in the LG management of Education, Health, Water & Environment; micro-scale Irrigation and crosscutting issues; and
- Level 3 - Central Government (CG) Management of Service Delivery focusing on incentivizing improvement in Central Government Performance in the oversight, management and delivery of services

Level 2 of the performance assessment system has been executed since 2018 to date and has led to some results in the management of resources at the LG level, as depicted in the improvement of LGPA results over the said period.

The above achievements notwithstanding, GoU noted that improving the adequacy and equity of resources as well as strengthening processes and systems at LG level alone are not sufficient, given that it is at the Lower Local Governments (LLG) that many of the core service delivery functions with impact on the citizens' daily life takes place. This implies that the efficiency and effectiveness of the LLGs is of critical importance for local development and the well-being of the citizens.

Therefore, the performance assessment and improvement framework were revised to, among others, strengthen the focus on issues related with areas of importance for effective service delivery. A set of combined performance areas of focus and dimensions across sectors was developed as a basis for elaborating the assessment system under the three levels mentioned above, including on LLG performance.

The development of the system has involved review of existing LLG reporting arrangements, lessons learnt from the LG PA, consultations with respective MDAs and select LGs/LLGs as well as field testing and refinement.

The LLG performance assessment system, to be rolled out country wide from FY 2022/23 and impacting on the FY 2023/24 grant allocations and onwards, is designed to be simple and amenable to: (i) the ongoing routine functions of LGs over LLGs, including inspection, monitoring, and support supervision; and (ii) support the new Government policies. It is targeted to:

- a) Addressing constraints to service delivery efforts;
- b) Incentivizing improvement in performance of: (i) crosscutting areas e.g. planning, budgeting, procurement and reporting among others; and (ii) sector specific especially in rural water and micro-scale irrigation; and
- c) Ensuring the successful implementation of the Parish Development Model.

1.2 Overview of the Performance Assessment and Improvement Framework

Below is an overview of the various “Levels” in the comprehensive performance assessment system.

Issue	Level 1 – Service Delivery Facility and LLG Performance			Level 2 LG Management of Service Delivery		Level 3 CG Management of Service Delivery
	1a) Schools	1b) Health	1c) LLGs – performance measures	2a Minimum conditions (MCs)	2b: Performance measures (PMs)	Education, Health, Water & Environment, Micro-scale Irrigation and Crosscutting MDAs
1. Target						
2. Objective	Incentivize improvements in processes and outputs at the school level	Incentivize improvements in processes and delivery of health services	Incentivize improvements in LLG management & service delivery across core sectors	Address basic safeguards and core blockages to service delivery.	Incentivize improvements in the LG management of Education, Health, Water & Environment; micro-scale Irrigation and Crosscutting issues	Incentivize improvement in Central Government Management of Service Delivery
3. Timing	To be decided	To be decided	July – Sept	Sept – Jan	Sept – Jan	Sept – Jan
4. Assessment Method and compilation of results	Use school inspection reports	Use DHMTC Reports	District / Municipal (LG TPC)	Contracted private firm	Contracted private firm	MDAs reporting against agreed actions.

Issue	Level 1 – Service Delivery Facility and LLG Performance			Level 2 LG Management of Service Delivery		Level 3 CG Management of Service Delivery
	Contracted firm	Contracted firm	Same firm contracted for LGMSD PA	Contracted firm	Spot checks & Contracted firm	Contracted firm
5. Independent verification of results						
6. Impact / use	- Allocation of part of the capitation grants; - Performance improvement support	- Allocation of part of the NWR grants; - Performance improvement support	- Allocation part of the DDEG; - Performance improvement support	- Impact on the allocation of the performance component of the development grants; - Inform performance improvement support		- Impact on the size of grant from World Bank to GoU

This Assessment Manual focuses **on Level 1C**, which covers the Performance Assessment of LLGs (Sub-counties, Municipal Divisions, City Divisions and Town Councils).

1.3 Principles and Scope for the design of the LLG performance assessment system

No	Issue	Guiding Principle
A Assessment Process		
1.	Timing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment results must be ready before the Independent Verification Agent (IVA) team visits the LGs As the LGMSD Assessment team is the IVA, then the LLG assessment must be completed before October Therefore, LLG assessment to be conducted between August and September.
2.	Assessment team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team members must be committed, knowledgeable and qualified The assessment team must be cost-effective Therefore, the Assessment team should be constituted by the CAO/TC CAO/TC must appoint a Focal point Person for the LLG Assessment
3.	Assessment method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment method must generate credible and comprehensive information Therefore, the LLG will use available reports/information based on existing processes as well as field-based data collection.
4.	Compilation of the Report/Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By the LG assessment team (LG TPC) using a standardized format by OPM
5.	Internal Quality Assurance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sub teams present individual reports to the Assessment team to reconcile results across LLGs.
6.	Feedback/Reports shared with LLGs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Assessment team will share reports with respective LLGs for review and raise grievance if any.
7.	Grievance redress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CAO/TC as the Accounting Officer to take lead in constituting the GRC. Use the GRC for the LG chaired by the CAO. The Assessor should not be part of the Committee.
8.	Internal endorsement of the results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LG TPC endorses the results
9.	Submission of the report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present the reports to the Executive Committee for information LG submits drafts reports to OPM that will share the results with IVA firm with copy to MoLG & respective line MDAs.
B Independent Verification of Results/Quality Assurance		
1.	Timing:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Verification of results must be completed in time to inform IPFs (BCC 2) Therefore, the verification will be done between October - December
2.	IVA team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost-effective and sustainable by Government Independent and credible Therefore, the firms contracted to conduct the LGMSD Assessment will be performing the IVA function as they are already in the field at the relevant time (For all LLGs including USMID cities and MLGs)
3.	Verification method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of reports Sample LLGs (all for cities) Compare and review with original assessment report
4.	Compilation of the Report/Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IVA compile the report and submit to OPM copy to the respective MDAs with general findings on credibility of the report as well as special issues, cases with deviations in results, and narrative with explanation.
C Approval of the Results		
1.	Review and reconciliation of Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint review and reconciliation – District; IVA; under the oversight of OPM Task Force
2.	Approval of Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LGPA Task Force submits and presents to the FD TC what was agreed in the Task Force Approval by the FD TC

No	Issue	Guiding Principle
3.	Submission of results on OTIMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OPM to submit results on OTIMS (like other data used to allocate grants)
D	Impact/use	
1.	Grants to be impacted on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part of the LLG DDEG (for each category within each LG) Quality and comprehensiveness of the LG's performance in the LLG PA will impact on the size of the LG DDEG as well.
2.	Dissemination of Results and implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LGs disseminate results to all LLGs. OPM disseminates at National level
3.	Performance Improvement support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LLG performance assessment results will guide the LGs to develop and implement customized PIPs for all LLGs annually

ELABORATION OF THE PROCESS AND ORGANIZATION OF THE LLG PA

2

In line with Section 34 of the Local Government Act (CAP 243), Higher Local Governments currently play the crucial routine role involving inspection, monitoring, and providing support supervision to LLGs. The LLG PA manual therefore serves as a tool for further strengthening this routine function of HLGs.

2.1 Preparatory Activities by LLGs

2.1.1 Submission of Reports by LLGs to LGs

The SAS/ ATC of LLGs will be required to timely submit the routinely reported information to the LG Planner as the Secretary to the TPC. All reports for the previous FY should be submitted before 30 July.

2.1.2 Internal Mock Assessment

LLGs shall prepare for the assessments in advance. This will involve conducting internal 'mock' assessments to determine the extent to which they have complied with the requirements and in case there are some gaps, to ensure that they are addressed before the assessment. LLGs shall collect and have ready all documents required at the point of time for the assessment. Evidence which is not available during the assessment (both information from secondary sources and fieldwork), will not be considered in the scoring of performance of a LLG.

2.2 LLG Performance Assessment by LG

2.2.1 Collection of Information

The information to be used in the performance of LLGs will be collected through:

- a) Review of reports submitted by LLGs to the LGs
- b) Field based assessment of the LLGs by the LGs

a) Review of reports submitted by LLGs

The Focal Point Person for the LLG performance assessment appointed by the CAO/TC will be responsible for receiving, compiling, reviewing, analysing and scoring the reports submitted by LLGs. The data to be reviewed will be guided by the means of verification

and source of information, as defined in the LLG PA manual. This review of reports will be conducted between **August and September** every year.

b) Field based performance assessment of LLGs by the LG

Between August and September each year, the LLG PA team constituted by the CAO/TC will visit each of the LLGs to assess the performance of LLGs and verify the information submitted in the reports.

2.2.2 Compiling and Internal Quality Assurance of the LLG PA Reports

Based on the reports submitted by the LLGs and information collected from the LLGs, during every **August and September**, the Focal Point Person for the LLG performance assessment will prepare a summary showing the performance of individual LLGs by assessment area, as well as a summary of the overall performance of LLGs, based on a standard format for compiling LLG performance assessment report as will be guided by OPM. The individual report compiled will be reviewed by the LLG PA team to ensure consistence across LGs

2.2.3 Grievance Redress Procedures

The CAO/TC will share the report as discussed by the LLG PA teams with the respective LLGs to give them a short window to submit grievances (if any) as follows:

- a) HLGs should provide draft assessment reports to LLGs by the 1st week of September each year, giving them 5 working days to raise issues (if any)
- b) LLGs should raise issues regarding their assessment results within the 5 working days from the date when the reports were availed by the HLGs for review. The issues must be raised in writing by the SAS/ATC and submitted to the CAO/TC, with supporting evidence.
- c) The Grievance Redress Committee will consider the grievances. Note the members of the LLG PA teams should not be part of the GRC that considers the grievances.
- d) Based on the advice of the GRC, the CAO/TC will provide a written response to the LLGs no later than 15th September. If necessary, the CAO/TC may request the LLG assessment team to review results, and /or mobilize field missions to rectify and reconcile any grievances.
- e) Any requisite adjustments must also be made before CAOs/TCs submission to OPM, latest by 30th September.

2.2.4 Internal Endorsement of the Performance Assessment Results

The LLG PA Focal Point Person will present the LLG PA results to the LG TPC (with information on any grievances and how they have been resolved) for discussion and endorsement before presentation of the results to the Executive Committee and submission to OPM.

2.2.5 Presentation and Submission of the LLGs PA Results

The CAO/TC will sign off the approved results and present to the LG Executive Committee for information. Thereafter the CAO/TC will submit the draft reports to OPM latest by September 30th as will be guided.

2.3 Independent Verification, Approval and Use of the Results

2.3.1 Verification of Results and Sanctioning False Reporting

The purpose of verification of results is to check whether the process and results of the LLG performance assessment conducted by the LGs are valid, reliable, and hence overall credible. The National Assessment Teams that conduct the LGMSD PA will verify results through the review of reports and collecting information from a sample of LLGs (sub-counties, town councils and divisions) as will be guided by OPM.

This verification above will be conducted from **October – December** each year.

2.3.2 Joint Review and Verification of Results

The IVA will compile the report and submit to OPM summarising findings and providing an opinion regarding the credibility of the assessment as conducted by the LGs.

The Office of the Prime Minister will convene a joint meeting of representatives of LGs with issues, IVA and members of the LGPA Task Force to jointly review and reconcile findings between the assessment(s) conducted by HLGs and the IVA.

2.3.3 Final Approval of the Results

The LG PA Task Force will submit LLG PA results to the Fiscal Decentralization (FD)–Technical Committee (TC) for approval. Following approval, OPM will transmit these results to MoFPED on OTIMS **before the second budget call circular (i.e. before 15th February)**, to be used in LLG DDEG allocations (implementing rewards and sanctions).

This will be done in **January** every year.

2.3.4 Use of the Performance Assessment Results to allocate part of the DDEG

The results of the LLG PA will be used to allocate part of the LLG DDEG: 50 % of the allocation from the DDEG will be determined by the weighted performance of the LLG in the performance assessment, see Table below. The allocation formulae for the DDEG performance grants will have two components:

1. Component 1: Allocation drawn on a **need-based formula** as per the DDEG guidelines:
2. Component 2: Allocation based on the **performance assessment** results for LLGs within a LG¹ computed as:

Table 1: **Weight of the basic component and performance component as at FY 2022/23**

Grant	Performance Grant	
	Basic Formula (%)	Performance element (score of the performance assessment, e.g. 56 points out of 100 points) weighted with the results of the basic allocation formula) (%)
DDEG	50%	50%

If the results are neither available nor credible – only the basic formula will apply to the entire amount and the lack of credibility or timeliness of submission will impact on the performance score results of the LG and their DDEG allocations.

2.3.5 Dissemination of LLG PA Results and Implications

Each LG is required to disseminate the LLG PA results and implications to the LLGs as guided by OPM. OPM will disseminate the LLG PA results and implications on grant allocations as part of the national dissemination of the LGMSD results.

2.3.6 Use of the results for development and implementation of PIPs

Based on the results of the LLG assessment, the LGs will prepare and implement customized performance improvement plan (PIP), which will focus on all LLGs in its jurisdiction.

2.4 Overview of Timing/Scheduling of Activities

The table below shows the overall timing of the various steps. Before this, the LLG Performance Assessment Manual should be shared with the LGs/LLGs.

¹ I.e. the LLGs are compared with other LLGs within their LG area.

No	Tasks/Activities	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May
A)	Preparatory Activities by the LLGs											
1.	Submission of all reports by SAS/ATC											
2.	Internal Mock Assessments by the LLG											
B)	LLG Performance Assessment											
3.	Collection of information on LLG Performance Assessment through: review reports; and field-based data collection											
4.	Compiling of LLG reports by the LLG PA team											
5.	Grievance redress by GRC											
6.	Internal endorsement of the results by the LG TPC											
7.	Submission of the LLG results to: (i) LG Executive Committee; and (ii) OPM											
C)	Independent Verification, Approval and Use of the Results											
8.	Independent Verification of the results by the firms conducting the LGMSD performance assessment											
9.	Joint review and reconciliation of results (LG, IVA and OPM)											
10.	Final approval of the results by the IGFTTR – TC											
11.	Use of the results to allocate part of the DDEG											
12.	Dissemination of results to LLGs and nationally											
13.	Use of the results for development and implementation of performance improvement plans (PIPs)											

INDICATORS AND ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

3

Below is a list of proposed performance areas, measures as well as indicators for LLG PA. Most of the indicators are intended to incentivize LLGs to: (i) comply with the PBS budgeting (work-plans) and progress reporting requirements; (ii) implement the Parish Development Model; and (iii) implement sector specific requirements and/or outcomes. It is expected that all the data/sources of information for assessing LLGs will be generated from: (i) the submissions of routinely prescribed reports which they submit to the HLGs and (ii) field-based verification.

Whenever, a LLG has not provided data/information on a performance measure(s), e.g. output data on execution, it will be scored zero points for a given indicator.

The scores for each LLG will be between 0-100 points (see the scoring guide for each performance measure).

The key principles that guided the selection of indicators are:

- a) The indicator MUST be under the mandate and control of the LLGs – attributable to the LLGs;
- b) The indicators should be comparable in a standardized/objective manner across the LLGs – SMART;
- c) The indicator should measure and reward efforts of the LLG – not to give advantage to a few LLGs because of their context;
- d) Indicator should be assessed across all LLGs annually;
- e) Indicators should not be easily stage managed (“just ticking the boxes”) – focus on “function” instead of “form”;
- f) Indicator should be assessed once – no overlap across indicators
- g) Indicator should focus on processes outputs/outcomes rather than process activities/inputs
- h) Indicator should not bias the LLG to select a specific investment but focus on issues which benefit all eligible areas in the investment menu
- i) Compliance to key elements of the PDM
- j) Incentivizing LLGs to perform their roles
- k) Incentivizing LLGs to comply to the guidelines

Performance Area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
A. Functionality of Parish Administrative Structures Maximum score is 10	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>	<p>From the SAS/TC obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The composition of PDCs/WDCs for each parish in the LLG; Minutes of PDCs submitted to the LLG to establish whether the PDC carried-out mobilization activities for individuals and groups to participate in development activities; The list of proposals submitted for the revolving funds during the previous FY Minutes of PDCs submitted to the LLG to establish whether the PDC appraised all proposals submitted for the revolving funds during the previous FY 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PDM guidelines List of PDCs members for each parish² in the LLG Minutes of PDCs/WDCs List of proposals submitted for the revolving funds Report for field mobilization
	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>	<p>From SAS/TC obtain and, review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parish data for the previous FY was submitted to the LLG and establish whether it was compiled, updated, analyzed and disaggregated by village, gender, age, and economic activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parish data for the previous FY
	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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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>Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY score 2, else score 0 Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0 	<p>From SAS/TC obtain and review the NGOs, CBOs & CSO mapping report for the previous FY to establish whether mapping was done and NGOs, CBOs and CSOs operating in the LLG were involved in raising awareness about the PDM and planning cycle</p> <p>From SAS/TC obtain and review the Annual Work Plan and Budget to establish whether the PDCs and Village Executive Committees were provided guidance on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved Programmes/activities and Priority enterprises through at least one of the following: demos, field visits, field days and competitions among others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NGOs, CBOs & CSO mapping report List of Parish priority enterprises Sensitization reports at village level Attendance sheets Approved work plan and budget for current FY reflecting parish activities. Consultative meeting minutes A letter by CAO/TC communicating incorporation of Parish issues into the LG annual Work plan LLG council minutes

2 Officially approved Parishes are those recognized in the Approved Estimates for LGs as cost centres.

Performance Area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
B. Planning and Budgeting <i>Maximum score is: 10</i>	4.	The LLG conducted Annual Planning 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: i. Is consistent with the LLG approved ³ development plan III; score 1 or else 0 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. 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 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. vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May; score 1 or else 0	From SAS/TC obtain and, review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LLG approved development plan III and Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY to establish whether AWPB is consistent with the LLG approved development plan III The ranked priorities from all parish submissions to establish whether they were incorporated in the AWPB Budget Conference Report to establish whether the AWPB is based on its outcomes LLG budget to establish whether it includes investments to be financed by the LLG as well as other funding sources AWPB to identify the capital investments to be implemented; and the project profiles for the current FY to establish whether they have been developed for all capital investments to be implemented in the current FY and followed the prescribed format. From the LG Economic Planner obtain the LLG submission register to establish whether the LLG submitted the AWPB for the current FY before 15th May of the previous FY. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning and Budgeting Guidelines LLG Approved Development Plan III AWPB Ranked priorities from all parishes Budget conference Reports LLG budget Council Minutes A file of LLG project profiles LLG submission register Minutes of the Parish meeting
	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 30 th April of the previous FY. Score 2 or else score 0	From PDU, check: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the LLG submitted the procurement plan no later than 30th April of the previous FY for procurements to be made in the current FY. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LLG procurement plan submission letters PDU files
	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	From the SAS/TC obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LLG budget for the current FY and ascertain whether the prioritized investment comply to the DDEG Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines investment menu. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LLG budgets submitted for the current FY DDEG Grant guidelines for the current FY

³ Approved here means duly signed by the respective LLG Accounting Officer e.g. SAS/TC and the Chairperson LC III

Performance Area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
C. Own Source Revenue Mobilization and Administration <i>Maximum score is 6</i>	7.	LLG collected local revenue as per budget (Budget realization) <i>Maximum score is 1</i>	Evidence that the LLG collected OSR for the previous FY within +/- 10% of the budget score 1 or else score 0.	From the LLG Head of Finance, obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Annual financial statements and budget for the previous FY and calculate the % of the budgeted OSR collected	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Approved LLG budget for previous FY (by 31st Annual Financial Statements for the previous FY.
	8.	Increase in LLG own source revenues from last financial year but one to last financial year. <i>Maximum score 1</i>	Evidence that the OSR collected increased from previous FY but one to previous FY by more than 5 %, score 1 or else score 0	From the LLG Head of Finance, obtain: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Annual financial statements for the previous FY and previous FY but one and calculate the increase in LLG own source revenue collection.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Annual Financial Statements for the previous FY and previous FY but one
	9.	The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY <i>Maximum score 4</i>	Evidence that the LLG: <ol style="list-style-type: none">Has remitted OSR to the administrative units, score 1 or else score 0.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 0Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance⁴ in previous FY, score 1, else score 0Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.	From the LLG Head of Finance obtain and review Annual Financial Statement for the previous FY to determine whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The LLG remitted the mandatory share of OSR to the LG and administrative unitsThe LLG did not spend more than 20% of OSR on councilors allowances.Budgeted and used at least Y% OSR funds on operational and maintenanceWhether OSR was publicized (e.g. notice boards, newsletter, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">AWPAFS for previous FYTransfer VouchersNotice boardsAuthorization letter from the Minister
D. Financial Management <i>Maximum points: 10</i>	10.	The LLG submitted annual financial statements for the previous FY on time <i>Maximum score is 4</i>	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	From the SAS/ATC: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Obtain and review acknowledged copies of LLG submissions of AFS to Auditor General and check timeliness.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Copy of LLG letter of submission, acknowledged by the Auditor General

⁴ Operation and maintenance means the functions, duties and labor associated with the daily operations and normal repairs, replacement of parts and structural components, and other activities needed to preserve an asset so that it continues to provide acceptable services and achieves its expected life.

Performance Area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
	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 <i>Maximum score is 6</i>	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 15 th October score 1 or else 0 ii. Q2 by 15 th January score 1 or else 0 iii. Q3 by 15 th April score 1 or else 0 iv. Q4 by 30 th July score 3 or else 0	From the LG Planner: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receive and review the LLG submissions of Annex 3 (PBS reporting) and check whether all the quarterly reports from previous FY were submitted to the LG by the SAS/TC with inclusions of the funding for the PDM. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hard copy of the quarterly reports, duly endorsed by the LLG SAS/TC PBS, Annex 3 progress report submission
E. Human Resources Management for Improved Service Delivery <i>Maximum points: 12</i>	12.	Appraisal of all staff in the LLG in the previous FY <i>Maximum score is 6</i>	Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All staff in the LLG including extension workers in the previous FY (by 30th June): score 2 or else 0 Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0 HC, III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else 0 	From the HRM department: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain and review personnel files submitted by the SAS/Town Clerk and check whether all the LLG staff were appraised during the previous FY. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff structures Staff lists Performance plan Appraisal reports Personnel files
	13.	Staff duty attendance <i>Maximum score is 6</i>	Evidence that the LLG has <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 2 or else 0 Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 2 or else 0 	From the HRM department obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel files and review whether staff lists have been publicized, and whether there is staff attendance register and whether staff performance reports with activities have been produced and are available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff structures Staff lists Performance plan Appraisal reports Staff performance reports Means of publication, e.g. notice boards, news, etc. Attendance register
F. Implementation and Execution <i>Maximum points: 7</i>	14.	The LLG has spent all the DDEG funds for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities <i>Maximum score is 2</i>	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	From the SAS/TC obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AFS and quarterly reports for the previous FY and check whether the investments were on eligible projects/ activities as per the DDEG LLG investment menu. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LLG Budget LLG Annual Financial Statement DDEG grant Budget and implementation guidelines for LLGs Investment inventory report (form G)

Performance Area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Maximum points: 5	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	From the SAS/TC obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AFS to determine whether the LLG did not deviate more than +/-10 % from the sector ceilings and programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AFS for previous FY Payment vouchers
	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) ⁵ : If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3 If 70% -90%: Score 2 If less than 70 %: Score 0.	From the SAS/TC obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress reports and review the completion rate using the enclosed template 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Work plan Progress Reports Certificate of completion. Budget performance Reports. AFS
	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	From the SAS/TC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain copies of the Environmental and Social Screening (E&S) Form/ ESMP (where applicable) for all the LLG projects to verify whether E&S and CC screening was carried out where required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental and social screening forms from the SAS/ATC ESMPs (where required) Signed E&S compliance certificate (where required)
18.	The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling System Maximum score is 2	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 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	From the SAS/TC obtain information on whether the LLG has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A specified system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a complaints log book with clear information and reference for onward action, a defined complaints referral path, and the public display of information at LLG offices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal description of the Grievance Handling system; complaints log book; Web-sites, public notice boards 	
				From the websites or other public means review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the LLG has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Websites Public notice boards

⁵ Refer to the completion rate computation table at the end of the Manual

Performance Area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
H. Basic (Pre & Primary) Education services Management (in public and private schools)	19.	The LLG has a functional land management system <i>Maximum score 1</i>	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	From SAS/TC establish whether the LLG has fully constituted Area Land Committee with sets of Minutes for the previous FY.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appointment letters for the members of Area Land Committee Minutes of Area Land Committees
	20.	Awareness campaigns and mobilization on education services conducted in last FY <i>Maximum score is 3</i>	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery score 3, else score 0	From the SAS/TC obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports on awareness campaigns and parents mobilization for improvement of education services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SAS/ATC Education reports on activities on awareness raising and mobilization
	21.	Monitoring of service delivery in basic schools <i>Maximum score is 4</i>	Evidence that the LLG has monitored schools at least once per term in the previous 3 terms and produced a list of issues ⁶ 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	From the SAS/TC, obtain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring reports to determine whether the LLG monitored schools in the previous 3 terms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring reports on schools Minutes of the committee
I. Primary Health Care Services Management	22.	Existence and functionality of School Management Committees <i>Maximum score is 3</i>	Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools; score 3, else score 0	From the SAS/TC obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of school management committees to determine that they were established; functioning; and implementing agreed actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of SMC meetings, Action plan and extent of implementation Implementation reports.
	23.	Awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY <i>Maximum score is 3</i>	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery score 3, else score 0	From the SAS/TC obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports on awareness campaigns and community mobilization for improvement of primary health care 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SAS/TC reports on activities on awareness raising and mobilization
<i>Maximum score is 10</i>					

6 List of issues may include: teacher and pupil attendance; the status of school infrastructure, hygiene and sanitation, mandatory displays etc.

Performance Area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
J. Water & Environment Management ⁶ <i>Maximum score is 10</i> (Applicable to Sub-Counties Only)	24.	The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY <i>Maximum score is 4</i>	Evidence that LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY ⁷ , score 4 or else score 0	From the SAS/TC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain reports on health service delivery monitoring submitted by the SAS/Town Clerk to the Executive Committee and check whether health issues on health centres are covered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health monitoring reports HUMCs minutes
	25.	Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee <i>Maximum score is 3</i>	Evidence that the LLG have functional Health Unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG; score 3, else score 0	From the SAS/TC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain and review evidence for establishment and operations of Health Unit Management Committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of composition Health Unit Management Committee Minutes of meetings. Action plan and extent of implementation
	26.	Evidence that the LLGs submitted requests to the DWO for consideration in the current FY budgets <i>Maximum score is 3</i>	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	From the DWO obtain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests from the LLGs for consideration in the current FY 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests from the LLGs
	27.	The LLG has monitored water and environment services delivery during the previous FY <i>Maximum score is 3</i>	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	From the DWO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain reports on water and environment monitoring/supervision reports submitted by the SAS/Town Clerk and check whether new and old facilities were covered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SAS/ATC water and environment monitoring reports
	28.	Existence and functionality of Water and Sanitation Committees <i>Maximum score is 2</i>	Evidence that the LLG have functional Water and Sanitation Committees (including collection and proper use of community contributions) score 2, else score 0	From the SAS/TC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain and review evidence for establishment and operations of Water and Sanitation Committees in all projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of composition of Water and Sanitation Committees Minutes of meetings. Action plan and extent of implementation Use of Community Contributions for Water Source Maintenance

7 The issues to be covered include: Health Workers duty attendance, reporting time on duty, status of infrastructure investment, drug stock-out, water and sanitation hygiene etc...

8 This excludes urban areas governed by a different water provision arrangement (NWSC and Umbrella Organizations)

Performance Area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
K. Urban Planning and Management Maximum 10 points (Applicable to Town Councils, City and Municipal Divisions Only)	29.	Functionality of investments in water and sanitation facilities <i>Maximum score is 2</i>	Evidence that the SAS has an updated lists on all its water and sanitation facilities (public latrines) and functionality status. Score 2 else 0	From the DWO, obtain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated reports submitted showing the water and sanitation status of the Sub County for all facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring/progress reports
	30.	Development of the Physical Development Plans as per guidelines <i>Maximum score 2</i>	If the LLG has a functional Physical Planning Committee in place that: (i) is properly and fully constituted; (ii) considers new investments/ application for development permission on time; and (iii) has submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD Score 1 or else 0	From the Physical Planner; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> obtain a list of the members of the Physical Planning Committee to establish whether it is properly and fully constituted. Review the Building Plan Registration Book and minutes of physical planning committee to determine whether all the submissions for new investments/ applications for development permits were decided and the applicants were notified (using the form in the Eighth Schedule, Physical Planning Act 2010) considered within 30 days after submission. From MoLHUD establish whether the sub-national entity submitted at least 4 sets of minutes of Physical Planning Committee to the MoLHUD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of the members of the Physical Planning Committee Building Plan Registration Book Minutes of physical planning committee
	31.	Implementation of the physical planning and building control measures as per guidelines <i>Maximum score 3</i>	If the LLG has detailed physical development plan(s) or/and area action plan(s) approved by the Council covering at least the percentage below Score 1 or else 0: 20% in 2022/23 30% in 2023/24 40% in 2024/25	From the Physical Planner; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> obtain the detailed physical plan to establish the proportion of the entity area covered and whether it was approved by the Council. From the Physical Planner establish the availability of an approved action area plan for the previous FY.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed physical plan Approved Action Area Plan



Performance Area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
			Evidence that the LLG has named streets, numbered plots, surveyed and demarcated roads as planned (90% or more implemented) in the previous FY score 1 or else 0	<p>(i) Review the annual work plan for the previous FY, whether the planned activities - street naming, plot numbering, surveying and demarcating roads, were implemented 90% or above.</p> <p>(ii) implemented activities recorded in the computerized street addressing/plot numbering and road system and database</p> <p>(iii) Visit a sample of 2-3 roads to establish whether the streets have been numbered, roads surveyed and demarcated;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation/progress report of annual work plan for the previous FY Street/plot database, road database Field visits to a sample of 2-3 streets
			Evidence that the LLG has a functional Development Control Team score 1 or else 0	<p>(i) Establishment: date and organogram</p> <p>(ii) Staffing: The team comprises of at least three staff of physical planner(s), engineer(s) and building inspector(s).</p> <p>(iii) Operation: Annual work plan and annual progress report. (Activities including identification of illegal developments, post approval inspections, and issuing penalties for occupation of buildings without development permits)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LG Organogram LG staff list for Development Control Team Annual work plan of development control team within physical planning directorate/department and annual progress report
	32.	The LLG has developed and implemented a solid waste management plan Maximum score 2	If the LLG has prepared status report on the implementation of the approved solid waste management plan during the previous FY score 1 or else 0		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved Solid waste management plan Status Report
			If the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns on the management of solid waste during the previous FY score 1 or else 0		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes/Report on awareness activities
	33.	Operation and Maintenance of infrastructure Maximum score is 3	If the LLG has prepared Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey report score 1 or else 0	From the Engineer obtain and review the Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey report for the previous FY to establish whether it was prepared	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey report

Performance Area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
L. Production Services Management <i>Maximum points is: 10</i>			<p>If the LLG has prepared an O&M Annual Plan which is based on the Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey score 1 or else 0</p> <p>If the LLG has spent own source revenues of not less than 20% on O&M score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>From the Engineer obtain review O&M Annual Work Plan for the current FY and compare with the Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey for the previous FY</p> <p>From the Treasurer obtain and review the final accounts for the previous FY and calculate the percentage of own source revenue spent on O&M</p> <p>From the SAS/ATC, Obtain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LLG Reports on production statistics to ascertain whether it was compiled, comprehensive and submitted to LG Production Office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> O&M Annual Work Plan Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey report Final Accounts Production statistics report(s)
	34.	<p>Up to date data on agriculture and irrigation collected, analyzed and reported</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>From the SAS/ATC, Obtain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reports on awareness creation, awareness materials distribution lists attendance lists for the awareness events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness reports Distribution lists Attendance lists
	35.	<p>Farmer awareness and mobilization campaigns carried out through farmer field days and awareness meetings</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>From the SAS/ATC, Obtain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly monitoring reports by extension staff Supervision reports by SAS/ATC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring reports Supervision reports
	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>		

Performance Area	No	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Assessment Procedure	Means of Verification
	37.	Farmer trainings through training farmer field schools and demonstrations organized and carried out Maximum score is 2	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.	From the SAS/ATC, Obtain; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training program • Training reports • Attendance sheets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training reports • Attendance sheets
	38.	The LLG has provided hands-on extension support to farmers and farmer organizations / groups Maximum score is 2	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	From the SAS/ATC, Obtain; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field reports on extension support provided • Review and check Agricultural extension diaries from a sample of 3 extension staff • Sample farmers and farmer groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field reports • Filled agricultural extension diaries • Farmer visits

NOTES:

Note 1: Template for review of performance measure number 16 on completion rate of projects.

- a) Step 1: Obtain and review the work plan for the previous FY to identify the projects and activities/phases that were agreed to be implemented;
- b) Step 2: Obtain and review the bills of quantities to determine the targets;
- c) Step 3: Obtain and review the physical progress report and interim completion certificates to determine progress made against planned targets in the previous FY;
- d) Step 4: Conduct field trips to each of the projects to verify the actual implementation rate.
- e) Step 5: Calculate the average implementation rate in the previous FY for all the projects
- f) Step 6: The completion rate (%) of each project, when determined, will then be weighted with the relative contracted size of the planned activities of the projects to get an aggregate result, see the example below

Table: Example of Weighting Completion Rates


Projects	Contract Amount	Annual Budget for Planned Activities	Completion rate against Annual Budget/planned completion	Weighted (Annual Budget/planned contract amount multiplied by completion rates)
Project 1	350,000	200,000	70%	140,000
Project 2	420,000	300,000	60%	180,000
Project 3	500,000	500,000	80%	400,000
Total		1,000,000		720,000
	Weighted implementation rate for this entity (Weighted total multiplied by 100 divided by the total annual budget/planned amount – NOT total contract amount.			72





THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA

OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER

PLOT 9-11, APOLLO KAGWA ROAD
P.O. BOX 341, KAMPALA, UGANDA

 www.opm.go.ug

 [facebook.com](https://facebook.com/opmuganda) | [opm Uganda](https://opmuganda.com)  [twitter.com](https://twitter.com/opmuganda) | [opm uganda](https://opmuganda.com)