



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Name: Abiliyep

Amudat District

(Vote Code: 806)

| Assessment | Scores |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| LLG Performance Assessment | 31% |

| No. | Summary of requirements | Definition of compliance | Compliance justification | Score |
|---|--|---|---|----------|
| 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> | <p>There were PDM guidelines in hardcopy, Submission list of PDCS members,</p> | 2 |
| 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>There was Parish analyzed data</p> | 2 |
| 3 | <p>The LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and PDCs on strategies for the development of the parish</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p> | <p>Evidence that the LLG:</p> <p>i. Has mapped NGOs, CBOs & CSO operating in the LLG and involved them in raising awareness about the PDM and planning cycle: score 2, or else 0</p> | <p>There was no NGOs, CBOs & CSO mapping report, no council minutes, no attendance list</p> | 0 |
| 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 provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on:</p> <p>ii. Approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY score 2, else score 0</p> | <p>There was no approved Annual Work Plan and Budget.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 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 provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on:</p> <p>iii. Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence presented, no Annual Work Plan and Budget</p> | 0 |
|---|---|---|--|---|

B. Planning and Budgeting

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | <p>The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p> | <p>Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:</p> <p>i. Is consistent with the LLG approved development plan III; score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no approved development plan III and Annual Work plan and Budget during the assessment</p> | 0 |
| 4 | <p>The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p> | <p>Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>There were no ranked priorities and submission letters</p> | 0 |
| 4 | <p>The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p> | <p>Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:</p> <p>iii. Is based on the outcomes of the budget conference; score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no budget conference report</p> | 0 |
| 4 | <p>The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p> | <p>iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no AWPB during assessment</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | <p>The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p> | <p>v. Evidence that the LLG developed project profiles for all capital investments in the AWP and Budget as per format in NDP III Score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no AWPB, no evidence of investments implemented.</p> | 0 |
| 4 | <p>The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p> | <p>vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There were no submission letters and AWPB.</p> | 0 |
| 5 | <p>Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p> | <p>Evidence that the LLG prepared and submitted inputs into the procurement plan for all the procurements to be done in a LLG for the current FY) to the CAO/TC by the 30th April of the previous FY, Score 2 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no procurement plan and Procurement requisition forms (LGPP Form1).</p> | 0 |
| 6 | <p>Compliance of the LLG budget to DDEG investment menu for the current FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p> | <p>Evidence that the investments in 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</p> | <p>There was no evidence of DDEG grant guidelines, there was no budget and Implementation Guidelines investment menu.</p> | 0 |
| C. Own Source Revenue Mobilization and Administration | | | | |
| 7 | <p>LLG collected local revenue as per budget (Budget realization)</p> <p>Maximum score is 1</p> | <p>Evidence that the LLG collected OSR for the previous FY within +/- 10% of the budget score 1 or else score 0.</p> | <p>There were no Annual financial statements and budget for the previous FY.</p> | 0 |
| 8 | <p>Increase in LLG own source revenues from last financial year but one to last financial year.</p> <p>Maximum score 1</p> | <p>Evidence that the OSR collected increased from previous FY but one to previous FY by more than 5 %, score 1 or else score 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence of OSR collection, no Annual financial statements for the previous FY during assessment.</p> | 0 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 9 | The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY Maximum score 4 | Evidence that the LLG: i. Has remitted OSR to the administrative units, score 1 or else score 0. | There was no evidence of mandatory share of OSR to the LG remitted | 0 |
| 9 | The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY 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 | There was no evidence | 0 |
| 9 | The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY Maximum score 4 | Evidence that the LLG: iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0 | There was no evidence | 0 |
| 9 | The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY Maximum score 4 | Evidence that the LLG: iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0. | There was no evidence | 0 |

D. Financial Management

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | The LLG submitted annual financial statements for the previous FY on time Maximum score is 4 | Evidence that the LLG submitted its Annual Financial Statement to the Auditor General (AG) on time (i.e., by August 31), score 4 or else score 0 | There were no acknowledgements of receipt by AG. There were no submission letters. | 0 |
| 11 | The LLG has submitted all 4 quarterly financial and physical progress reports including finances for the Parish Development Model (PDM), for the previous FY on time and in the prescribed format Maximum score is 6 | Evidence that the LLG submitted all four quarterly financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time: i. Q1 by 15th October score 1 or else 0 | There were no submission of progress report | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 11 | <p>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</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p> | <p>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:</p> <p>ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There was no evidence</p> | 0 |
| 11 | <p>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</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p> | <p>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:</p> <p>iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0</p> | <p>There were no quarterly reports</p> | 0 |
| 11 | <p>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</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p> | <p>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:</p> <p>iv. Q4 by 30th July score 3 or else 0</p> | <p>There were no quarterly reports</p> | 0 |

E. Human Resources Management for Improved Service Delivery

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 12 | <p>Appraisal of all staff in the LLG in the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p> | <p>Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:</p> <p>(i) All staff in the LLG including extension workers in the previous FY (by 30th June): score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There were copies of appraisal forms</p> | 2 |
| 12 | <p>Appraisal of all staff in the LLG in the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p> | <p>Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:</p> <p>(ii) Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There were copies of appraisal forms</p> | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|
| 12 | Appraisal of all staff in the LLG in the previous FY Maximum score is 6 | Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG: (iii) HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else | There were copies of appraisal forms | 2 |
| 13 | Staff duty attendance Maximum score is 6 | Evidence that the LLG has (i) Publicized the list of LLG staff: score 3 or else 0 | There were staff attendance registers and staff performance reports | 3 |
| 13 | Staff duty attendance Maximum score is 6 | Evidence that the LLG has (ii) Produced monthly analysis of staff attendance with recommendations to CAO/TC score 3 or else 0 | There were no monthly staff attendance analysis reports. | 0 |

F. Implementation and Execution

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 14 | The LLG has spent all the DDEG funds for the previous FY on eligible projects/activities Maximum score is 2 | Evidence that the LLG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/ activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines: Score 2, or else score 0 | There was no evidence of DDEG grants submitted there were no AFS and quarterly reports | 0 |
| 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 | There was no evidence of AFS | 0 |
| 16 | Completion of investments as per annual work plan and budget Maximum score is 3 | Evidence that the investment projects planned in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of FY (quarter four) : If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3 If 70% -90%: Score 2 If less than 70 %: Score 0. | there were no Progress reports, Annual Work plan and budget performance reports | 0 |

G. Environmental and Social Safeguards

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 17 | The LLG has implemented environmental and social safeguards during the previous FY Maximum score is 2 | Evidence that the LLG carried out environmental, social and climate change screening where required, prior to implementation of all planned investments/projects, score 2 or else score 0 | There were no evidence of copies of ESMP. | 0 |
| 18 | The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling System Maximum score is 2 | (i) If the LLG has specified a system for recording, investigating and responding to grievances, which includes a designated a person to coordinate response to 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 | No websites and no public noticeboards in place | 0 |
| 18 | The LLG has an Operational Grievance Handling System 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 | There was no evidence of grievance redress mechanisms in place | 0 |
| 19 | The LLG has a functional land management system Maximum score 1 | If the LLG has a functional Area Land committee in place to assist the LG Land board in an advisory capacity on matters relating to land, including ascertaining rights on the land score 1 or else 0 | No evidence of existence of Area Land Committee | 0 |

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

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | Awareness campaigns and mobilization on education services conducted in last FY Maximum score is 3 | Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery score 3, else score 0 | There were no reports | 0 |
| 21 | Monitoring of service delivery in basic schools Maximum score is 4 | Evidence that the LLG has monitored schools at least once per term in the previous 3 terms and produced a list of issues requiring attention of the committee responsible for education of the LLG council in the previous FY: If all schools (100%) - score 4 If 80 – 99% – score 2 If 60 to 79% score 1 Below 60% score 0 | There was a monitoring report conducted on 9th January 2022 | 2 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 22 | Existence and functionality of School Management Committees Maximum score is 3 | Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools; score 3, else score 0 | There were minutes of school management committees, action points on issues of school enrolment and reports | 3 |
|----|---|--|---|---|

I. Primary Health Care Services Management

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 23 | Awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY Maximum score is 3 | Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery score 3, else score 0 | There no awareness reports on improvement of primary health car | 0 |
| 24 | The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY Maximum score is 4 | Evidence that LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY , score 4 or else score 0 | There were no reports | 0 |
| 25 | Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee Maximum score is 3 | Evidence that the LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG; score 3, else score 0 | There was evidence of evidence for establishment of Health unit Management Committee of Abiliyep HC III chaired by Losilongole Philip | 3 |

J. Water & Environment Services Management

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| 26 | Evidence that the LLGs submitted requests to the DWO for consideration in the current FY budgets Maximum score is 3 | Evidence that the SAS submitted in writing requests to the DWO for consideration in the planning of the current FY score 3, else score 0 | There was no evidence of submission letters | 0 |
| 27 | The LLG has monitored water and environment services delivery during the previous FY Maximum score is 3 | Evidence that SAS/ATC monitored/supervised aspects of water and environment services during the previous FY including review of water points and facilities, score 3 or else score 0 | There were no reports on water and environment monitoring/ | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 28 | Existence and functionality of Water and Sanitation Committees Maximum score is 2 | Evidence that the LLG have functional Water and Sanitation Committees (including collection and proper use of community contributions) score 2, else score 0 | There was no evidence of establishment and operations of Water and Sanitation Committees of all projects | 0 |
| 29 | Functionality of investments in water and sanitation facilities Maximum score is 2 | Evidence that the SAS has an updated lists on all its water and sanitation facilities (public latrines) and functionality status. Score 2 else 0 | There were no status reports | 0 |

K. Urban Planning and Management (Applicable to Town Councils and Divisions only)

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|
| 30 | Development of the Physical Development Plans as per guidelines 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 | | |
| 30 | Development of the Physical Development Plans as per guidelines Maximum score 2 | (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 | | |
| 31 | Implementation of the physical planning and building control measures as per guidelines Maximum score 3 | (i) If all infrastructure investments implemented by the LLG in the previous FY: (i) are consistent with the approved Physical Development Plan; and (ii) have a planning compliance certificate issued by MoLHUD. Score 1 or else 0 | | |
| 31 | Implementation of the physical planning and building control measures as per guidelines Maximum score 3 | (ii) 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 | | |

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 31 | Implementation of the physical planning and building control measures as per guidelines Maximum score 3 | (iii) Evidence that the LLG has a functional Development Control Team score 1 or else 0 |
| | | |
| 32 | The LLG has developed and implemented a solid waste management plan Maximum score 2 | (i) 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 |
| | | |
| 32 | The LLG has developed and implemented a solid waste management plan Maximum score 2 | (ii) If the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns on the management of solid waste during the previous FY score 1 or else 0 |
| | | |
| 33 | Operation and Maintenance of infrastructure Maximum score is 3 | (i) If the LLG has prepared Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey report score 1 or else 0 |
| | | |
| 33 | Operation and Maintenance of infrastructure Maximum score is 3 | (ii) 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 |
| | | |
| 33 | Operation and Maintenance of infrastructure Maximum score is 3 | (iii) If the LLG has spent own source revenues of not less than 20% on O&M score 1 or else 0 |

L. Production Services Management

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|
| 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>There was evidence of reports of production statistics submitted on 8th February 2022</p> | 2 |
| 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>Reports were available</p> | 2 |
| 36 | <p>The LLG has carried out monitoring activities on production activities for crops, animals and fisheries</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p> | <p>If the LLG extension staff has implemented monitoring activities on agricultural production for crops, animal and fisheries covering among others irrigation, environmental safeguards, agricultural mechanization, postharvest handling, pests and disease surveillance, equipment installations, farmers implementing knowledge from trainings, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>There were monthly monitoring and supervision reports</p> | 2 |
| 37 | <p>Farmer trainings through training farmer field schools and demonstrations organized and carried out</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p> | <p>If the LLG extension staff has carried out farmer trainings on irrigated agriculture, agronomy, pests and diseases management, operation and maintenance of equipment, linkage to markets etc. through for example farmer field schools, demonstrations, and field training sessions, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0.</p> | <p>there were attendance sheets and training reports</p> | 2 |
| 38 | <p>The LLG has provided hands-on extension support to farmers and farmer organizations / groups</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p> | <p>If the LLG extension staff have provided extension support to farmers and farmer groups on crop management, aquaculture, animal husbandry, irrigation, Operation and Maintenance of equipment, postharvest handling, value addition, marketing etc. reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0</p> | <p>there were field reports on extension support provided, farmers and farmer groups list and Agricultural extension diaries.</p> | 2 |