



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Merikit Town Council

(Vote Code: 273849)

Score 45/100 (45%)

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,</p>	0	<p>Although there was evidence that all the three coded parishes out of four parishes in Merikit town council had PDCs duly constituted as per the PDM guidelines (The list of PDCs by coded parish (Central, Kachinga and Merikit) is attached),</p> <p>The composition of PDCs in coded parishes only at Merikit sub-county was as follows:</p> <p>Central Parish</p> <p>Dera Christopher, LC2 Chairperson</p> <p>Nyaguti Anna, Chairperson Parish Women Council</p> <p>Opoya Michael, Chairperson Parish Youth Council</p> <p>Othieno Raymond, Chairperson Parish Disability Council</p> <p>Obbo Bonifance, Chairperson Parish NRM</p> <p>Obella Damisiano, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council</p> <p>Kadapawo Samuel, Parish Chief</p> <p>Kachinga Parish</p> <p>Othieno Francis, LC2 Chairperson</p> <p>Aboth Margaret, Chairperson Parish Women Council</p> <p>Emojong Moses, Chairperson Parish Youth Council</p> <p>Otara Oketcho Gordian, Chairperson Parish Disability Council</p> <p>Odiang Godfrey, Chairperson Parish NRM</p> <p>Oketch Elias, Chairperson Parish Older Persons Council</p> <p>Ofwono Peter, Parish Chief</p> <p>Magoro Parish</p> <p>Olowo John Bosco, LC2 Chairperson</p> <p>Jane Francis Obbo, Chairperson Parish Women Council</p>

appraisal of all proposals submitted for the revolving funds during the previous FY for all parishes, score 2, else score 0.

Obbo Stephen, Chairperson
Parish Youth Council

Othieno Robert, Chairperson
Parish Disability Council

Omollo Patrick, Chairperson
Parish NRM

Ojore Richard, Chairperson Parish
Older Persons Council

Merikit Parish

Othieno Erasmus, LC2
Chairperson

Amongn Juliet, Chairperson Parish
Women Council

Olowo Martin, Chairperson Parish
Youth Council

Oguti Tophil, Chairperson Parish
Disability Council

Okech Charles, Chairperson
Parish NRM

Onyango Damascus, Chairperson
Parish Older Persons Council

Angwalas Esther Mebo, Parish
Chief

only one (Kachinga) availed minutes for meetings held. For example, review of the minutes showed that Kachinga PDC held meetings on 28/9/2023, 18/12/2023 and 22/5/2024 where the PDC discussed on issues to do with PDM, among other development activities in their parishes.

Minutes for other two parishes (Central and Merikit). However, there was no evidence of minutes presented to proof that the two PDCs appraised all proposals submitted for revolving funds. This was because the appraisal of proposals for the revolving funds was no longer the responsibility of the PDCs but it was the responsibility of the PDM SACCO Loan Committees.

2	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. Maximum score is 2	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.	0	Although data from all the parishes in Merikit town council had been compiled through PDMIS, there was no evidence of updated data and their analysis disaggregated by village, gender, age and economic activity, among others.
3	The LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and PDCs on strategies for the development of the parish Maximum score is 6	Evidence that the LLG: 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 ii. Approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY score 2, else score 0 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	0 2 2	Although one NGO (UNICEF) was reportedly operating in Merikit town council, there was no evidence on file for the mapping report for NGOs, CBOs and CSOs operating in Merikit town council. Although all the 4 parishes of Merikit town council did not have parish development action plans for FY 2024/2025 in the right format, there was evidence of an approved sub-county work plan and budget for FY 2024/25 by Council reflecting parish activities. There was evidence that all the four parishes had their respective parish priority enterprises, which were as follows: Central parish (Poultry, Piggery and Rice); Kachinga parish (Poultry, Cassava and Piggery); Magoro parish (Piggery, Poultry and Fish farming); and Mrikit parish (Cassava, Piggery and Poultry,).

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 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 development plan III; score 1 or else 0	0	No consistence of the development plan budget and AWP.
---	--	--	---	--

		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.	0	Ward priorities not prepared seperately and not duly signed by parish chiefs & PDCs
		Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:	0	Although the budget conference was held on 17/10/2023 its out come was not incorporated in the planning and budgeting process.
		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	0	The LLG did not include investments to be financed by the LLG as well as other funding sources
		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	0	Project profiles for the current FY were not updated.
5	Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement Maximum score is 2	vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0	0	The budget was not submitted and not signed by town clerk and chairperson
		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	0	Evidence of submission of Procurement plan to DPU not presented.
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	0	DDEG AWP for the current FY not availed during the time of assessment.

Assessment area: C. Own Source Revenue Mobilization and Administration

7	LLG collected local revenue as per budget (Budget realization) Maximum score is 1	Evidence that the LLG collected OSR for the previous FY within +/- 10% of the budget score 1 or else score 0.	0	<p>✎ A budget for previous FY is not signed</p> <p>✎ No Annual Financial Statements for previous FY.</p>
8	Increase in LLG own source revenues from last financial year but one to last financial year. Maximum score 1	Evidence that the OSR collected increased from previous FY but one to previous FY by more than 5 %, score 1 or else score 0	0	<p>✎ No Annual Financial Statements for previous FY.</p> <p>✎ Availd AFS for previous FY but one.</p>
9	The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY Maximum score 4	<p>Evidence that the LLG:</p> <p>i. Has remitted OSR to the administrative units, score 1 or else score 0.</p> <p>0</p> <p>Evidence that the LLG:</p> <p>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</p> <p>0</p> <p>Evidence that the LLG:</p> <p>iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0</p> <p>1</p> <p>Evidence that the LLG:</p> <p>iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.</p> <p>1</p>	<p>✎ No evidence of OSR remittance to the District or Local Councils</p> <p>✎ Spent more than 20% of OSR on councilor’s allowances.</p> <p>✎ Budgeted for OSR and funds used on operation & maintenance. (Refer to VR 14/5)</p> <p>There is evidence of Publicizing OSR and how it was used for the previous FY as seen on the notice board.</p>	

Assessment area: D. Financial Management

10	The LLG submitted annual financial statements for the previous FY on time Maximum score is 4	Evidence that the LLG submitted its Annual Financial Statement to the Auditor General (AG) on time (i.e., by August 31), score 4 or else score 0	0	No evidence of submission of AFS for previous FY
----	---	--	---	--

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>1</p>	<p>Availed a signed copy of PBS Q1 submitted to CAO's office and to other relevant authorities on 12th/10/2023</p>
	<p>i. Q1 by 15th October score 1 or else 0</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>1</p>	<p>Availed a signed copy of PBS Q2, submitted to CAO's office on 10th/01/2024 and to other relevant authorities.</p>
	<p>ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0</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>1</p>	<p>Availed a signed copy of PBS Q3, submitted to CAO's office on 12th/04/2024 and to other relevant authorities.</p>
	<p>iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0</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>3</p>	<p>Availed a signed copy of PBS Q4, submitted to CAO's office on 15th/07/2024 and to other relevant authorities.</p> <p>Reported PDM funds</p>
	<p>iv. Q4 by 30th July score 3 or else 0</p>	

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	CDO, Agric, Vet officers and 4 parish chiefs appraised by 11/6/2024.
	Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:		
	(ii) Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year (by 31st December) – score 2 or else 0	0	Head teachers appraised and submission to DEO although a copy could not be accessed.
	Evidence that the SAS/Town Clerk appraised staff in the LLG:		
	(iii) HC III & II In-charges in the previous FY (by June 30th) – score 2 or else	0	The in-charges appraised although a copy could not be accessed.

Staff duty
attendance

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

3

Staff list publicized on the notice board

Staff attendance prepared with comments and submitted as bellow

1. June 2024 submitted on
1/7/2024.

2.May 2024 submitted on
17/6/2024.

3. April 2024 submitted on
6/5/2024.

4. March 2024 submitted on 5/4/2024.

5.Feb 2024 submitted on
6/3/2024.

6.Jan 2024 submitted on
15/2/2024.

7. Dec 2023 submitted on
15/2/2024.

8.Nov 2023 submitted on
13/12/2024.

9. Oct 2023 submitted on
13/2/2023.

10. Sept 2023 submitted on 3/10/2023.

11.August 2023 submitted on
13/09/2023.

12.Jule 2023submitted on
1/8/2023.

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

3

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

Maximum score is
2

2

Spent shs 6,425,500 on investment projects out of budgeted amount of shs 8,031,760 representing a performance of **80%**

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	2	The funds were used as guided by the work plan/Program eg spent 80% of DDEG on investment cost.
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.	3	The completion rate was at 100% because they procured all the 34 desks for Morukapel P/S, installed culverts, procured fruit seedlings within the FY in question.

Assessment area: 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	0	The LLG did not fill the Environmental and Social Screening (E&S) Forms for the projects.
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 (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	0 1	Although the LLG had publicized the referral path ways there was no grievance handling system in form of a log book being maintained. Grievance redress mechanism publicized.

19	The LLG has a functional land management system			6 members of ALC were appointed on 4/3/2022 under minute No 19/TDLG/C/24/11/2021. the members are
	Maximum score 1	If the LLG has a functional Area Land committee in place to assist the LG Land board in an advisory capacity on matters relating to land, including ascertaining rights on the land score 1 or else 0	1	Okumu Ben Owino C/person, Apel Irene Misty Sec other members are Okiru Gerald Mary, Oloka Alex Oganda, Oketcho Maliza, Echemere Barburu Rita.

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

20	Awareness campaigns and mobilization on education services conducted in last FY	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery score 3, else score 0	0	No reports on awareness and parents mobilization for improvement of education services.
	Maximum score is 3			
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:		1st term reports dated 12/2/2024 submitted on 28/2/2024
	Maximum score is 4	If all schools (100%) - score 4	4	2nd term report dated 4/06/2024 submitted on 28/6/2024
		If 80 – 99% – score 2		3rd term report dated 12/10/2023 submitted on 17/10/202
		If 60 to 79% score 1		Minute 4/5/24 and minute 6/5/24 GPC discussing issues of desks for Morukape and Merikit Primary schools.
		Below 60% score 0		
22	Existence and functionality of School Management Committees	Evidence that the LLG have functional school management committees in all schools; score 3, else score 0	0	There minutes but no implementation plan.
	Maximum score is 3			

Assessment area: I. Primary Health Care Services Management

23	Awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY Maximum score is 3	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery score 3, else score 0	0	No awareness campaigns report on community mobilization for improvement of primary health care.
24	The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY Maximum score is 4	Evidence that LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY , score 4 or else score 0	4	4th quarter report dated 28/6/2024 and submitted on 28/6/2024, 3rd quarter dated 4/4/20 on 8/4/2024, submitted on 8/4/2024, 2nd quarter dated 18/12/2023 on 18/2/2023 and 9 member attended on 14/2/2024.
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	0	In complete minutes.

Assessment area: 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	0	No Physical Planning Committee in place.
		(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	0	No Physical Planning Committee in place.

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 (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 (iii) Evidence that the LLG has a functional Development Control Team score 1 or else 0	0 0 0	No Physical Planning Committee in place. No Physical Planning Committee in place. No Physical Planning Committee in place.
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 (ii) If the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns on the management of solid waste during the previous FY score 1 or else 0	0 0	The LLG did not developed and implemented a solid waste management plan. The LLG did not conducted awareness campaigns on the management of solid waste during the previous FY.
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 (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 (iii) If the LLG has spent own source revenues of not less than 20% on O&M score 1 or else 0	0 0 0	The LLG has not prepared Annual Infrastructure inventory and condition survey report. The O&M Annual Work Plan for the current FY was not prepared. No evidence of own source revenue spent on O&M.

Assessment area: L. Production Services Management

34	Up to date data on agriculture and irrigation collected, analyzed and reported Maximum score is 2	If the LLG extension staff have collected, analyzed and reported data on agriculture (i.e., crop, animal and fisheries) and irrigation activities including production statistics for key commodities, data on irrigated land, farmer applications, farm visits etc. as per formats, the reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0.	2	There was evidence of production statistics reports submitted to LG Production office on 8/1/2024 for season 2 and 30/6/2024 for season 1 FY 2023/2024 and data collected was comprehensive and analyzed.
----	--	--	---	---

35	Farmer awareness and mobilization campaigns carried out through farmer field days and awareness meetings Maximum score is 2	If the LLG has carried out awareness and mobilization campaigns on all aspects of agriculture through farmer field days and awareness meetings, exchange visits, reports compiled and submitted to LG Production Office score 2 or else 0	2	There was evidence in form of awareness reports and associated attendance sheets to show that the LLG carried out awareness and mobilization campaigns on all aspects agriculture. For example, a report submitted to LG Production office on 11/7/2024 indicated that farmers were involved in field days and exchange visits that took place on 3/7/2024 at COFIA farm, among other awareness activities.
36	The LLG has carried out monitoring activities on production activities for crops, animals and fisheries Maximum score is 2	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	0	At the time of assessment, the LLG did not avail any monthly monitoring reports by extension staff and supervision reports by SAS.
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.	2	There was evidence on file that LLG extension workers such as Agero Judith for Namono Juliet (Agricultural Officer) and Jenga Paul (Animal Husbandry Officer) carried out farmer trainings as per attendance sheets on training reports submitted to LG Production office on 15/4/2024, 1/7/2024 and 15/7/2024.
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	2	There were field reports on extension support found on file that were submitted to LG Production office on 8/1/2024, 6/2/2024, 8/2/2024, 30/6/2024 and 15/7/2024. For filled agricultural extension diaries, MAAIF abolished hard copies of extension diaries and introduced e-extension diaries app in the FY 2022/2023 and in the FY 2023/2024, the app developed a problem whereby it failed to update data to-date.