



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Performance Assessment

Kikaatsi Subcounty

(Vote Code: 237116)

Score 76/100 (76%)

No.	Performance Measure	Scoring Guide	Score	Justification
Assessment area: A. Functionality of Parish Administrative Structures				
1	<p>The LLG has ensured that there are functional PDCs/WDCs in all their respective Parishes/Wards</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG has duly constituted PDCs/WDCs with composition in accordance with the PDM Guidelines, and that PDCs are fully functional as evidenced by mobilization of beneficiaries within a parish/ward, appraisal of all proposals submitted for the revolving funds during the previous FY for all parishes, score 2, else score 0.</p>	2	<p>There was evidence that Kikaatsi Subcounty constituted PDCs with composition of 7 members for each of the 3 Parishes i.e Embare Parish, Kayonza Parish and Keikoti Parish in accordance with the PDM Guidelines. The PDCs are fully functional as evidenced by Mobilisation of beneficiaries within each of the four parishes. The Minutes for mobilization meetings and reports for each of the three parishes were on file together with lists of the beneficiary enterprise groups and membership as follows: Embare Parish (40 groups), Kayonza Parish (22 groups) and Keikoti Parish (26 groups).</p> <p>All this Evidence was obtained from a file code named PDM File Red in colour.</p> <p>The LLG was compliant.</p>
2	<p>LLG has ensured that all Parish Chiefs/Town Agents have collected, compiled, and analyzed data on Parish/community profiling as stipulated in the PDM Guidelines.</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>Evidence that all the Parishes/Wards in a LLG have compiled, updated, and analyzed data on community profiling disaggregated by village, gender, age, economic activity among others as stipulated in the PDM Guidelines, score 2 else score 0.</p>		
3	<p>The LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and PDCs on strategies for the development of the parish</p> <p>Maximum score is 6</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG:</p> <p>i. Has mapped NGOs, CBOs & CSO operating in the LLG and involved them in raising awareness about the PDM and planning cycle: score 2, or else 0</p>	2	<p>Kikaatsi Subcounty conducted mapping exercise for all NGOs, CBOs, and SCOs as per the mapping report dated 18th May 2022 titled "Mapping of CBOs CSOs in Kikatsi Sub-County. Some of the NGOs on the list of 8 include; Kikaatsi Farmers Cooperative Society, Ngiira Farmers Cooperative Society, Kikaatsi coffe Farmers Association, Kyeibuza SACCO among others.</p> <p>The representatives of these CBOs participated in the meeting held on 31st May 2022 as evidenced in the minutes of the meeting and the report of the awareness creation. The representatives as evidenced from the minutes rallied people of Kikaatsi to embrace the PDM and interest themselves in planning for the development of their Parishes and sub-county at large by following up government projects and programs. The LLG was compliant.</p>

Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on:

ii. Approved Programmes/activities 2
to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY score 2, else score 0

There was Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on approved Programmes/activities to be implemented within the Parish for the current FY 2022/2023. The Subcounty Chief (SAS) wrote to all Village executive committees and PDCs on 13th May 2022 (Letter on file and was also on Notice board by the time of Assessment. The letter clearly indicated all the Six approved projects as follows:

1-Grading of Kigabagaba-keikoti CAR at 12 Million to be funded by DDEG and URF

2-Construction/extension of production offices using DDEG and

The LLG was compliant.

Evidence that the LLG provided guidance and information to the Village Executive Committees and to PDCs on:

iii. Priority enterprises that can be implemented in the parish score 2 or else 0

2

The LLG provided guidance and information to the village executive committees as evidenced by the letter written by SAS on 18/03/2022 seen on notice board and file clearly indicating the enterprises for each of the 3 parishes. The reports from agriculture extension workers showed evidence of support and guidance to farmers.

The LLG was compliant

Assessment area: B. Planning and Budgeting

4

The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines

Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:

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

1

A

Maximum score is 6

Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY:

ii. Incorporates ranked priorities from all its respective parish submissions which are duly signed by the Parish Chief and PDC Chairperson score 1 or else 0.

1

The LLG provided evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY 2022/2023 Incorporates ranked priorities from all its respective parish submissions which are duly signed by the Parish Chief and PDC Chairperson. The assessor established that all the 3 Parishes submitted their ranked priorities to SAS as follows: Embare Parish (on: 02/10/2021), Keikoti Parish (on: 03/10/2021) and Kayonza Parish (on: 08/02/2022). All the major projects in the approved AWP and Budget were seen on the lists of the submissions from the Parishes. The LLG was compliant.

The LLG presented evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and

Evidence that prioritized investments in the LLG council approved Annual Work plan and Budget (AWPB) for the current FY: 1

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

Budget (AWPB) for the current FY 2022/23 were based on the outcomes of the budget conference. The Budget conference report dated 28/04/2021 was in place and the ranked priorities from each parish were presented and discussed in the budget conference which was held on 24/11/2021. Budget conference report had all the 2 projects in the approved Annual Work plan and Budget for the current FY 2022/23.

The LLG was compliant.

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

Analysis of Kikaatsi Subcounty LLG Approved workplan and budget for FY 2022/2023 established inclusion of investments to be financed by the LLG. Namely

1. Construction/extension of subcounty Production office.
2. Grading of Kigabagaba – Keikoti Road road funded by DDEG and URF

The LLG was compliant.

v. Evidence that the LLG developed project profiles for all capital investments in the AWP and Budget as per format in NDP III Score 1 or else score 0 1

Kikaatsi Subcounty developed project profiles for all the capital investments in the AWP and Budget as per format in NDP III and were annexed to the budget and the annual workplan as one document.

The LLG was compliant

vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0 1

The LLG budget was submitted to the District before 15th May 2022. The assessor was provided with evidence of submission letter dated 13/05/2022 which on file. The Letter was stamped received by Chief Administrative Officer's Office and by the District Planner on 13/05/2022.

The LLG was Compliant.

5
Procurement planning for the current FY: submission of request for procurement
Maximum score is 2

Evidence that the LLG prepared and submitted inputs into the procurement plan for all the procurements to be done in a LLG for the current FY) to the CAO/TC by the 30th April of the previous FY, Score 2 or else score 0 2

The LLG presented evidence that the LLG prepared and submitted inputs into the procurement plan for all the procurements to be done in a LLG for the current FY: 2022/23 to the CAO by the 30th April of the previous FY 2021/22. The submission letter was in place stamped received by CAOs Office and Procurement and Disposal Unit on 24th April 2022. The copy was also received by PDU on the same date.

The LLG was Compliant.

6
Compliance of

Kikaatsi Subcounty was allocated DDEG totaling to

the LLG budget to DDEG investment menu for the current FY

Maximum score is 2

Evidence that the investments in the approved LLG Budget for the current FY comply with the investment menu in the DDEG Grant, Budget and Implementation Guidelines, score 2 or else score 0

2

UGX: 16,152,361/= for the FY 2022/2023. The analysis of the approved Budget for FY 2022/23 for Kikaatsi Subcounty provided evidence that the investments to be funded by DDEG i.e construction/extension of subcounty headquarters (production offices) which was equivalent to (80%) of the total DDEG IPF provided. This was in line with the provision of up to 80% of DDEG being spent on Capital works. The remaining funds were spent on Investment servicing Costs UGX: 1.615,236/= (10%) and UGX 1.615,236/= (10%) on Support to Parish Planning including data collection, monitoring all projects and programs in parish as per DDEG guidelines for FY 2022/2023. On Page 7.

The LLG was compliant.

Assessment area: C. Own Source Revenue Mobilization and Administration

7

LLG collected local revenue as per budget (Budget realization)

Maximum score is 1

Evidence that the LLG collected OSR for the previous FY within +/- 10% of the budget score 1 or else score 0.

1

the llg collected 100% OSR as of the revised budget of 21/22. the llg collected 24,131,500/= and had revised local revenue to 24,131,500/= in the council that sat on 10/5/2022 under MIN:11/05/2022 2nd paragraph. as evidenced in revised budget, AFS and council minutes

8

Increase in LLG own source revenues from last financial year but one to last financial year.

Maximum score 1

Evidence that the OSR collected increased from previous FY but one to previous FY by more than 5 %, score 1 or else score 0

1

the OSR collection increased by 29.4% from previous year but one as evidenced in the AFS

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.

1

the llg remitted mandatory share to the lg and lower administrative units as evidenced by transfer payment vouchers 1/6=700,000/= (5% for parishes), 1/6=3,000,000/=, 1/3=1,384,000/= (25% for LCI)

Evidence that the LLG:
ii. Did not use more than 20% of the OSR on councilors allowances in the previous FY (unless authority was granted by the Minister), score 1, else score 0

1

the llg spent 14.73% of OSR on councilors' allowance as evidenced in AFS under trial balances and payment vouchers (13/5=660000 dated 1/6/2022, 12/12=510000 dated 11/12/21, and 2/10=480000 dated 16/10/2021)

Evidence that the LLG:

the llg spent 17.72% (2,780,000/=) of OSR on O&M as

iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0 1
 evidenced in the payment vouchers: 3/12=200000, 29/12=100000, 13/11= 1200000, 8/11=60000, 4/6=100000,13/10=340000, 15/10=160000 and 17/10=300000

Evidence that the LLG:

iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0. 0
 the llg had not publicized the collection and expenditure on the public notice board

Assessment area: D. Financial Management

10 The LLG submitted annual financial statements for the previous FY on time 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
 the llg submitted AFS on 31/8/2022 as evidenced by the hard copy of submission letter stamped by the auditor general
 Maximum score is 4

11 The LLG has submitted all 4 quarterly financial and physical progress reports including finances for the Parish Development Model (PDM), for the previous FY on time and in the prescribed format 1
 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
 the llg submitted 1st quarter on 1/10/2021 evidenced by the submission letter stamped by planning and CAO'S office
 Maximum score is 6
 Evidence that the LLG submitted all four quarterly financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time: 1
 ii. Q2 by 15th January score 1 or else 0
 the llg submitted 2nd quarter on 3/1/2022 evidenced by the submission letter stamped by planning and CAO'S office
 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: 0
 iii. Q3 by 15th April score 1 or else 0
 the llg submitted 3rd quarter on 1/4/2022 evidenced by the submission letter stamped by planning and CAO'S office

Evidence that the LLG submitted

all four quarterly financial and physical progress reports, for the previous FY to the LG Accounting Officer including on the funding for the PDM on time: 3

the Ilg submitted 4th quarter on 1/7/2022 evidenced by the submission letter stamped by planning and CAO'S office

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

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

12

Appraisal of all staff in the LLG in the previous FY

Maximum score is 6

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

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

staff list was seen with different staffs like Nyamwija Donata,

Staff structure also seen

performance plan for all staffs appraised

appraisal reports were available.

SAS has a list of all staffs appraised by 25/6/2022.

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 2

The subcounty has 5 primary schools with 5 head teachers.

Primary School Head teachers in public primary schools in the previous school calendar year were all appraised by 31/12/2021. Foreexample Atweta Innocent of kikatsa p/s, Nuwahwera Addah of keikoti p/s, Twesigye Fred of Kyeibuza p/s

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 2

The Ilg has only 1 health Centre and the In-charge was appraised by 30/6/2022.

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 3

The Ilg publicised the staff attendance list on the notice board.

Evidence that the LLG has

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

The Ilg produced all the monthly analysis reports at every end of the month with recommendations made and duly submitted to CAO offices.

Assessment area: F. Implementation and Execution

14

The LLG has spent all the DDEG funds for the previous FY on eligible

Kikaatsi Subcounty had a budget of UGX 42,901,465/= as DDEG for FY 2021/2022.

The subcounty spent 80% of the grant (UGX 34,321,172/=) on 2 projects namely:

projects/activities

Maximum score is 2

Evidence that the LLG budgeted and spent all the DDEG for the previous FY on eligible projects/ activities as per the DDEG grant, budget, and implementation guidelines: Score 2, or else score 0

2

1-Grading of Ekikoona-Akashego CAR 16,355,743 Million

2-Renovation of Ruhengyere primary school at a total sum of UGX 17.965,429/= which was done by Jahe Contractors Ltd.

The other funds were spent on investment servicing costs and parish planning activities including monitoring.

The vouchers are on file and were verified.

The expenditure of 80% on capital projects was consistent with DDEG implementation guidelines and the projects were on the positive/eligible investments in the DDEg guidelines for FY 2021/2022.

The LLG was compliant.

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

Kikaatsi presented evidence that execution of budget in FY 2021/22 did not deviate for any of the sectors/main programs by more than +/-10%. The evidence was obtained from review of Annual Financial statements (Final accounts) on page 12 where the revised budget of UGX 97,588,476 was fully realized and spent implying 100% execution for all sectors and main programs. There were no deviations hence rendered the LLG compliant.

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

Kikaatsi Subcounty implemented only 2 projects in FY 2021/2022 i.e

1-Grading of Bunonko-Akatyaza CAR (4kms) at UGX 5,560,000/= using URF.

2-Grading of Ekikoona-Akashego CAR 16,355,743 Million

3-Renovation of Ruhengyere primary school at a total sum of UGX 17.965,429/= which was done by Jahe Contractors Ltd.

For each of the projects the completion certificates were seen attached on the payment vouchers.

Completion rate for projects were all at 100% by the end of FY 2021/2022.

Assessment area: G. Environmental and Social Safeguards

17

The LLG has implemented environmental and social safeguards during the previous FY

Evidence that the LLG carried out environmental, social and climate change screening where required, prior to implementation of all

Maximum score is 2 planned investments/ projects, score 2 or else score 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
- (ii) If the LLG has publicized the grievance redress mechanisms so that aggrieved parties know where to report and get redress score 1 or else 0

- 19 The LLG has a functional land management system
- 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

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
- 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
- 3
- Kikaatsi sub-county conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery as evidenced by reports; (1) Awareness activity report of the sub-county schools compiled on 30/6/2022 it indicated that 31/03/2022 activity was done at Ruhengyere primary school, Keikoti on 24/5/2022, Kyeibuza Primary school activity was done on 9/5/2022 and 19/05/2022 for Bunonko primary school. Rwanda Kikaatsi primary school on 9/2/2022. (2) Awareness report done on 23/5/2022 (3) Awareness report in the third quarter report done 14/3/2022.
- 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
- Kikaatsi sub-county monitored schools and compiled reports as evidenced by (1) 3rd Quarter report on monitoring and supervision of schools highlighting schools visited, challenges and recommendations. (2) Education quarterly reports 23/5/2022, 15/6/2022,26/3/2022. (3) Monitoring and supervision of all schools in Kikaatsi report on 17/01/2022. The sub-county monitored Specific schools as follows;

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

4

(1) Kikaatsi Primary school was monitored on 16/6/2022 and 24/03/2022

(2) Kyeibuza Primary school monitored 29/03/2022 and 20/06/2022

(3) Ruhengyere primary school monitored on 24/03/2022 and 16/06/2022

(4) Keikoti Primary school monitored 21/3/2022 and 29/6/2022

(5) Bunonko Primary 29/06/2022, 21/03/2022 and 27/7/2022

(6) Keikoti central primary school 22/3/2022 and 22/6/2022

(7) Gods care Kayoonza 10/3/2022 and 14/6/2022

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

3

Kikaatsi sub-county has functional school management committees. The committees were in place for schools. Kikaatsi primary schools' minutes of the meeting were done on 7/6/2022. Kyeibuza primary school minutes of the meeting indicate they were done on 28/3/2022 and 25/3/2022. Ruhengyere primary school minutes of the meeting indicate they were done on the 22/2/2022. Keikoti Primary school minutes of the meeting indicate 24/5/2022. Bunonko Primary school minutes of the meeting indicate the meeting was done 15/6/2022 and 9/2/2022.

Assessment area: I. Primary Health Care Services Management

23

Awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY

Maximum score is 3

Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery score 3, else score 0

3

LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and community mobilization for improved primary health care service delivery as evidenced by a report on community sensitization about communicable diseases that was conducted on 29/4/2022, a report on sensitization and awareness on malaria increase that was done on 23/5/2022, Stakeholder meeting held on 20/8/2021, awareness report on PHC done on 20/6/2022 by the health stakeholders highlighting activities done, lesson learnt and strategies set for improved service delivery and Kikaatsi HC conducted covid-19 campaign against Covid-19 through administering covid-19 vaccinations with pictorial attachments.

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

Monitoring was done according to a report done on 20/6/2022 with a picture attached. A monitoring report on health monitoring exercise done on 15/6/2022 identifying the monitoring team and the field findings and the action to be done in a given period. The health performance report done 14/07/2022 indicate monitoring was done. There was a performance report done on 7/7/2022 with details of the facility.

25	Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee	Evidence that the LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG; score 3, else score 0	3	The HUMC for Kikaatsi HCIII is in place and there 5 members according to the approval of HUMC report compiled on 30/5/2022. The appointment letters for HUMC members were in place. The HUMC minutes of a meeting held on 22/06/2022, 22/03/2022, 12/12/2021 and 14/9/2021 with their respective action plan and extend of implementation.
	Maximum score is 3			

Assessment area: J. Water & Environment Services Management

26	Evidence that the LLGs submitted requests to the DWO for consideration in the current FY budgets	Evidence that the SAS submitted in writing requests to the DWO for consideration in the planning of the current FY score 3, else score 0	3	The Ilg has the writing requests dated 14/6/2022 submitted to DWO for consideration in this current FY. The request was for a borehole in Bunoko borehole, Byembogo cell also need a bore hole.
	Maximum score is 3			
27	The LLG has monitored water and environment services delivery during the previous FY	Evidence that SAS/ATC monitored/supervised aspects of water and environment services during the previous FY including review of water points and facilities, score 3 or else score 0	0	SAS has reports on monitoring all aspects of water with reports done on a quarterly basis. The reports includes all new latrines, drying racks and hand washing facilities. Quarter 1 was dated 7/9/2021 quarter 3 23/3/2022, quarter 4 23/6/2022 .however all these reports are yet submitted to to the DWO.
	Maximum score is 3			
28	Existence and functionality of Water and Sanitation Committees	Evidence that the LLG have functional Water and Sanitation Committees (including collection and proper use of community contributions) score 2, else score 0	2	The composition of WUC are in place in 3 parishes and 17 water sources. For example kururoko borehole the chairperson is Nuwagira Geofrey .The WUC has minutes that sat on 11/3/2022. Bunonko borehole has minutes that sat on 10/3/2022 with a chairperson Nasasira Mariam .Byembogo borehole sat on 25/6/2022 and its chairperson is Byabagye Geofrey.
	Maximum score is 2			
29	Functionality of investments in water and sanitation facilities	Evidence that the SAS has an updated lists on all its water and sanitation facilities (public latrines) and functionality status. Score 2 else 0	0	The Ilg has an updated list of all its water sources and their functionality status however they are not yet submitted to the DWO.
	Maximum score is 2			

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.

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

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

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.

38

The LLG has provided hands-

If the LLG extension staff have

on extension support to farmers and farmer organizations / groups	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
Maximum score is 2	