



LLG Performance Assessment

LLG Name: Nansana Div

Nansana Municipal Council

(Vote Code: 725)

Assessment	Scores
LLG Performance Assessment	81%

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 was evidence that the PDCs were constituted as the guidelines stipulate with 7 members.</p> <p>The PDCs were involved in mobilization of the residents during enterprise selection and SACCO formation.</p> <p>There was evidence of reports about proposals submitted about the revolving funds.</p> <p>The minutes for the PDCs meetings were also produced.</p> <p>The PDM guidelines were also followed.</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 evidence that all town agents and parish chiefs collected, compiled data for analyzing community profiles household profiles and economic activities in their respective wards.</p> <p>there was evidence from the T/C that she received the reports from the town agents about the data collected.</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 evidence of NGOs, CBOS and CSOs however there was no evidence that they participated in PDM awareness and planning cycle.</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>annual work plans were present and PDCs and village executive committees were provided guidance on the approved programmes/activities as per the annual workplans from all the division town agents. the AWPB were all signed by the LC1 chairpersons and the respective ward town agents.</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 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 evidence of the annual workplans and budgets by the town agents and the PDCs and village executive committees were all guided through the different participatory meetings held in the different cells and wards. the AWPB were all signed by the LC1 chairpersons and recieved by the SATC</p>	2

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>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 evidence that the Division Council AWP and budget for the current fy was consistent with the 5 year development plan III evidenced by the projects below; construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kazo Primary Schools for staff, Supply of 3 seater wooden desks with metallic stands and Grading and stone pitching of Kakooza-Kafunda Rd.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score is 6</p>			
4	<p>The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines</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 was evidence of all the ranked priorities from all parish submissions being incorporated in the AWPB and were duly signed by the parish chief and PDC chairperson.</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score is 6</p>			
4	<p>The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines</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 evidence that the AWPB is based on the outcomes of the budget conference report dated 15/nov/2021</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score is 6</p>			

4	<p>The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines</p>	<p>iv. That the LLG budget include investments to be financed by the LLG score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>There was evidence that the Division Council budgeted to implement the following projects; Construction of 5 stance lined pit latrine at Kazo Primary School and supply wooden 3 seater desks with metallic stands to selected UPE schools, Supply of furniture for offices and Council pews</p>	1
	<p>Maximum score is 6</p>			
4	<p>The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines</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>Not yet done</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score is 6</p>			
4	<p>The LLG conducted Annual Planning and Budgeting exercise for the current FY as per the Planning and Budgeting Guidelines</p>	<p>vi. That the LLG budget was submitted to the District/Municipality/City before 15th May: score 1 or else 0</p>	<p>The LLG budget was submitted on the 15th of May 2022</p>	0
	<p>Maximum score is 6</p>			

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	The LLG procurement plan was submitted on 26/april/2022	2
---	--	--	---	---

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	The SATC provided evidence that the DDEG Grant was budgeted for appropriately; 10% was earmarked for monitoring supervision and appraisal of capital works, 10% was earmarked as support to parish activities, Grading and stone pitching of Alliance Road, Ivory Estate, Victory Church-Kabumbi, Kasolo-Kamponye drainage, Kakooza-Kafunda Rd were to be implemented under 80% UDDEG.	2
---	---	--	---	---

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.	The Division budgeted to collect 1,601,860,000 from OSR however, 1,285,254,154 was collected translating to a deviation of 19.8%	0
---	--	---	--	---

8	Increase in LLG own source revenues from last financial year but one to last financial year.	Evidence that the OSR collected increased from previous FY but one to previous FY by more than 5 %, score 1 or else score 0	The Division collected 613,475,250 in fy 2020/2021 and UGX 1,285,254,154 was collected in fy 2021/2022 representing an increase of 47.73%	1
	Maximum score 1			
9	The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY	Evidence that the LLG: i. Has remitted OSR to the administrative units, score 1 or else score 0.	The 10% remitted to the Ward amounted to 54,227,629/= and the 25% remitted to Cells was 135,749,025/=	1
	Maximum score 4			
9	The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY	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	The Division spent 138,380,000 as Councilors' allowances from the budgeted 1,285,254,154 OSR translating to 10.76%	1
	Maximum score 4			
9	The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY	Evidence that the LLG: iii. Have budgeted and used OSR funds on operational and maintenance in previous FY, score 1, else score 0	Only UGX 1,379,500 was spent under Operation and Maintenance.	0
	Maximum score 4			

9	The LLG has properly managed and used OSR collected in the previous FY	Evidence that the LLG: iv. Publicised the OSR and how it was used for the previous FY, score 1, else score 0.	The Division publicised revenue performance for the previous financial year and also had the projects implemented in fy 2021/22 pinned on the notice board.	1
	Maximum score 4			

D. Financial Management

10	The LLG submitted annual financial statements for the previous FY on time	Evidence that the LLG submitted its Annual Financial Statement to the Auditor General (AG) on time (i.e., by August 31), score 4 or else score 0	The Financial statements were submitted on 29/08/2022	4
	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	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	Submitted on 14/10/2021	1
	Maximum score is 6			

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>Submitted on 12th January 2022</p>	1
----	--	---	---------------------------------------	----------

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>they were submitted on 13/04/2022</p>	1
----	--	--	--	----------

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:

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

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

there was evidence from the SATC that all 16 staff at the division were appraised for the previous FY as per submitted report to the municipal council dated 28/july/2022

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:

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

there was no evidence of appraisal forms for primary school Head teachers for the previous FY

it was attributed to closure of schools due to COVID 19

0

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 was evidence from the SATC that all health IN charges of Nabweru HCIII and Nakuule HCII were appraised for the previous FY as per the reports dated 28/July/2022 and 30/June/2022 all submitted to the municipal council.	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	The list of Division of was publicized and is available on the notice board with staff contacts	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	Monthly staff attendance analysis presented for the 12 months	3

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	The Division Spent the DDEG funds as per the guidelines i.e. 80% Grading of Sekirabanga Road 0.7m, Stone pitching of side drains Muganzirwaza 448m2, and 10% was used for participatory planning and data collection at Ward level, 10% was used for monitoring and supervision of capital works.	2
----	--	---	---	---

15	<p>The LLG spent the funds as per budget</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>The Division budgeted to collect UGX 2,174,936,257 and collected 1,945,944,494 representing a percentage of 10%</p>	2
16	<p>Completion of investments as per annual work plan and budget</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>Evidence that the investment projects planned in the previous FY were completed as per work plan by end of FY (quarter four) :</p> <p>If more than 90 % was completed: Score 3</p> <p>If 70% -90%: Score 2</p> <p>If less than 70 %: Score 0.</p>	<p>All the projects budgeted for implementation in the previous financial year were implemented apart from Kazo-Lujegere Rd</p>	3

G. Environmental and Social Safeguards

17	<p>The LLG has implemented environmental and social safeguards during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 2</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>there was evidence from the SATC of the E&S forms from the ministry of LG for the projects to be implemented in the different cells in nansana division i.e. muganzilwanza, kazo, nabweru north and nansana</p> <p>all certificates were signed by the municipal environment officer and the SATC</p>	2
----	---	---	--	----------

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 feedback, complaints log book with clear information and reference for onward action, a defined complaints referral path, and public display of information at LLG offices score 1 or else 0	there was evidence of a grivance comitte with 6 members all having appointment letters from the SATC there was evidence of the existence of a complaints log book with clear information and references for onward actions.. the log book showed a defined complaints referral path	1
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 evidence on public display of information at the division office notice board for the public to know how to go about grievances.to get redress	1
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	LLG has constituted the area land committee but not confirmed or active	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	Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and parent's mobilization for improvement of education service delivery score 3, else score 0	there was evidence from the SATC about awareness campaigns and parents mobilization for improvement of education services as per the report dated 04/July/2022 from the division health inspector.	3
	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:	there was evidence from the SATC that all the 5 schools in the division were monitored as per the report from the division health inspector carried out on the 21/01/2022	4
	Maximum score is 4	<p>If all schools (100%) - score 4</p> <p>If 80 – 99% – score 2</p> <p>If 60 to 79% score 1</p> <p>Below 60% score 0</p>	<p>the schools visited were Kazo cou ps, Kazo Mixed ps, Nansana cou ps, Nansana sda ps, and St Joseph ps</p>	
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	all the five schools have school management committees in place and all the members have appointment letters from the SATC	3
	Maximum score is 3			

I. Primary Health Care Services Management

23	<p>Awareness campaigns and mobilization on primary health care conducted in last FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG has conducted awareness campaigns and mobilized communities for improved primary health care service delivery score 3, else score 0</p>	<p>there was evidence from the SATC of the awareness campaigns and community mobilisation on improved health care as per the report dated 10/06/2022 by the division health inspector.</p>	3
24	<p>The LLG monitored health service delivery at least twice during the previous FY</p> <p>Maximum score is 4</p>	<p>Evidence that LLG monitored aspects of health service delivery during the previous FY , score 4 or else score 0</p>	<p>there was evidence of monitoring report on health service delivery by the health inspector in Nabweru HCIII, Nakuule HC II and in all the schools in the division. the report dated 20/06/2022 clearly stipulated findings and recommendations in all the areas visited.</p> <p>report was received by the SATC and submitted to the executive for discussion.</p>	4
25	<p>Existence and functionality of Health Unit Management Committee</p> <p>Maximum score is 3</p>	<p>Evidence that the LLG have functional Health unit Management Committee for all Health Facilities in the LLG; score 3, else score 0</p>	<p>there was evidence from the SATC of the existence and functionality of the health management committees in both Nabweru HCIII and Nakuule HCII all having 9 members.</p> <p>all members had appointment letters from the SATC</p>	3

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
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
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
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
Maximum score is 2

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	not applicable	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	not applicable	0
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	not applicable	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	not applicable	0

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

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	not applicable	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	not applicable	0

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.	there was evidence from the SATC about production statistics as per the agricultural extension data collection form the division Assistant VET officer. data was collected, compiled and submitted to the municipal production office for approval.	2
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	there was evidence from the SATC about awareness creation reports i.e. dairy zero grazing report dated 2/3/2022, poultry beneficiary verification report dated 10/06/2022, farm visits report in different cells dated 30/04/2022. attendance lists were also included in the reports. the reports were all submitted to the municipal production office	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 was evidence of quarterly monitoring reports by extension staff in the division. Agricultural Extension Services reports by the extension worker dated 22/11/2021,30/09/2021, and 4/04/2022,</p> <p>reports were submitted to the municipal production office and recieved by the SATC</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 was evidence of training programs by the assistant agricultural officer through training reports i.e. Dairy Zero grazing activity. Quarterly reports dated 30/09/2021, 4/04/2022 also clearly indicated the trainings in FMD vaccination, mushroom demo site at kazo central the report has attendance sheets as well.</p> <p>the report was submitted to the municipal production office for approval.</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>field and farmer visit reports were present</p> <p>a filled agricultural extension dairy was also presented</p>	2