

DISTRICT LEAGUE TABLE 2016

CALLING FOR CENTRAL GOVERNMENT TO BETTER TARGET DISTRICT SUPPORT

DECEMBER 2016

unicef



Introduction

Increased accountability between decision-makers and citizens is crucial in Ghana for improving both the demand for and the supply of quality public services. The District League Table is an independent tool for promoting social accountability. It is produced on an annual basis by UNICEF Ghana and the Ghana Centre for Democratic Development (CDD Ghana) in collaboration with the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development. The District League Table 2016 marks the third year since initial publication and much has changed, in terms of the index itself and the impact that the District League Table has made on raising accountability for development across the country.



Since the launch of last year's District League Table, we have engaged with key stakeholders at the national and regional levels across the country, talking with policy-makers, local government staff and citizen groups to understand how they have been using the District League Table to create change. We have listened to feedback and ideas on how to improve the District League Table and gathered stories and information on how it is being used to generate debate and accountability for improving wellbeing across the country.

A key finding of these reviews is the need to underline once more that the table is not to assess performance of District Assemblies but rather shows overall wellbeing across the entire country at the District level. The development of a District is not the sole responsibility of the District Assembly but rather sits with a range of actors, especially those at the central level that allocate the majority of resources to the local level. This means that for those Districts that are ranking near the bottom of the District League Table, it can be used to argue

the case for increased national support to be targeted toward them thereby improving the equity of resource allocation and ultimately wellbeing across Ghana.

This year's brief report summarises the objectives of and improvements in the District League Table, and presents the results and major trends for 2016. It explores how the District League Table is being used to bring about change, and concludes with some key outcomes.

What is the District League Table?

The District League Table is a simple ranking tool showing national progress toward delivering development across Ghana's 216 Districts. While District Assemblies are assessed for their compliance against administrative and statutory requirements in other measures, the District League Table focuses rather on Ghana's actual progress in improving development and wellbeing across the country as a whole, breaking down the indicators to the District level. Key District indicators are aggregated into an index which then allows Districts to be ranked from 1st down to 216th place in terms of level of development.

The objectives

The objective of the District League Table is to increase social accountability in Ghana so as to lead to improved development for the country's population. It does this by opening up space for dialogue between the state and the population through the provision and tracking of essential information on wellbeing at the District level. The District League Table has the following 4 aims:

1. To support central and local Government to better understand progress in development across the country.
2. To increase transparency of information on development at the District level and raise the populace's awareness;
3. To support debate and dialogue on accountability and development progress; and
4. To increase state responsiveness in the provision and delivery of essential services across the country.

It is expected that through the use of the District League Table's results, citizens will become increasingly informed and empowered to understand how development is progressing across the country. It is also expected that the Ghanaian Government and other stakeholders at National, Regional and District levels will be empowered to use the results to identify gaps in development, target support better, and monitor progress year on year.

The Methodology

The District League Table's simple methodology is based on global practice of index design such as the Human Development Index. As such, it provides us with a holistic overview of which Districts are developing well and which need more support – it is not intended to provide information on progress in specific sectors.

Following extensive stakeholder discussions at national level and at local level in the ten regions of the country, this year's District League Table was reviewed to ensure it continues to use the best available indicators possible. Pre-launch briefings were again held with District and Regional actors as well as MDAs responsible in providing the data required.

While more information on the methodology is available on our websites, the District League Table's approach of aggregating six key indicators from six different sectors remains unchanged. However, an important improvement this year is in two of the indicators – specifically those on sanitation and governance. Due to important improvements in data collection in the sector the sanitation indicator now reflects progress toward Open Defecation Free status at the community – rather than simply District – level. The governance indicator now considers MMDAs' scores on the

FOAT Performance Measure instead of their simple fulfilment of the FOAT Minimum Conditions. While other indicators continue to be suggested, until they exist in official, routine data collection systems they clearly cannot be used. As before, all indicators are officially established national indicators available in national, verified Government databases.



Sector	Indicator		Measurement	Source	Year	Target
Education	District BECE pass rate		% of pupils that passed their BECE (average of the four core subjects pass rates)	EMIS (GES)	2014/2015	100%
Sanitation	Community certification for Open Defecation Free	In 2015 was: Whether District is certified ODF or not	% of the District's communities that are certified ODF	Environmental Health and Sanitation, MLGRD (BASIS)	2015	100% of communities are certified ODF
Rural Water	Coverage of rural water supply (in Districts with rural populations only)		% of rural population covered by a rural water supply system	CWSA	2015	100%
Health	Skilled attendant at delivery		% of expected deliveries attended by skilled personnel	DHIMS (GHS)	2015	100%
Security	Coverage of police services		Number of population per police officer converted to 0-100 index	Ghana Police	2015	1 officer per 500 people
Governance	FOAT Performance Measures Score	In 2015 was: if FOAT Minimum conditions for District Administration met	FOAT Performance Measures Score	DDF/FOAT	2013	100%

Ghana's District League Table 2016



■ High Ranking
(more than 65%)

Mid Ranking
(50-65%)

Low Ranking
(less than 50%)

The Results

The results of the 2016 District League Table are presented in the map, as well as in full in the table, which shows the 2016 score for each District, its rank, and its score for last year.



Once again this year, there is a new District topping the table; that of La Nkwantanang-Madina Municipal, in the Greater Accra Region, with a score of 77.8. The District in 216th place is now North Tongu in the Volta Region with a score of 40.9. This means that the top and bottom scores have both improved slightly since last year. The national average is 58.9, below which 101 Districts are found – this compares with an average of 56 in 2015. With an eventual target of a score of 100%, it is clear that the majority of Districts are still far from this goal.

Encouragingly there are 8 Districts that are new to the top 20, such as Asunafo North Municipal in the Brong Ahafo Region. Furthermore, almost half of the Districts in the bottom 20 are new there too as several featuring there last year have managed to move up. Karaga, which was the 216th District in 2014, has risen to 207th place due to improvements in education and sanitation.

Considering the Regions by their average score provides the ranking as below. We continue to see better off Regions ranking higher. However, important improvement is noted by the Central and the Northern region, the latter managing to move off the bottom of the Regional ranking.

Regional Average Scores

		2016	2015
1	Ashanti	63	61
2	G. Accra	62	61
3	B. Ahafo	61	60
4	Upper East	61	59
5	Western	61	59
6	Upper West	60	53
7	Central	59	53
8	Eastern	56	55
9	Northern	55	50
10	Volta	54	53

The top Districts in each of the Regions are listed below. This list supports the overall trend that Municipal Districts are more likely to rank higher in the league table than their rural counterparts.

Top Districts in each Region

Ashanti	Ejura Sekyeredumase Municipal
G. Accra	La Nkwantanang-Madina Municipal
B. Ahafo	Jaman South
Upper East	Bawku Municipal
Western	Bibiani Anhwiaso Bekwai
Upper West	Sissala East
Central	Awutu Senya East Municipal
Eastern	Nsawam-Adoagyiri Municipal
Northern	Yendi Municipal
Volta	Kpando

Since 2015, there have been some important shifts in the ranking of Districts, a little of which is due to the changes in the sanitation and the governance indicators, however most of the changes are due to a District's level of development. In the table, those Districts that have risen in ranking are shaded in green and those that have declined are shaded red. Overall, 164 Districts managed to improve their score as compared to last year. But this means that 52 other Districts experienced a decline in the score. Some Districts saw large increases in their score as they managed to overcome certain obstacles. The most improved District was Wa East in Upper West Region which managed to increase their score by 27 percentage points. Other Districts that rose significantly included Agona West Municipal in Central Region, and Suaman in Western Region.

A key area of improvement has been that of sanitation. While no District in Ghana is still yet certified as Open Defecation Free, with the new data available we can see that several Districts are making good progress by certifying individual communities, such as Nandom and Lawra in Upper West, and Mion in the Northern Region.

As noted above, while not always the case, Metropolitans and Municipalities often perform better than more rural Districts. Two-thirds of the top 20 Districts are Municipalities or Metropolitans, whilst none of the bottom 20 Districts are. This points to an ever widening gap between rural and urban areas.

As highlighted in previous years, we continue to see important differences in development levels between Districts, particularly between Districts in the same region. Across the country as a whole, those Districts at the top of the ranking are doing almost twice as well as the lowest ranked Districts, although the gap has showed signs of narrowing this year. While Districts in better-off Regions are likely to rank higher in the District League Table and those from poorer Regions rank lower, this pattern is not a reliable predictor of District ranking. Indeed, in the table above we see that Ghana's two poorest Regions, Upper West and Upper East, are not close to having the lowest average scores.

What is of most note, is that some Districts are performing better than might be expected of them. Certain Districts with high poverty rate rank higher than average. In particular, it is noted that inequality within Regions is now greater than inequality between regions, or between the north and the south of the country. The Central, Northern, Eastern and Greater Accra Regions have the greatest disparities between their top and bottom Districts. In Central Region, Awutu Senya scores 72 while Ekumfi scores 41.8. In the Northern Region, Bole scores 68 while East Gonja scores just 43.

As examined in 2014 and 2015, a number of factors drive a District's level of development. While the Region's poverty level can be a key factor, it is not the only determinant and others such as equitability of resource allocation from central government, ability to raise Internally Generated Revenue (IGR), or issues such as good leadership and collaborative working can be crucial.

Use and Impressions of the District League Table

Multiple actors can use the District League Table to promote accountability. However, it is crucial to note that responsibility for progress in development across the entire country sits largely with the central Government as the majority of resources continue to be allocated from that level. This means that service provision or development in a District is not largely led by nor attributed to the District Assembly. Indeed the District League Table cannot be used to assess the performance of District Assemblies.

This means that the District League Table must be used to raise accountability for development and service delivery primarily with central Government. In this way, that the District League Table aims to empower – it does not intend to 'name and shame' low-ranking Districts. It must be used to highlight inequities in local development and call for more support where required. Central Government must use the ranking as a framework to understand the national picture on inequities and how to better target resource allocation. Donors can also use it to support planning decisions and to call for greater accountability. Media and civil society have a central role to play in disseminating and questioning progress, and to support the creation of a national dialogue around development issues. District staff can use the ranking to provide valuable information on where they stand in their region or in the country as a whole and use it as a basis to call for more resources. Citizens can use it to inform them on their District's national ranking and to call all stakeholders to address slow progress.

The District League Table will only be effective in promoting accountability for development across the country if it is widely promoted, talked about,

understood and used to bring about change. The primary channel through which this is likely to occur is through awareness-raising on the District League Table with central Government that brings about more equitable resource allocation. A second important channel is through communication with citizens and District officers that results in increased awareness of a District's comparative level of wellbeing.



District League Table 2015 displayed on District notice board in Northern Region

The main driver of such awareness-raising has been widespread dissemination and communication on the District League Table and its results following the annual launch – in 2015, more than 50 media articles and reports were generated. As a result, awareness of the initiative is very high - in a targeted survey of over 150 District officers in 4 regions of the country, almost 95% of officers interviewed were aware of the District League Table¹¹.

At the national level, we are yet to assess the reach and influence of the District League Table beyond the media. It is important that we can be clear whether the initiative is being used to better target support. A key challenge has been to translate raised awareness of the District League Table at the central Government level into its acceptance and use as a tool to improve resource allocation.

At the local level, Districts are using it to hold discussions on their development progress and create momentum for improving their situation, as the quotes below suggest.

"The DLT is good because it tells you how you are doing and it also informs you of what you should do to make the people happy by ensuring that you are accountable to the people. The report has made it possible for us

¹¹2016. UNICEF field report for Greater Accra, Western, Northern, Eastern and Volta Regions

to make certain decisions in the districts". **Richard K. Oduro, Municipal Planning Officer, LaDade Kotopon Municipal, Greater Accra region.**

"It is a good exercise, and I like the fact that ... the DLT highlight[s] the gaps to redirect policy to address them. Some of the districts do not even understand these things and they go on building schools and CHPS compounds and not really assess the benefit on people". **Alhassan Issahaku, Regional Coordinating Director, Northern region.**

"It increases transparency and openness ..." **Sammy Ewoade, District Chief Executive, Ho West, Volta Region.**

"When I heard about the release of the league table I wanted to know the position of Jomoro and Axim because they are close districts. There is excitement and we want to know how we did. So now, before it is released we try to do what we can to do better. ... It's not about one person, it's about all departments. Once we hear the league table is out, we are eager to know where our district is. We are all aware that another one will be coming so we have to work harder to improve and perform better than other districts". **Ted Tetteh, Environmental Health officer, Ellembelle District Assembly, Western Region.**

But again, not all reactions to the District League Table at the local level were positive. Most critical feedback relates to the lack of control that Districts have over their own resource allocation and that responsibility sits to a greater degree with the central level of Government rather than with Districts themselves.

"The report should be directed to central government so they know how they can best support development at the local level. Fine tune the process such that central government can assist. The DLT assessment is putting pressure on districts on things they cannot control". **Kafui Semenu Bekui, District Chief Executive, South Dayi, Volta Region.**

"The DLT is good but the comparison creates problems because districts do not have the resources to work with". **John Vadi, District Coordinating Director, Upper Manya Krobo, Eastern Region.**

Key Messages

A central conclusion that can be drawn from the District League Table is that inequity within regions remains a major issue. Individual Regions, whether in the north or the south, continue to see wide differences between the scores of their Districts. This means that a range of different factors are influencing the wellbeing of a particular District. These factors need to be better analysed and understood, so that lessons can be learned from higher ranking Districts and applied to lower ranking neighbours.

As a public good, accessibility to quality data still remains a major challenge. Basic indicators on

wellbeing are not freely published nor easily available. Although the indicators used are part of national databases such as the EMIS and the DHIMS, such databases are often stored on individual computers in agencies in Accra and are not published annually online as in other countries. However, as the league table is repeated annually, we are seeing some progress in data collection and availability - gaps in rural water data have been improved, and BECE scores for each District for 2014/15 are available online, even if only in PDF format. The emerging online sanitation information system, BASIS, developed under the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development is a commendable example.

In addition, there is a continuing desire to use other indicators in the District League Table which do not as yet exist in national, annual databases at a District level (such as those related to violence, roads, agriculture, learning or crime). Where the demand exists for such information, MDAs should attempt to fill the data gap through improvements in data systems and their accessibility.

Finally, it needs reiteration that the development of Ghana's 216 Districts is a responsibility of Government as a whole, particularly central Government which is largely responsible for resource allocation. This means that where Districts are facing significant challenges, they need to be supported with targeted assistance – such as increased District Assembly Common Fund allocations – to ensure they can boost their development levels. In allocating resources from the central level to Districts, Government is encouraged to use the District League Table ranking as a basis for more equitable resource allocation.

All related data and documents are available on the website: <http://www.unicef.org/ghana/>, <http://www.cddgh.org/publications> and <http://iamawareghana.com/index.php?id=71>

Acknowledgements

The District League Table is jointly produced by UNICEF and CDD Ghana. The authors of the report gratefully recognise the collaboration with the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, particularly Dorothy Onny, Joseph Obeng Poku and Raphael Edu-Gyan, in the production and dissemination of the District League Table. Furthermore, we are grateful for the supportive contributions of the agencies who participated by sharing data and advice, these include the Environmental Health and Sanitation Department (at MLGRD), Ministry of Education, Ghana Education Service, Ministry of Health, Ghana Health Services, Community Water and Sanitation Agency, Ghana Police Service, and the Ghana Statistical Service. This report was written by UNICEF Ghana with CDD Ghana. The UNICEF team comprised Sarah Hague, Charles Dzradosi, Offeibea Baddoo, and Ruth Pappoe. The CDD Ghana team comprised Franklin Oduro, Mavis Zupork Dome, Mohammed Awal, Rexford K. Asiam, Mina Okura and Edem Selormey.

RANK	DISTRICT	REGION	SCORE 2016	RANK (2015)	RANK	DISTRICT	REGION	SCORE 2016	RANK (2015)	RANK	DISTRICT
1	La Nkwantanang-Madina Municipal	GA	77.8	2	43	Tano North	BA	65.1	44	87	Sunyani West
2	Tema Metropolitan	GA	77.6	1	44	Bawku West	UE	65.1	47	88	Asante Akim South
3	Awutu Senya East Municipal	CR	74.4	13	45	East Mamprusi	NR	65.0	62	89	Nadabdam
4	Awutu Senya	CR	72.5	5	46	Asunafo South	BA	64.9	49	90	Sefwi Akontombrab
5	Ejura Sekyeredumase Municipal	AR	72.4	11	47	Assin North Municipal	CR	64.9	78	91	Suhum Municipal
6	Offinso municipal	AR	72.1	38	48	Wassa Amenfi East	WR	64.8	72	92	Biakoye
7	Bibiani Anhwiaso Bekwai	WR	72.0	4	49	Wa East	UW	64.6	214	93	Sene West
8	Asante Akim North	AR	71.8	17	50	Dormaa Central Municipal	BA	64.3	19	94	Ajumako-Enyan-E
9	Upper Denkyira East Municipal	CR	71.7	22	51	East Akim Municipal	ER	64.3	89	95	Builsa North
10	Nsawam-Adoagyiri Municipal	ER	71.3	8	52	Kpando	VR	64.2	30	96	Kassena Nankana
11	Ellembele	WR	71.3	14	53	Nandom	UW	64.2	96	97	Jirapa
12	Bekwai Municipal	AR	70.6	27	54	Birim North	ER	64.0	69	98	Asutifi North
13	Jaman South	BA	70.2	6	55	Suaman	WR	64.0	176	99	South Tongu
14	Berekum Municipal	BA	70.2	10	56	South Dayi	VR	63.7	117	100	Shama
15	Sunyani Municipal	BA	69.9	20	57	Hohoe Municipal	VR	63.6	139	101	Kassena Nankana Municipal
16	Asunafo North Municipal	BA	69.9	46	58	Bia West	WR	63.6	57	102	Atiwa
17	Ashaiman Municipal	GA	69.5	23	59	Bongo	UE	63.5	53	103	Sekyere Afram Plains South
18	Bawku Municipal	UE	69.2	33	60	Lawra	UW	63.5	102	104	Efutu Municipal
19	Asutifi South	BA	69.0	29	61	Keta Municipal	VR	63.5	74	105	New Juaben Municipal
20	Kwahu West Municipal	ER	68.6	25	62	Kintampo North Municipal	BA	63.3	70	106	Nkoranza North
21	Wenchi Municipal	BA	68.5	50	63	Upper Denkyira West	CR	63.2	67	107	Sissala West
22	Tarkwa Nsuaem Municipal	WR	68.3	39	64	Ga West Municipal	GA	63.1	54	108	Offinso North
23	Yendi Municipal	NR	68.2	51	65	Tamale Metropolitan	NR	63.0	58	109	Banda
24	Juabeso	WR	68.1	9	66	Ejisu-Juaben Municipal	AR	63.0	55	110	Krachi West
25	Bole	NR	68.0	40	67	Kwabre East	AR	63.0	24	111	Savelugu Nanton Municipal
26	Obuasi municipal	AR	67.7	16	68	Nkoranza South Municipal	B.A	63.0	26	112	Jasikan
27	Sekyere East	AR	67.7	42	69	Lower Manya Krobo Municipal	ER	62.8	121	113	Mion
28	Techiman Municipal	BA	67.6	34	70	Pusiga	UE	62.8	83	114	Nzema East Municipal
29	Bolgatanga Municipal	UE	67.2	21	71	Nadowli-Kaleo	UW	62.7	116	115	Ga East Municipal
30	Asante Akim Central Municipal	AR	67.1	41	72	Komenda Edina Eguaf	CR	62.7	98	116	Talensi
31	Mampong Municipal	AR	67.1	52	73	Twifo Ati-Morkwa	CR	62.7	104	117	Wassa Amenfi Central
32	Sissala East	UW	67.0	60	74	Mpohor	WR	62.5	32	118	Bosomtwe
33	Shai-Osudoku	GA	66.6	28	75	Ningo-Prampram	GA	62.4	76	119	Agona West Municipal
34	Accra Metropolitan	GA	65.9	37	76	Jaman North	BA	62.3	106	120	Sekyere South
35	La Dade-Kotopon Municipal	GA	65.8	43	77	Asikuma Odoben Brakwa	CR	62.2	99	121	Garu-Tempene
36	Kumasi Metropolitan	AR	65.7	131	78	Pru	BA	62.1	101	122	Birim Central Municipal
37	Atwima Nwabiagya	AR	65.6	3	79	Bosome Freho	AR	62.0	114	123	Wa West
38	Amansie West	AR	65.6	45	80	Atwima Kwanwoma	AR	61.9	7	124	Adansi North
39	Kpone Katamanso	GA	65.5	73	81	Asokore Mampong Municipal	AR	61.8	178	125	Asuogyaman
40	Atwima Mponua	AR	65.5	122	82	Ahafo Ano North	AR	61.6	100	126	Akwapim South
41	Sefwi Wiawso Municipal	WR	65.4	71	83	Kadjebi	VR	61.4	68	127	Ada East
42	Tano South	BA	65.2	15	84	West Gonja	NR	61.4	94	128	Amansie Central
					85	Ho Municipal	VR	61.3	88		
					86	Sekyere Central	AR	61.3	168		



Improved DLT ranking since 2015



Declined DLT ranking since 2015

“The

League Table 2016



	REGION	SCORE 2016	RANK (2015)		RANK	DISTRICT	REGION	SCORE 2016	RANK (2015)		RANK	DISTRICT	REGION	SCORE 2016	RANK (2015)
	BA	61.3	110		129	Tain	BA	57.8	149		173	Wassa East	WR	52.3	128
h	AR	61.2	56		130	Wa Municipal	UW	57.7	48		174	Afigya-Kwabre	AR	52.3	136
	UE	61.1	61		131	Mamprugu-Moagduri	NR	57.7	144		175	Fanteakwa	ER	52.1	159
a	WR	61.1	64		132	Ga Central Municipal	GA	57.6	80		176	Akwapim North Municipal	ER	52.1	120
	ER	61.1	59		133	Denkyembour	ER	57.3	12		177	Atebubu-Amantin	BA	51.9	156
	VR	61.0	91		134	Wassa Amenfi West	WR	57.2	36		178	Central Tongu	VR	51.9	146
	BA	61.0	107		135	Zabzugu	NR	57.1	130		179	Techiman North	BA	51.8	166
ssiam	CR	61.0	143		136	Kumbungu	NR	57.0	194		180	Binduri	UE	51.8	186
	UE	60.8	93		137	Aowin	WR	56.9	183		181	Tatale Sanguli	NR	51.7	175
West	UE	60.6	66		138	Jomoro	WR	56.6	129		182	West Akim Municipal	ER	51.5	160
	UW	60.6	140		139	Ahanta West	WR	56.6	152		183	North Gonja	NR	51.4	170
	BA	60.6	63		140	Mfantseman Municipal	CR	56.6	115		184	Sekondi-Takoradi Metropolitan	WR	51.3	124
	VR	60.6	92		141	Ledzokuku-Krowor Muni.	GA	56.3	125		185	Nanumba South	NR	51.2	181
	WR	60.5	77		142	Nanumba North	NR	56.3	113		186	West Mamprusi	NR	51.2	138
	UE	60.4	79		143	Sekyer Kumawu	AR	56.1	105		187	Ada West	GA	50.6	147
	ER	60.4	123		144	Ketu South	VR	56.0	127		188	Kwahu Afram Plains South	ER	49.8	196
ains	AR	60.4	151		145	Kintampo South	BA	55.8	90		189	Twifo Hemang Lower Denkyira	CR	49.5	208
	CR	60.3	118		146	Gomoa East	CR	55.7	188		190	Upper West Akim	ER	48.9	190
icipal	ER	59.9	65		147	Kwahu South	ER	55.7	81		191	Ga South Municipal	GR	48.8	167
	BA	59.8	87		148	Tolon	NR	55.7	193		192	Saboba	NR	48.8	203
	UW	59.7	133		149	Birim South	ER	55.4	157		193	Kpandai	NR	47.9	205
	AR	59.7	31		150	Kwaebibirem	ER	55.1	103		194	Adaklu	VR	47.8	206
	BA	59.6	150		151	Ahafo Ano South	AR	54.9	132		195	Chereponi	NR	47.8	198
	VR	59.6	97		152	Central Gonja	NR	54.8	161		196	Builsa South	UE	47.7	173
	NR	59.3	154		153	Cape Coast Metropolitan	CR	54.8	172		197	Sene East	BA	47.7	204
	VR	59.2	82		154	Ayensuano	ER	54.4	163		198	Akyemansa	ER	47.5	187
	NR	59.2	191		155	Agortime Ziope (Adaklu Anyigbe)	VR	54.2	145		199	Dormaa East	BA	47.5	162
icipal	WR	58.9	112		156	Ho West	VR	54.2	171		200	Nkwanta South	VR	47.2	180
	GA	58.9	109		157	Daffiama-Bissie-Issa	UW	54.2	201		201	Afadzato South	VR	47.1	207
	UE	58.8	111		158	Bunkpurugu-Yunyoo	NR	54.1	142		202	Nkwanta North	VR	46.9	165
ntrol	WR	58.8	108		159	Ketu North	VR	54.0	134		203	Sagnerigu	NR	46.7	199
	AR	58.6	18		160	Adentan Municipal	GR	54.0	153		204	Dormaa West	BA	46.7	148
icipal	CR	58.5	213		161	Sawla-Tuna-Kalba	NR	53.8	158		205	Krachi Nchumuru	VR	46.2	209
	AR	58.4	35		162	Prestea-Huni Valley	WR	53.7	155		206	Krachi East	VR	46.2	202
	UE	58.4	119		163	Adansi South	AR	53.5	185		207	Karaga	NR	45.4	215
icipal	ER	58.4	84		164	North Dayi	VR	53.3	164		208	Akatsi South	VR	44.6	182
	UW	58.1	126		165	Bia East	WR	53.3	135		209	Kwahu East	ER	44.5	177
	AR	58.1	85		166	Kwahu Afram Plains North	ER	53.1	197		210	Gushiegu	NR	44.0	212
	ER	58.1	75		167	Bodie	WR	53.0	137		211	Lambussie Karni	UW	43.8	192
	ER	58.0	86		168	Abura Asebu Kwamankesse	CR	52.9	184		212	Gomoa West	CR	43.6	216
	GA	57.8	95		169	Agona East	CR	52.5	195		213	Upper Manya Krobo	ER	43.3	200
	AR	57.8	141		170	Assin South	CR	52.5	189		214	East Gonja	NR	43.3	211
					171	Akatsi North	VR	52.5	174		215	Ekumfi	CR	41.8	210
					172	Yilo Krobo Municipal	ER	52.4	179		216	North Tongu	VR	40.9	169

most improved District in the DLT 2016 is Wa East in Upper West Region”