


Ghana's District League Table 2015 REPORT

Strengthening
Social Accountability
for National
Development



Ghana's District League Table 2015*Strengthening Social Accountability for National Development*

November 2015



Acknowledgements:

The District League Table is jointly produced by UNICEF and CDD Ghana. The authors of the report gratefully recognise the supportive contributions of all the agencies who participated in the District League Table exercise by sharing data and advice. These include various Departments in the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, 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, Offeibea Baddoo, Charles Dzradosi, Afua Gyapomaa, and Anna-Maria Levi. The CDD Ghana team comprised Franklin Oduro, Mohammed Awal, Rexford K. Asiama, Mavis Zupork Dome, Mina Okura and Edem Selormey.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	6
2.	What is the District League Table?	6
2.1	The Objective	6
2.2	The Methodology used in the District League Table	7
2.3	Impact and Impressions of Last Year's District League Table	11
3.	The District League Table results	12
3.1	Overall analysis	12
3.2	Top 20 and Bottom 20 Districts	13
3.3	Regional analysis	14
3.4	Changes since the 2014 District League Table	15
3.5	Within Region Inequality: a New Development Threat	16
4.	Lessons Learnt	17
4.1	Access to more extensive data	17
4.2	Encouraging the improvement of indicators	17
4.3	Promoting accountability across the whole of Government	18
5.	Conclusion	18

1. Introduction

In 2014, Ghana's first ever District League Table (DLT) was launched. It was designed by UNICEF Ghana and the Ghana Centre for Democratic Development (CDD Ghana), in collaboration with the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development. It became Ghana's national tool for raising awareness of District development and promoting social accountability at the local level.

Social accountability means that citizens and the state become better connected, providing information and feedback on expectations and progress in generating development. Citizens need information on their rights and on service provision and should be empowered to connect with service providers. In turn, Government actors benefit from feedback from citizens, recognition, increased credibility, and ultimate improvements in government programmes and services.



Since the first launch of the District League Table a year ago, citizens, District officers, politicians, civil society and media have used it to strengthen accountability and feedback between citizens and the state. It has created increased momentum to strengthen service delivery and improve communication and reporting with key stakeholders.

As a result of the role that social accountability can play in development and the success of the maiden District League Table in 2014, this document presents the new results of the Ghana District League Table 2015. The DLT is explained in the following section of this report. In section 3 the results are presented, before lessons learnt and conclusions drawn in sections 4 and 5 respectively.

2. What is the District League Table?

This report launches the results of Ghana's second ever annual District League Table (DLT). The DLT is a simple ranking tool of progress toward delivering development and key basic services in each of Ghana's Districts. It is based on global practice of developing indices for measuring and monitoring progress¹. This report, the District League Table, and all the data that was used to compile it are available on the website: <http://www.unicef.org/ghana/>.

While reporting is in place to monitor District compliance with their administrative and statutory requirements or procedures, the DLT focuses rather on Ghana's actual performance in delivering development for its citizens. It looks at progress in achieving key outputs in sectors including health and education and then aggregates this information into a single index. With this index, each District in the country is then ranked to see which Districts are doing well and which are lagging behind.

2.1 The Objective

The ultimate objective of the District League Table is to increase social accountability in

¹For example, see the Child Development Index and the Human Development Index among others.

Ghana to lead to improving development for the country's population. As stated above, increased accountability between decision-makers and citizens is crucial in Ghana for improving both the demand for and the supply of public services. The DLT aims to help open up the space for dialogue between the state and the population. The DLT does this by providing essential information on wellbeing at the District level as well as a mechanism through which improvements can be tracked.

The DLT therefore has the following 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 on their fundamental rights;
3. To support debate and dialogue on the issues that emerge; and
4. To increase state responsiveness in the provision and delivery of key public goods and services.

Through using the results of the DLT, it is expected that citizens will become increasingly informed and empowered to understand how development is progressing in their District. It is also expected that the Ghanaian Government and other stakeholders will be empowered to use the DLT results to identify gaps in service delivery, target support better, and monitor progress year on year. Such transparency and monitoring of progress will help strengthen local Government, providing them with the information they need to make a case for change. In other experiences, greater accountability of service delivery at the local level has even been shown to increase local revenue generation, as people become increasingly confident that money is being spent well². However, it is crucial to note that the services provided are not only the responsibility of the District Assembly – indeed in many cases it is the central government agency which largely commands expenditure planning and disbursement at District level. This means that the District League Table must also be used to raise accountability for development and service delivery at the central level as well.

It is also important to underline that the District

League Table aims to empower – it does not intend to 'name and shame' those Districts that are facing challenges or to punish low ranking ones – quite the reverse. The DLT will help



highlight inequities in local development where more support is required.

2.2 The Methodology used in the District League Table

Given the DLT's rigorous design in 2014 - its first year - the methodology for the DLT 2015 remains the same. Its simple methodology, similarly applied in other such indices around the world including the Human Development Index, enables us to compile an index with which to compare development at a glance across all 216 Districts. It provides us with a multi-sectoral overview of how Districts are doing, which are lagging behind and which are doing better. It is not to be used to assess Districts on their performance in specific sectors but rather as a collective, holistic measurement on District development as a whole.

Process undertaken

In its second year, the compilation of the 2015 District League Table followed a number of important steps to ensure a robust, credible

²The Social Accountability Sourcebook. World Bank. 2005

and transparent index. The process is briefly summarised below.

1. Brief review of new literature and data;
2. Stakeholder consultations of all agencies engaged in producing and using the data at the central level 3;
3. Pre-launch briefings of stakeholders on the DLT from District level up organised in all 10 regions of the country and centrally in Accra;
4. Accessing and assessing the data;
5. Calculating the index and ranking of the Districts in the District League Table;
6. Publication, dissemination and communications at national and regional levels.

Stakeholder Engagement and Roles:


In an improvement on the DLT's launch of last year, the DLT team made a substantial effort in 2015 to consult at District level and discuss the DLT with District and Regional government staff before the DLT was released, as well as through dissemination events planned for after the launch. Through Regional events arranged by the Institute of Local Government Studies to orient the new District Assembly Members as well as meetings organised by the MLGRD on the DLT, a range of discussions were organised in each of the 10 Regions involving District and Regional government staff, particularly District Chief Executives, and District Coordinating Directors.

As a tool for promoting social accountability, the DLT aims to play a key role in enhancing dialogue, transparency and responsiveness between citizens and Government. As such, multiple actors can use the DLT to promote social accountability. Districts staff can use the DLT to provide valuable information on where they stand in their region or in the country as a whole. They can also use the annual publications of the DLT to demonstrate progress, or lack of progress, made each year – thereby helping build trust and support among the District's population toward local decision-makers. Citizens can use the DLT to inform them on their District's national ranking and to call stakeholders (at both local and central

level) to address slow progress so as to move up the ranking next year.

Central Government can use the DLT as a framework to understand the national picture on inequities in local development and how to help improve development through more targeted and efficient resource allocation. Donors can also use the DLT to support planning decisions and to call for greater accountability. Media and civil society have a central role to play in using the DLT to disseminate and question the resulting ranking, and to support the creation of a national dialogue around local development issues.

Calculating the Index:



³The agencies that contributed to the District League Table are gratefully recognised as: The Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, Ministry of Education, Ghana Education Service, Ministry of Health, Ghana Health Services, Community Water and Sanitation Agency, Ghana Water Company Ltd, Ghana Statistical Service.

Once the data for each indicator was received, the information was compiled into the DLT's index using the same methodology as last year. This was done in three basic steps:

- (i) Ensuring that all indicators sat on a standard 0 to 100 percentage scale, where 0 is the worst (minimum) score and 100 is the best (maximum) ⁴;
- (ii) Aggregating all the indicators for each District and averaging them without any weighting. This simply means that the final score for each District was achieved by adding up the 6 indicator values and dividing the total by 6 to provide a simple average.
- (iii) This provides us with one single score for each individual District by which all 216 are ranked, from the District in 1st place with the most advanced level of development, to the District in 216th place facing the most challenges.

Given that this is the second year of the DLT, we are now able to analyse progress made from one year to the next, highlighting those Districts that have made the most progress. In order to do this, this year's DLT largely uses 2014 data, however there are some exceptions to this, where MDAs were unable to provide data for the previous year and 2013 data was used instead.

The indicators used and issues encountered:

As the DLT seeks to examine the overall state of development in Districts across the country, the indicators agreed upon during the first DLT's design in 2014 are those that represent sufficiently a wide range of sectors important to people's wellbeing. During the design of the first DLT last year, key sectors were considered at the outset, and the process of selecting the indicators for the DLT index was lengthy and iterative. Key criteria for indicator selection were agreed in advance⁵. Proposed indicators were agreed with the service provider or relevant agency in Government.

All the final indicators are officially established national indicators available in national Government databases - the DLT did not involve

⁴Most of the indicators are already expressed as a percentage, with 100% as their ultimate target. However, a couple of the indicators such as police coverages are different and had to be converted to a 0-100 scale. Details are provided in the data sheet available on our websites.

⁵ The indicator had to be a key priority for people's wellbeing and District development; it had to be available at the District level in an annually produced national database for every District in Ghana; it had to be representative of the output or outcome level - i.e. not percentage of budget spent etc.

any surveys or estimation of indicators. It is important to note that the DLT uses indicators to compile one single index, with a single score for each District. This means that the DLT provides

a holistic overview of development in a District and does not provide a measure of how each District is doing in individual sectors.

Various issues were taken into account before agreement with the relevant MDA on each indicator was arrived at last year for the first DLT. As mentioned in 2014, getting some data was an obstacle. In some cases, key indicators that were initially proposed last year were actually impossible to include as they did not meet the basic criteria of being available and robust at the District level. For example, average distance to a health centre was seen as an important indicator for healthcare, but it is not routinely available at the District level. For the area of child protection, no indicator met the criteria at all. Data on District level water supply coverage in urban areas is also still not available. The final list of indicators is presented in the table below. Even that no improvements have occurred since last year, the indicators remain the same as for 2014, thereby keeping the DLT comparable from year to year. They cover access to quality education, healthcare, rural water, sanitation,



security and governance.

Table 1: Indicators Used to Compile the District League Table

Sector	District Indicator	Measurement	Source	Year	Maximum
Education	BECE pass rate	% of pupils that passed their BECE (average of the 4 subjects pass rates)	EMIS (GES)	2013	100%
Sanitation	District certification as Open Defecation Free	Whether District is ODF or not ODF	Environmental Health and Sanitation, MLGRD	2014	District is certified ODF
Rural Water	Coverage of rural water supply	% of rural population covered by a rural water supply system	CWSA	2014	100%
Health	Skilled attendant at delivery	% of expected deliveries attended by skilled personnel	DHIMS (GHS)	2014	100%
Security	Coverage of police services	Number of population per police officer	Ghana Police	2014	1 per 500 people
Governance	Minimum conditions for District Administration	Minimum conditions are fulfilled or unfulfilled	DDF/FOAT	2013	Fulfilled

While it was determined with the MDAs that these were the best indicators to use, covering a wide range of sectors important to welfare, these final indicators still present some challenges. The governance indicator, of meeting the FOAT Minimum Criteria, was recommended as no other useful indicator to measure governance quality at the local level exists. However, in 2015 every single District has now been motivated to meet their Minimum Criteria. This means that the indicator provides us with no differentiation of governance quality in the Districts and might be somewhat redundant.

Indicators should also be stable from year to year. This was an important factor in selecting the indicators for the DLT. However, the education indicator (the BECE pass rate) has not remained stable because in 2012/13 the Ministry increased the score at which a student

passes the BECE (to include grades 1 to 7, instead of grades 1 to 6 as in other years) – this meant that a higher than usual proportion of pupils were deemed to have passed their BECE in 2012/13 than would have occurred if the pass score was kept the same. Once the pass score was brought back down to its usual level in 2013/14 in this year's DLT, it appears as if the proportion of children passing their BECE has declined across the country. This indicator can only remain in the DLT if it is kept stable in future years.

Some indicators have improved. After discussions with CWSA in 2014, highlighting gaps in the data provided, the agency undertook a data collection exercise to improve their monitoring of rural water provision. Several Districts that lacked data on rural water coverage in 2014 now have an indicator reported. However, gaps still remain

and a few rural Districts also mention receiving water in some communities from GWCL, such as Efutu Municipal and Gomoa West, which could underestimate their coverage. However, data from GWCL on District water coverage remains unavailable.

2.3 Impact and Impressions of Last Year's District League Table

The maiden publication of the District League Table in 2014 has been used in a range of ways that have increased accountability between District officers, citizens and central Government and partners. Primarily it has been important for:

- Increasing awareness among Districts of their level of development in comparison to other Districts;
- Creating an impetus for more proactively addressing challenges so as to rise up the DLT this year;
- Being used by Government and partners for prioritising programme planning;
- Creating awareness and visibility in the national and regional press for advocating for improved District development.

District officers and Ministry of Local Government staff state that the District League Table 2014 was used to trigger positive change in District development. For example, according to the Ministry, the National Sanitation Day was an initiative established as a direct result of the District League Table 2014. Several Districts also talked about the initiatives and programmes they put in place following the publication of the first DLT last year in an endeavour to rise up the ranking. Some examples of positive feedback are below:

"The DLT is a good initiative and will help to improve accountability. It should be accepted by all because its future is very bright."

Mrs. Agartha Ahya, District Coordinating Director, Tano South, Brong Ahafo Region

"The DLT is absolutely good. It tells you that people are watching what you are doing; each elected member should be accountable and make sure that people receive education and good health which are things we are

supposed to do as elected members." **Hon. Nana Appiah Daniel**, Assembly Member, Kwaebibirem, Eastern Region.

"I acknowledge receipt of your open letter to newly elected assembly members. I am very grateful for your message to us. I am elected member of the Twifo Hemang Lower Denkyira District Assembly, and I was very pleased with the content of the message. ... Again, as a newly elected member to the assembly, I believe there would be other things I would be required to do or not to do, in order to boost the overall performance of my assembly on the league table." **Hon. Kwaku Abban**, Assembly Member, Twifo Hemang Lower Denkyira, Central Region"

Not all feedback on the District League Table was entirely positive. In particular, some District officers felt that the media did not always cover the league table in a sufficiently nuanced way, at times attacking those Districts that came toward the bottom of the table.

The District League Table is fine but it is the way it was carried out the first time which is not good. If an assembly is not able to score high, it means that the Assembly does not have enough funds to implement any activities. It is best for organisers to rather influence government to release funds on time so that assemblies can function. **Hon. Alhaji Alhassan Fuseini**, District Chief Executive, Gushiegu District, Northern Region

The District league Table is good but the perception that when a district scores low, it means that the Chief Executive is not doing well should be erased. Currently, the Assembly is constructing health centers supported by the Netherlands government and two police stations. The United States and a local NGO have also provided books and sanitary towels to some schools. All these are aimed at providing quality service to the people we serve and also to score high on the DLT. **Hon. Donkor Fuseini**, District Chief Executive, Sekyere Afram Plains South, Ashanti Region

RANK	DISTRICT	REGION	SCORE	(RANK 2014)	RANK	DISTRICT	REGION	SCORE	(RANK 2014)	RANK	DISTRICT
1	Tema Metropolitan	GA	76.6	20	43	La Dade-Kotopon Municipal	GA	64.2	25	87	Nkoranza North
2	La Nkwantanang-Madina Municipal	GA	76.4	100	44	Tano North	BR	64.1	24	88	Ho Municipal
3	Atwima Nwabiagya	AR	75.5	104	45	Amansie West	AR	64.0	58	89	East Akim Municipal
4	Bibiani Anhwiaso Bekwai	WR	72.8	5	46	Asunafo North Municipal	BR	63.8	41	90	Kintampo South
5	Awutu Senya	CR	70.0	8	47	Bawku West	UE	63.5	48	91	Biakoye
6	Jaman South	BR	69.7	4	48	Wa Municipal	UW	63.4	33	92	South Tongu
7	Atwima Kwanwoma	AR	69.5	10	49	Asunafo South	BR	63.0	77	93	Builsa North
8	Nsawam-Adoagyiri Municipal	ER	69.4	2	50	Wenchi Municipal	BR	62.5	55	94	West Gonja
9	Juabeso	WR	69.3	38	51	Yendi Municipal	NR	62.4	68	95	Ada East
10	Berekum Municipal	BR	69.3	6	52	Mampong Municipal	AR	62.2	153	96	Nandom
11	Ejura Sekyeredumase Municipal	AR	69.3	12	53	Bongo	UE	61.4	36	97	Krachi West
12	Denkyembour	ER	69.2	3	54	Ga West Municipal	GA	61.3	93	98	Komenda Edina Eguabirem Municipal
13	Awutu Senya East Municipal	CR	68.8	31	55	Ejisu-Juaben Municipal	AR	61.3	54	99	Asikuma Odoben Br
14	Ellembele	WR	68.5	44	56	Asante Akim South	AR	61.3	53	100	Ahafo Ano North
15	Tano South	BR	68.1	1	57	Bia West	WR	61.3	51	101	Pru
16	Obuasi municipal	AR	68.1	13	58	Tamale Metropolitan	NR	61.2	52	102	Lawra
17	Asante Akim North	AR	67.9	27	59	Suhum Municipal	ER	61.2	79	103	Kwaebibirem
18	Bosomtwe	AR	67.7	14	60	Sissala East	UW	61.1	57	104	Twifo Ati-Morkwa
19	Dormaa Central Municipal	BR	67.6	17	61	Nadbdam	UE	61.1	39	105	Sekyere Kumawu
20	Sunyani Municipal	BR	67.5	22	62	East Mamprusi	NR	61.0	61	106	Jaman North
21	Bolgatanga Municipal	UE	67.1	15	63	Asutifi North	BR	61.0	65	107	Sene West
22	Upper Denkyira East Municipal	CR	66.8	23	64	Sefwi Akontombra	WR	60.9	111	108	Wassa Amenfi Centra
23	Ashaiman Municipal	GA	66.7	40	65	New Juaben Municipal	ER	60.7	60	109	Ga East Municipal
24	Kwabre East	AR	66.7	9	66	Kassena Nankana West	UE	60.6	62	110	Sunyani West
25	Kwahu West Municipal	ER	66.4	18	67	Upper Denkyira West	CR	60.5	59	111	Talensi
26	Nkoranza South Municipal	BR	66.4	43	68	Kadjebi	VR	60.4	67	112	Nzema East Municipa
27	Bekwai Municipal	AR	66.3	28	69	Birim North	ER	60.2	86	113	Nanumba North
28	Shai-Osudoku	GA	65.9	46	70	Kintampo North Municipal	BR	60.2	56	114	Bosome Freho
29	Asutifi South	BR	65.7	29	71	Sefwi Wiawso Municipal	WR	59.9	42	115	Mfantseman Municip
30	Kpando	VR	65.6	131	72	Wassa Amenfi East	WR	59.8	102	116	Nadowli-Kaleo
31	Offinso North	AR	65.4	37	73	Kpone Katamanso	GA	59.8	91	117	South Dayi
32	Mpohor	WR	65.4	11	74	Keta Municipal	VR	59.8	50	118	Efutu Municipal
33	Bawku Municipal	UE	65.3	21	75	Asuogyaman	ER	59.8	49	119	Garu-Tempane
34	Techiman Municipal	BR	65.2	26	76	Ningo-Prampram	GA	59.5	167	120	Akwapim North Muni
35	Sekyere South	AR	65.2	19	77	Shama	WR	59.5	116	121	Lower Manya Krobo Municipal
36	Wassa Amenfi West	WR	65.1	70	78	Assin North Municipal	CR	59.5	87	122	Atwima Mponua
37	Accra Metropolitan	GA	65.0	35	79	Kassena Nankana Municipal	UE	59.0	99	123	Atiwa
38	Offinso municipal	AR	64.9	7	80	Ga Central Municipal	GA	59.0	140	124	Sekondi-Takoradi Metropolitan
39	Tarkwa Nsuaem Municipal	WR	64.7	32	81	Kwahu South	ER	58.9	66	125	Ledzokuku-Krowor M
40	Bole	NR	64.6	47	82	Jasikan	VR	58.9	84	126	Wa West
41	Asante Akim Central Municipal	AR	64.4	34	83	Pusiga	UE	58.9	78	127	Ketu South
42	Sekyere East	AR	64.3	16	84	Birim Central Municipal	ER	58.9	81	128	Wassa East
					85	Adansi North	AR	58.6	110		
					86	Akwapim South	ER	58.5	94		

League Table 2015



	REGION	SCORE	(RANK 2014)	RANK	DISTRICT	REGION	SCORE	(RANK 2014)	RANK	DISTRICT	REGION	SCORE	(RANK 2014)
	BR	58.5	112	129	Jomoro	WR	54.6	143	173	Builsa South	UE	48.8	117
	VR	58.4	90	130	Zabzugu	NR	54.6	115	174	Akatsi North	VR	48.6	163
	ER	58.3	71	131	Kumasi Metropolitan	AR	54.5	160	175	Tatale Sanguli	NR	48.5	149
	BR	58.3	120	132	Ahafo Ano South	AR	54.4	103	176	Suaman	WR	48.5	119
	VR	58.2	101	133	Sissala West	UW	54.2	98	177	Kwahu East	ER	48.4	164
	VR	58.2	106	134	Ketu North	VR	54.1	148	178	Asokore Mampong Municipal	AR	48.3	82
	UE	58.2	64	135	Bia East	WR	54.1	155	179	Yilo Krobo Municipal	ER	48.3	194
	NR	58.2	73	136	Afigya-Kwabre	AR	54.0	162	180	Nkwanta South	VR	48.2	151
	GA	58.2	105	137	Bodie	WR	54.0	141	181	Nanumba South	NR	48.2	204
	UW	58.1	176	138	West Mamprusi	NR	53.7	124	182	Akatsi South	VR	48.1	186
	VR	58.0	76	139	Hohoe Municipal	VR	53.7	165	183	Aowin	WR	48.0	107
afu	CR	58.0	114	140	Jirapa	UW	53.6	97	184	Abura Asebu Kwamankesse	CR	48.0	173
				141	Amansie Central	AR	53.3	139	185	Adansi South	AR	47.8	132
akwa	CR	57.7	72	142	Bunkpurugu-Yunyoo	NR	53.2	210	186	Binduri	UE	47.5	178
	AR	57.5	89	143	Ajumako-Enyan-Essiam	CR	53.2	108	187	Akyemansa	ER	47.5	183
	BR	57.4	63	144	Mamprugu-Moagduri	NR	53.2	159	188	Gomoa East	CR	47.4	195
	UW	57.3	88	145	Agortime Ziope (Adaklu Anyigbe)	VR	53.0	169	189	Assin South	CR	47.3	191
	ER	57.2	206	146	Central Tongu	VR	53.0	211	190	Upper West Akim	ER	47.2	188
	CR	57.0	180	147	Ada West	GA	52.7	142	191	Mion	NR	46.9	146
	AR	57.0	118	148	Dormaa West	BR	52.5	122	192	Lambussie Karni	UW	46.9	182
	BR	56.9	80	149	Tain	BR	52.2	121	193	Tolon	NR	46.5	184
	BR	56.8	69	150	Banda	BR	51.6	154	194	Kumbungu	NR	46.2	196
al	WR	56.8	137	151	Sekyere Afram Plains South	AR	51.6	214	195	Agona East	CR	46.2	185
	GA	56.8	92	152	Ahanta West	WR	51.5	161	196	Kwahu Afram Plains South	ER	45.7	193
	BR	56.4	74	153	Adentan Municipal	GA	51.5	157	197	Kwahu Afram Plains North	ER	45.4	168
	UE	56.4	75	154	Savelugu Nanton Municipal	NR	51.3	138	198	Chereponi	NR	44.9	203
al	WR	56.2	95	155	Prestea-Huni Valley	WR	51.2	172	199	Sagnerigu	NR	44.8	189
	NR	56.2	125	156	Atebubu-Amantin	BR	51.2	144	200	Upper Manya Krobo	ER	44.5	198
	AR	56.1	127	157	Birim South	ER	51.1	158	201	Daffiama-Bissie-Issa	UW	44.0	200
al	CR	55.8	113	158	Sawla-Tuna-Kalba	NR	51.1	179	202	Krachi East	VR	44.0	199
	UW	55.8	85	159	Fanteakwa	ER	51.0	145	203	Saboba	NR	43.4	213
	VR	55.8	30	160	West Akim Municipal	ER	50.9	128	204	Sene East	BR	43.0	190
	CR	55.8	96	161	Central Gonja	NR	50.6	134	205	Kpandai	NR	42.8	197
	UE	55.7	136	162	Dormaa East	BR	50.5	174	206	Adaklu	VR	42.3	207
icipal	ER	55.6	109	163	Ayensuano	ER	50.5	181	207	Afadzato South	VR	42.3	205
	ER	55.6	45	164	North Dayi	VR	50.3	135	208	Twifo Hemang Lower Denkyira	CR	41.5	201
	AR	55.5	83	165	Nkwanta North	VR	50.3	170	209	Krachi Nchumuru	VR	40.7	192
	ER	55.4	123	166	Techiman North	BR	50.3	171	210	Ekumfi	CR	39.8	215
	WR	55.3	129	167	Ga South Municipal	GA	50.2	187	211	East Gonja	NR	39.5	202
				168	Sekyere Central	AR	50.0	175	212	Gushiegu	NR	38.7	212
Municipal	GA	55.2	156	169	North Tongu	VR	49.9	152	213	Agona West Municipal	CR	38.6	150
	UW	55.0	126	170	North Gonja	NR	49.7	133	214	Wa East	UW	37.6	209
	VR	54.7	130	171	Ho West	VR	49.6	177	215	Karaga	NR	37.4	216
	WR	54.7	147	172	Cape Coast Metropolitan	CR	49.1	166	216	Gomoa West	CR	36.8	208

istrict ranking in the DLT 2015 is Kwaebibirem District in Eastern Region”

3. The District League Table results

3.1 Overall analysis

The results of the 2015 District League Table are presented in full in the table on the centre spread of this report. It shows all the 216 Districts in the country, and their score, ranked in order of their development level. As such, it provides a holistic picture of Ghana's development at the District level.

This year, there is a new District topping the table; that of Tema Metropolitan, in the Greater Accra Region, with a score of 77. The District in last place has changed since last year too; it is Gomaa West in the Central Region with a score of just 37. The national average is 56, below which 105 Districts are found. With an eventual target of a score of 100% in the DLT, it is clear that the majority of Districts are still far from this goal.

The map on this report's first page gives us an overview of the disparities in District development levels across the country geographically. We see concentrations of Districts doing poorly and groups of Districts that are doing considerably better. However, as we'll explore in section 3.2,



we also see how some higher achieving Districts that stand out in deprived regions, and some struggling Districts can be found in better-off regions.

3.2 Top 20 and Bottom 20 Districts

In the 2015 DLT, the most deprived Districts in Ghana include Wa East in Upper West Region, East Gonja in Northern Region, and Krachi East in Volta. Those that are found at the top of the table include Atwima Nwabiagya in Ashanti Region, Ellembele in Western Region and Sunyani Municipal in Brong Ahafo Region. In the table below, we present the top and bottom 20 Districts in the DLT. Their ranking in the 2014 DLT are presented alongside the District's name for comparison purposes. Most Districts in the top 20 were found there last year, representing their consistently high level of development. However, 7 Districts are new to the top 20. Likewise, only 5 Districts are new to the bottom 20, most of them having featured there last year.

Table 2: Top 20 and Bottom 20 Districts in the District League Table 2015 – 2014 Rank in brackets

Top 20 Districts				Bottom 20 Districts			
2015 Rank	District (and 2014 rank)	Region	Score	2015 Rank	District (and 2014 rank)	Region	Score
1	Tema Metropolitan (20)	GAR	76.58	197	Kwahu Afram Plains North (168)	ER	45.37
2	La Nkwantanang-Madina Municipal (100)	GAR	76.35	198	Chereponi (203)	NR	44.91
3	Atwima Nwabiagya (104)	AR	75.54	199	Sagnerigu (189)	NR	44.78
4	Bibiani Anhwiaso Bekwai (5)	WR	72.84	200	Upper Manya Krobo (198)	ER	44.46
5	Awutu Senya (8)	CR	70.02	201	Daffiama-Bissie-Issa (200)	UWR	44.05
6	Jaman South (4)	BAR	69.69	202	Krachi East (199)	VR	44.02
7	Atwima Kwanwoma (10)	AR	69.53	203	Saboba (213)	NR	43.43
8	Nsawam-Adoagyiri Municipal (2)	ER	69.41	204	Sene East (190)	BAR	43.00
9	Juabeso (38)	WR	69.30	205	Kpandai (197)	NR	42.83
10	Berekum Municipal (6)	BAR	69.28	206	Adaklu (207)	VR	42.30
11	Ejura Sekyeredumase Municipal (12)	AR	69.25	207	Afadzato South (205)	VR	42.26
12	Denkyembour (3)	ER	69.25	208	Twifo Hemang Lower Denkyira (201)	CR	41.51
13	Awutu Senya East Municipal (31)	CR	68.79	209	Krachi Nchumuru (192)	VR	40.69
14	Ellembele (44)	WR	68.47	210	Ekumfi (215)	CR	39.78
15	Tano South (1)	BAR	68.15	211	East Gonja (202)	NR	39.55
16	Obuasi Municipal (13)	AR	68.08	212	Gushiegu (212)	NR	38.68
17	Asante Akim North (27)	AR	67.92	213	Agona West Municipal (150)	CR	38.57
18	Bosomtwe (14)	AR	67.66	214	Wa East (209)	UWR	37.65
19	Dormaa Central Municipal (17)	BAR	67.59	215	Karaga (216)	NR	37.38
20	Sunyani Municipal (22)	BAR	67.50	216	Gomoa West (208)	CR	36.82

Looking at these two groups, we highlight some points of note. Among the top 20 Districts, the Ashanti Region and the Brong Ahafo Regions stand out. Between them, these two regions hold 11 of the top ranking Districts. The top ranking Districts are often those that are in less poor regions, such as Ashanti with just 15% poverty incidence. However, Brong Ahafo has a poverty level twice that of Ashanti (28%) but is still doing well. This means that wealth levels are important but not sufficient to

determine a District's level of wellbeing. Having said this, several Districts in poorer regions that are ranked highly in the DLT are often actually located in Municipal Districts rather than rural Districts, reflecting their greater capacity and resources. This year, no District from any of the three northern regions is found in the top 20.

Among the bottom 20 Districts, a few regions are equally evident. Again, here we see some correlation between the level of poverty in a region and a District's level of development. Most notably, the Northern Region, with a high poverty rate of 50%, stands out with 7 of the bottom 20 Districts. Volta region and Eastern Region each have 4 Districts in the bottom 20.

As examined during the launch of the District League Table in 2014, numerous 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 (IGF), or issues such as good leadership are crucial. While we comment on some of these issues in brief in this report, separate analysis is still needed to understand what the core factors are and how Districts can learn from each other.

3.3 Regional analysis

In considering the Regions by their average of their District scores, we can compile the following Regional ranking. The top regions are Greater Accra, Ashanti, and Brong Ahafo, and the bottom regions are Central, Volta and Northern. Their rankings for last year are shown on the far right, two have risen up the ranking (Greater Accra and Ashanti), while two have slid down (Brong Ahafo and Upper East). The bottom five Regions have not changed, with the Northern Region still scoring the lowest. This is a concern as Northern Region represents the largest number of poor people in Ghana and must be a priority.

The regional rankings do not take into account any weighting for population size. This means that Upper East, though ranking in the middle, accounts for a small proportion of the country's population, while regions like Northern with the lowest ranking actually account for much larger numbers of people.

Table 3: Ranking of Ghana's Regions by average DLT score

Rank	Region	Score	Rank in DLT 2014
1	Greater Accra	61	5 ↑
2	Ashanti	61	3 ↑
3	Brong Ahafo	60	1 ↓
4	Western	59	4
5	Upper East	59	2 ↓
6	Eastern	55	6
7	Upper West	53	7
8	Central	53	8
9	Volta	53	9
10	Northern	50	10

3.4 Changes since the 2014 District League Table

As this is the second year that UNICEF and CDD Ghana have produced the District League Table, we are able to see what changes have occurred since a year ago: whether Districts have managed to improve their rankings since last year or whether some Districts are still facing challenges.

Looking at the full DLT table on the inside cover, last year's ranking for each District is noted in brackets next to the District's name so we can quickly see if a District have moved up or down compared to last year. Overall, 98 Districts managed to improve their ranking in the DLT as compared to last year. Some made big improvements as they managed to overcome certain obstacles. The most improved District was Kwaebibirem in Eastern Region which managed to rise up the DLT by over 100 places. It did this because its governance score improved. Mampong Municipal managed to increase its indicator for the rate at which mothers deliver with a skilled attendant, which also pushed it up the ranking significantly. La Nkwantanang-Madina Municipal saw its ranking rise as its security indicator improved. The best improving Districts are listed below.

Table 4: Best Improved Districts in the DLT 2015

District	DLT Rank 2014	DLT Rank 2015
Kwaebibirem, ER	206	103 ↑
Mampong Municipal	153	52 ↑
Kpando	131	30 ↑
Atwima Nwabiagya	104	3 ↑
La Nkwantanang-Madina Municipal	100	2 ↑

Some Districts such as those above have improved their ranking very impressively – indeed, a 100 place jump seems surprising. However, several of these Districts that have improved are actually those that did not meet their Minimum FOAT criteria for District administration in 2014. The indicator is binary – a District scores zero if the conditions are not met, and 100 if the conditions are met. Last year, ten Districts failed to meet these Minimum Conditions for administrating their area. This year, by meeting the Minimum Conditions they have improved their score greatly, thereby restoring the Districts to higher rankings in the DLT.

At the bottom of the District League Table, the scores have improved since last year. In 2014, the lowest scoring District was Karaga District with a score of just 15. Its score has improved substantially to 37, due to improvements in its governance and security indicators, and it no longer sits at the bottom of the DLT.

A key point of feedback from the DLT 2014

was that, in many cases, Metropolitan and Municipal Districts might be expected to rank higher than other Districts. In 2015, we have carried out this analysis to determine if this is the case. Indeed, in almost all the regions, many of the Metropolitan and Municipal Districts rank higher than their rural counterparts in the same Region. For example, Municipal Districts such as Nsawam-Adoagyiri Municipal (ER), Berekum Municipal (BAR), and Obuasi Municipal (AR), all rank in the top 20 of the DLT. However, it is not always the case as more rural Districts can still rank highly. For example, 6 out of the top 10 Districts are classified neither as Metropolitan nor Municipal.

3.5 Within Region Inequality: a New Development Threat

As noted last year, according to the DLT scores, there are important differences in development levels between Districts, both across the country and – particularly of note this year – within regions. Across the country as a whole, those



Districts at the top of the DLT are doing twice as well as the lowest ranked Districts. While this gap in equity has narrowed since last year's DLT, this is due to the fact that a few of the low ranking Districts have improved their scores often just in one area, particularly that of governance.

In the 2015 DLT we note more so than last year, that Districts in better off Regions like Greater Accra and Ashanti rank higher. In contrast, regions which suffer from isolation, higher poverty rates and weak infrastructure and services, such as the Volta and Northern Regions, are more likely to rank near the bottom of the league table. However, a key factor of note is that Ghana's two poorest Regions, that of Upper West and Upper East (GLSS6), do not have the lowest average District scores (as noted in section 3.3 above). The Upper East Region in particular is doing comparatively well, though not as well as in the DLT 2014.



We have also noted that some Districts are performing better than might be expected – i.e. some Districts in a poor and isolated region are doing significantly better than its neighbours. For example, Nandom in Upper West has a very high poverty rate (74% in the Poverty Maps, GSS, 2015) and is comparatively isolated on Ghana's rural border, however it achieves the region's third highest score (58), just above the national average. Likewise, in the Northern region, Bole has a very high poverty level (79% according to the GSS poverty maps) but scores top for the Region in the DLT at 64.6, well above the national average.

A key factor in the analysis of this year's DLT is that inequality is no longer solely an issue between the north and south of the country. Indeed, in some cases, inequality within regions is now an even more serious problem than the north-south divide. If we take the Upper West region as a prime example, we see that the DLT score ranges significantly within the region from 63.4 in Wa Municipal to 37.7 in Wa East just next door. Likewise, the Northern Region faces significant within region inequities ranging from a high of 64.6 in Bole down to 37.4 in Karaga. These high scoring Districts are comparable with high scores found in any part of the country. Bole's score is higher than that of two-thirds of the Districts in the Greater Accra Region, and higher than that of half of the Districts in the Ashanti Region.

We know from the results of Ghana's new national household survey published last year (the GLSS6) that Ghana's level of inequality is increasing. However, analyses like that above arising from the DLT demonstrate that inequality is no longer a straightforward story about Ghana's wealthier south and its consistently poor north. The story has changed. We are now faced with significant within-region inequality, which, in some cases, is now greater than national inequality as a whole. Such analysis is confirmed by the publication of Ghana's new Poverty Maps by GSS, which reflect similarly large differences between poverty levels within regions, particularly in the north of the country.

As mentioned in section 3.2, there will be District specific factors to help explain the difference in development levels in each individual District. Some may be able to raise greater amounts of



Internally Generated Funds (IGF), some may benefit from greater allocations from central budgets, and others may have simply more able and motivated District Assembly personnel. Whatever the factors, we can use the DLT to identify and learn from those Districts that are doing better than expected and apply that learning elsewhere.

4. Lessons Learnt

4.1 Access to more extensive data

Similarly to last year, the experience of accessing the basic indicators required for the compilation of the DLT was challenging. The DLT's agreed indicators are calculated and commonly used at the national level and they are estimated for the District level within standard sectoral databases (such as the Education Management Information System (EMIS) or the District Health Information Management System (DHIMS)). However, accessing these databases, held on individual computers in different agencies in Accra, is still not open and straightforward. Standard indicators for each District are not routinely posted online once they become available. They are not disseminated in annual publications. In other countries around the world, local level indicators can be easily accessed through public documents, websites or even posters and notice boards in communities.

This means that it is far from easy for policy-makers or civil society to have a clear understanding of the country's level of development at the District level. Without easy access to such basic information, citizens cannot check the progress of their District, politicians cannot be held accountable for progress made in Districts they are responsible for, and both central and local Government cannot effectively target resources to where they are most needed.

4.2 Encouraging the improvement of indicators

A key area of feedback within the DLT has been the possibility of expanding it to include different issues. The aim of the DLT is to be simple, easily understood and compiled, and credible. Compiling an index with a large range of indicators is unlikely to meet these objectives. Other such indices around the world are compiled with around 3 to 8 indicators.

A key limiting factor considered by the MDAs in selecting the indicators for the DLT is their lack of availability. For several important areas for human development, annual, official indicators at the District level simply do not exist. Issues such as local governance, sanitation facilities, violence, child labour, quality of education, and social protection do not feature comprehensively in administrative data collection systems. However, where new indicators become available they can be considered by MDAs for inclusion. For example, in relation to sanitation, several Districts such as Mion in the Northern Region and Kadjebi in the Volta Region have made great progress toward becoming Open Defecation Free. However, no national, annually collected database as yet exists through which their progress can be captured. As a result, the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development is now embarking on the development of a Management Information System for the sector. In future years, it should be possible to measure the proportion of communities within Districts which have become Open Defecation Free, thereby providing more nuanced tracking of sanitation conditions.

As mentioned in section 2.2, although indicators should remain stable from year to year, the education indicator has not done so as the BECE pass score was inflated in 2012/13. This



indicator can only remain in the DLT if it is kept stable in future years. Other indicators have improved, like the rural water indicator, due to CWSA's data collection drive last year but gaps remain.

4.3 Promoting accountability across the whole of Government

As was clearly highlighted in last year's DLT, accountability for District development does not sit solely at the District level. It remains true that in Ghana the majority of service provision is delivered and managed from central authorities such as Ghana Education Service (GES) and Ghana Health Service (GHS), with District Assemblies (DAs) receiving only marginal proportions of responsibility and funding for service delivery. For DAs to be able to increase their responsiveness to citizens for service delivery, they still need to be further empowered to receive clear assignments, budget allocations and autonomy from the central level that are delivered on time. In the meantime, agencies with central level responsibility for service delivery should scale-up efforts to prioritise those Districts that rank the lowest in the District League Table.

5. Conclusion

In a progressive and democratic country such as Ghana, the social compact between citizens and the state must be solid. The annual publication of the Ghana District League Table aims to strengthen this compact by promoting social accountability across the country. It does this by

providing information on District development, promoting dialogue between stakeholders, and supporting decision-makers to respond to their needs.

Now in its second year, the DLT is Ghana's first and only national tool for social accountability. Its results are extensively communicated through national and local stakeholder forums, media channels, and information packs. Revised annually, this year's new ranking allows us to track those Districts that have made the most progress in improving their score.

This second issue of the District League Table raises some important points relating to social accountability for development in Ghana, which are of value to all stakeholders.

First, the DLT provides evidence of the increasing problem of *within* region inequality in Ghana, demonstrating that we cannot put poor performance in the DLT purely down to the level of poverty in a region. According to the GSS, inequality is relatively high and still rising in Ghana. On average, the wealthier south has pulled ahead of the poorer north of the country. However, the DLT's analysis shows the story is more complicated than that. We are now faced with significant within-region inequality, which, in some cases, is now greater than national inequality as a whole. This means that a few individual Districts in poor regions are moving ahead by themselves, leaving the rest of the Region remaining in poverty. Some Districts in the northern part of the country are now doing better than many Districts in the wealthier south. This means that in Regions such as Upper East, Upper West, and the Northern Region, inequality

is high as a few Districts appear to be benefiting the most and developing fastest.

As noted last year, there is much that Government and other stakeholders can do to address such inequities by better targeting resources. Citizens and civil society can also use the results of the DLT to discuss why their District ranks as it does. And the Government of Ghana could use the DLT in their formula for allocating financing from the Common Fund.

Secondly, last year's DLT highlighted major weaknesses in the accessibility of Ghana's data and its communication to wider audiences. This situation has not changed. No sector provides annual, up-to-date District data in public documents or online. Sector databases such as the EMIS for education and the DHIMS for health continue to be inaccessible for the majority of the population, including many decision-makers and Government staff. Retaining such crucial information on service provision within a small group at the central level, means that citizens remain unaware, the media uninformed, and Government decision-makers unable to best plan and target resources based on need.

Thirdly, this year's analysis of the DLT highlights

increasing dissatisfaction with the range of District indicators available in Ghana. Some indicators are found wanting in their descriptive depth of the issues. Indicators that are currently available for areas such as governance and sanitation are insufficiently nuanced. Other indicators such as that used for education may not prove suitably stable for retention in the DLT. Other major issues are entirely absent as they are not monitored at the District level at all – for example no routine District data is available across the country on child protection, water coverage in urban areas or social protection coverage.

UNICEF and CDD Ghana intend to continue the annual compilation and dissemination of the DLT in the years to come. In this way, it will be possible to continue to track which Districts make the biggest improvements each year, and which make the least. In addition, through the awareness and dialogue which will be promoted around the DLT this year and in early 2016, accountability for development in Ghana will be gradually increased as citizens, civil society, the media, partners and government staff and politicians become increasingly aware of the inequities in Ghana's development as a country.



ABOUT UNICEF

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Ghana is committed to reaching the most disadvantaged children to ensure that they survive and thrive. Our work involves supporting partners to reach the isolated, to include the disadvantaged, and advocating for the rights of the voiceless. As a result, our work is focused on the poorest regions of Ghana, working with the most deprived communities, and advocating for national policies that enable the poorest to engage and be protected.

We do this through a 'life cycle approach', which focuses on the points in a child's life where the potential change and impact are the greatest. UNICEF Ghana's goal is to create a positive cycle through which the next generation of children can break free of poverty and participate fully in Ghana's growing economy.

Our programme covers five main areas (i) Social Policy and Equity; (ii) Health and Nutrition; (iii) Water and Sanitation; (iv) Education; (v) Child protection .

ABOUT CDD

The Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD-Ghana) is an independent, non-governmental and non-profit research and advocacy institute dedicated to the promotion of democracy, good governance and economic openness in Ghana and throughout Africa. CDD-Ghana's research outputs and other services are available to and used by governmental and non-governmental agencies, Africa regional bodies, development partners as well as researchers and the public.