

THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA

LOCAL GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT OF SERVICE DELIVERY PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT - 2021

NATIONAL SYNTHESIS REPORT

MAY, 2022

OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER

Foreword

The 2021 Local Government Management of Service Delivery (LGMSD) Performance Assessment is the second edition since the revision of the assessment framework aimed at incentivizing improved management of service delivery at Local Government (LG) level. This assessment was conducted between October to December 2021 with involvement of the performance assessment Task force, members from relevant Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs), Local Governments and Development Partners.

This report provides findings on performance of LGs, identifies issues constraining service delivery in Local Governments, and proposes recommendations to address them. The focus is on ensuring that resources transferred to LGs are objectively distributed to finance local and national priorities, and are duly and effectively utilized and accounted for by the duty bearers.

Overall, the 2021 assessment results indicate an improvement in average performance of Local Governments to 44% in both minimum conditions and performance measures, compared to 36% in 2020. It should be noted that the above improvement was registered amidst the COVID 19 pandemic and its related challenges, which in a way restrained some of the LGs' functions.

The improvement in performance is largely attributed to enhanced achievement in the core performance measurements that principally focused on LG staffing, environment and social safeguards; which significantly determine the overall score. Also, efforts aimed at capacity building including; vigorous and continuous orientation of LGs on the assessment process and LGMSD Manual, as well as development and implementation of the Performance Improvement Plans coordinated by the Ministry of Local Government that have enlightened LGs on the assessment framework.

My office extends special gratitude to the Performance Assessment Task Force, MDAs and LG representatives who participated in the assessment and reviewing of the results. I also wish to appreciate the Assessment and Verification Firms which were contracted to conduct the assessment and quality assurance tasks.

Office of the Prime Minister acknowledges the financial and technical support from the UK Aid/ODI-BSI and the World Bank towards the design and implementation of the LGMSD Assessment framework.

Finally, I call upon all LGs, MDAs and other stakeholders to put to use the findings and recommendations herein, so that they can contribute to improving LG performance and service delivery.

For God and My Country

Keith Muhakanizi

PERMANENT SECRETARY

Executive Summary

Introduction

This report presents the synthesized results from the Local Government Management of Service Delivery (LGMSD) Performance Assessment for 2021; conducted between October - December 2021. This assessment is the second edition under the revised framework.

The LGMSD has two dimensions which are: (i) Minimum conditions (MCs) which are seen as core performance indicators, and focus on key bottlenecks for service delivery and safeguards management; and ii) Performance Measures (PMs) which are sectoral assessments and are used to evaluate service delivery in the Districts/Municipalities as a whole. Table 1 below highlights the total number of Local Governments (LGs) assessed in LGMSD 2021.

Table 1: LGs assessed in LGMSD 2021

No. of LGs assessed	District Local Governments (DLGs)	135
	Municipal Local Governments (MLGs)	19
	Total Local Governments	154

The assessment for 2021 was conducted in 154 of the 176 LG Votes (District and Municipal Local Governments), of which 135 were DLGs and 19 were MLGs that were operational as at July, 2020. The remaining 22 MLGs were assessed under the Uganda Support to Municipal Infrastructure Development (USMID) program in the areas of Education and Health, which results are presented in a separate report (due to varying timing of the assessments).

The assessment results have been used to inform, among others: allocation of development grants for FY 2022/23, and development of the Performance Improvement Plans for the weakest performing LGs and assessment areas, which is coordinated by the Ministry of Local Government. The results will also be used to inform the Government Annual Performance Report (GAPR) for FY 2021/22 and future NDP-III Programme guidelines to support LGs.

Overview of the LGMSD Results

Summary of the Key Findings

The overall key findings from the assessment are presented in this section. The details are presented in the main report (PART B) and in LG specific reports (which are up-loaded and accessible in OPAMS: http://budget.go.ug/LGPAs and on the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) website.

Overview of the results for Minimum Conditions and Performance measures

The overall performance for all LGs assessed in 2021 across the four dimensions improved from 36% in 2020 to 44% in 2021. Education was the best performed area at 53% having improved from 44% in 2020 followed by Health which improved from 35% to 44%, Crosscutting from 32% to 38% and finally Water and Environment performance areas from 36% to 40% over the same period. Education still performed slightly better than other areas because most LGs met the minimum conditions related to recruitment of critical staff (District/Principal Education Officers and School Inspectors); as well as environment and social safeguard issues.

Microscale Irrigation (MSI) performance greatly improved in 2021 assessment from 9% in 2020 to 47%. However, results for MSI were not considered in overall performance of LGs since the assessment was only conducted in 40 piloted Micro-Scale Irrigation LGs, and since the indicators are progressively enrolled in the system.

Ibanda district still emerged the overall best performer in 2021 scoring 82% as was the case in 2020. Isingiro district was ranked number 2 scoring 77% having improved from number 3 in 2020. Kira Municipal Council scoring 70%, Mpigi 68%, Gulu district and Njeru Municipal Council 67% complete the list of top 5 performers. Five LGs of Ibanda, Isingiro, Rubanda, Mpigi districts and Masindi Municipal Council featured among the top 10 LGs in both the 2020 and 2021 assessments.

The worst performers on the other hand were; Ntoroko District (15%), Buliisa district (16%), Kitagwenda (17%), Rukiga district (18%) and Bukwo district (19%) average score as the bottom 5 performers overall. In comparison to the 2020 assessment, only Obongi district appeared again in the worst 10 LGs for 2021; although it registered a slight improvement from 15% to 25%, indicating the possibilities to progressively improve performance and ranking over time.

Figure 1 below shows the overall scores for the 5 assessments.

Figure 1: Aggregate score per Assessment Area for Minimum Conditions and Performance Measures



No. of LGs assessed = 154

Tables 2 and 3 below show the top 10 and the bottom 10 performing LGs in the 2021 LGMSD assessment, including their ranks and scores, and reveals a significant variation in performance across LGs for 2020.

Table 2: Top 10 performing LGs in 2021

Vote	Rank 2021	Score 2021	Rank 2020	Score 2020
Ibanda District	1	82%	1	82%
Isingiro District	2	77%	2	79%
Kira Municipal Council	3	70%	40	46%
Mpigi District	4	68%	9	62%
Gulu District	5	67%	78	35%
Njeru Municipal Council	5	67%	41	45%
Kamwenge District	7	65%	30	49%
Rubanda District	8	64%	4	69%
Sembabule District	9	63%	18	56%
Masindi Municipal Council	10	62%	7	65%
Kole District	10	62%	83	32%

No. of LGs assessed = 154 (Note: Terego DLG was not assessed in 2020)

Table 3: Bottom 10 performing LGs in 2021

Vote	Rank 2021	Score 2021	Rank 2020	Score 2020
Obongi District	144	25%	144	15%
Kapelebyong District	144	25%	83	32%
Kalaki District	144	25%	120	24%
Busia District	147	23%	126	23%
Terego District	148	21%	N/A	N/A
Namisindwa District	148	21%	139	20%
Bukwo District	150	19%	86	31%
Rukiga District	151	18%	132	21%
Kitagwenda District	152	17%	86	31%
Buliisa District	153	16%	132	21%
Ntoroko District	154	15%	86	31%

No. of LGs assessed = 154 (Note: Terego DLG was not assessed in 2020)

Crosscutting – Key results

The Crosscutting assessment covered two components namely; Minimum Conditions (MCs) and Performance Measures (PMs). These were evaluated against 3 thematic areas for the MCs and 9 thematic areas for the PMs to give a total of 100 maximum obtainable percent points. Details of the combined MCs and PMs scores are highlighted in figure 2 below;

Figure 2: Distribution of LGs across aggregate score categories for both Minimum Conditions and Performance Measures (combined)



No. of LGs assessed = 154

From the figure above, only 10 (7%) of the LGs assessed scored above 60%, while 15 (10%) scored between 51% - 60%. Majority (53%) of the LGs scored between 31% - 50%, while 33 (21%) of the LGs scored between 21%-30%. Ibanda District registered the highest score of 81%, followed by Makindye-Ssabagabo MLG (78%) and Isingiro District (74%) while Namisindwa and Kitagwenda districts registered the lowest score of 8%, followed by Bukwo (9%), Sironko 13% and Bududa 14%. Figure 3 below focuses on the Minimum Conditions separately.

Figure 3: Aggregate scores for Crosscutting Minimum Conditions per Assessment Area



No. of LGs assessed = 154

Performance in Minimum Conditions was moderate for both DLGs and MLGs, with the aggregate scores ranging between 44% and 69% in all the three thematic areas. Environment and Social Requirements (scoring 69% overall), and Human Resource Management and Development (61% overall score) were the best performed areas. Continuously low performance has been registered under Financial Management and Reporting scoring 46%, with DLGs scoring only 44%. LGs' implementation of the audit recommendations (32%) remained the most poorly performed indicator under Financial Management and Reporting assessment area.

Figure 4: Aggregate scores per thematic area for Crosscutting Performance Measures



No. of LGs assessed = 154

Largely, MLGs edged DLGs with an aggregate score of 70% compared to 66% for the latter. The best performed area was delivery of Local Government Service Delivery with an aggregate score of 88%, followed by Transparency and Accountability with an aggregate score of 78% and Financial Management with a score of 76%. The lowest scores were registered in Local revenue management, with an overall score of 39%, and which is an area, which has consistently created challenges for the LGs since the first assessment, but which was also severely impacted by Covid 19 and its related effects during the assessment period.

Notably good performance was registered in indicators related to: having complete procurement files (97%); DDEG projects being implemented in line with the Engineer's estimates (95%); DDEG grants being spent on eligible activities (94%), which is important for targeting of the use of funds towards development oriented areas); incorporation of projects in Annual Work Plan, budget and procurement plan (93%); timely submission of annual performance contract (92%); conducting Environment and Social Impact Assessments (90%); and recruitment of the Principal Human Resource Officer (87%).

LGs performed poorly on indicators related to; timely invoicing and communication of DDEG transfers (13%), timely warranting of DDEG grants (27%), release of budgeted allocations to Natura Resources and Community Based Services Departments (22% and 21% respectively), recruitment of the District Engineer (29%), reporting on status of implementation of audit recommendations (32%), establishing grievance redress committees (34%), local revenue planning and collection (39%), and submission of staff requirements to Ministry of Public Service (43%).

Education – Key results

Education performance area was also assessed based on two components: 1) Minimum Conditions; and 2) Performance Measures. The assessment results showed an improvement in overall combined performance (MCs and PMs scores) of LGs from 44% in 2020 to 53% in 2021.

Figure 5: Distribution of LGs across aggregate score categories for both Minimum Conditions and Performance Measures (combined scores)



No. of LGs assessed = 154

From figure 5 above, there were significant variations noted in performance across all the LGs, with only 1% of the LGs scoring above 90%, while 8% of the LGs scored between 81%-90%. More LGs (21%) scored in the range of 51%-60% than in other score ranges, whereas 18% of the LGs scored in the range of 41% - 50%, and 14 LGs scored 20% and below.

The top performing LGs in the Education assessment were Njeru Municipal Council (91%), Kibuku district (88%), Ibanda district (87%), and Rakai district (85%); closely followed by Masindi Municipal Council, Kumi district, Kole district and Kapchorwa Municipal Council that each scored 84%. Kyankwanzi district scored the lowest at 0% due to failure to meet any of the minimum conditions, followed by Nakapiripirit District (13%), Ntoroko and Terego Districts each scoring 16%.

Figure 6: Aggregate scores for Education Minimum Conditions per Assessment Area



No. of LGs assessed = 154

From Figure 6 above, LGs performed fairly well under Education Minimum Conditions with an overall score of 77%, with DLGs scoring 76% and MLGs 84%. LGs performed better in Environment and Social Requirements with an overall score of 89%, as compared to 72% for Human Resource Management and Development. Figure 7 below shows the performance in the thematic areas under the Education Performance Measures.

Figure 7: Aggregate scores per assessment area for Education Performance Measures



No. of LGs assessed = 154

Generally, MLGs scored slightly better than DLGs in most of the PMs under the Education assessment. The overall performance score for LGs' compliance to PMs was 68% with DLGs scoring 67% and MLGs 71%. LGs performed better in areas of; Investment Management and Human Resource Management and Development, both scoring 77%; followed by Management, Monitoring and Supervision scoring 70%. Local Government Service Results and Environment and Social Safeguards were the least performed areas with scores of 60% and 57% respectively.

Best performed indicators included; Education projects approved by the contracts' committee or cleared by Solicitor General if above threshold, Complete procurement files, Education development grant spent on eligible activities, and Allocations towards inspection and monitoring (all of which scored 97%); followed by School infrastructure followed standard technical designs by MoES, and Contract price being within engineer's estimates (both with an aggregate score of 96%).

The worst scoring indicators included: Timely invoicing and communication of capitation grants to schools (25%); Change in PLE rate (29%) - an area which is also expected to take time for improvements, and which was adversely impacted by COVID-19); Appraisal of secondary school head-teachers (31%), Timely submission of warrants for school's capitation (32%); School compliance with MoES budgeting and reporting guidelines (37%); and Dissemination of guidelines on proper school siting (44%).

Health – Key results:

Health performance area was also assessed based on two components: 1) Minimum Conditions and 2) Performance Measures. The assessment results showed an improvement in overall performance of LGs from 35% in 2020 to 44% in 2021, although this was still below the score for other assessments like Education. Details are highlighted in Figure 8 below.

Figure 8: Distribution of LGs across aggregate score categories for both Minimum Conditions and Performance Measures (combined score)



No. of LGs assessed = 154

The greater number of LGs (38) scored in the range of 41% - 50%, while 32 LGs (21%) scored between 51% - 60%, another 30 LGs (19%) scored between 31% and 40%, and 34 LGs had scores of 30% and below. 52 LGs scored above 50% of the maximum attainable score for the Health assessment. Kamwenge district obtained the highest score of 86%, followed by Ibanda district (80%), Isingiro district (79%), Oyam district (76%), Lira district and Ibanda Municipal Council each scoring 74%. Sheema Municipal Council and Ntoroko district scored the lowest at 9%, followed by Bukwo District (16%), Kasanda, Luuka and Kasese Districts each scoring 17% respectively.

Figure 9: Aggregate scores for Health Minimum Conditions per assessment area



No. of LGs assessed = 154

The overall aggregate score for LGs' compliance to Health MCs was 69%, with DLGs scoring 70% and MLGs 65%. LGs performed better in Environment and Social Requirements with an aggregate score of 87%, as compared to 62% for Human Resource Management and Development.

Figure 10 below shows the results in the thematic areas under the Health Performance Measures.

Figure 10: Aggregate scores per assessment area for Health Performance Measures



No. of LGs assessed = 154

The overall performance score for LGs' compliance to PMs was 63%, with DLGs scoring 67% and MLGs 62%. LGs performed better in thematic areas of: Local Government Service Delivery Results scoring 76%, followed by Investment Management scoring 73%, while Performance Reporting and Performance Improvement (53%) and Management, Monitoring and Supervision of Services (55%) were the least performed areas.

Health Departments performed well in indicators related to; Projects being approved by the contracts committee prior to construction, and following standard technical designs (both scoring 97%); Having complete procurement files (96%); Contract prices being within the Engineer's estimates (93%); Development grants being spent on eligible activities (92%); and Conducting ESIAs (90%).

On the other hand, the least performing indicators included: Timely invoicing and communication of health facility transfers (15%); Taking corrective action based on health worker appraisal reports (17%); Compliance to Ministry of Health budgeting and reporting guidelines (25%); Timely submission of RBF invoices and warrants for health facility transfers (25%); and Timely submission of budget performance reports (29%).

Water and Environment – Key results

Unlike Education and Health performance areas, Water and Environment was only assessed in DLGs, since MLGs are served by National Water and Sewerage Corporation. 135 LGs were therefore assessed both on Minimum Conditions and Performance Measures. The assessment results showed a slight improvement in overall performance of LGs from

36% in 2020 to 40% in 2021, although this was still below the overall aggregate scores in the other assessment areas.

Figure 11: Distribution of LGs across aggregate score categories for both Minimum Conditions and Performance Measures (combined scores)



No. of LGs assessed = 135

None of the DLGs scored above 80%, which was attributed to the poor performance in the Minimum Conditions, and these significantly impact on the overall combined score for a LG. Generally, 3% (4) of the districts (i.e. Ibanda, Mpigi, Isingiro and Wakiso DLGs) scored between 71% - 80%, while, 7% (9) of the districts scored between 61% - 70%. The majority of the DLGs (70) registered scores between31% - 50%. The lowest performing districts were Bulisa, Amuria, Rukiga and Ntoroko, which all scored less than 11% of the maximum score

Figure 12: Aggregate scores for Water and Environment Minimum Conditions per assessment area



No. of LGs assessed = 135

The overall aggregate score for LGs' compliance to Water and Environment MCs for 2021 was 62%. LGs performed better in Environment and Social Requirements with an aggregate score of 74%, as compared to 57% for Human Resource Management and Development.

Figure 13: Aggregate scores per assessment area for Water and Environment Performance Measures.



No. of LGs assessed = 135

LGs had an improvement in the overall aggregate score across the six performance measures in Water and Environment from 56% in 2020 to 63% in 2021. The most significant improvement was registered under Environment and Social Requirements with a 20-percentage point improvement between 2020 and 2021; followed by Investment Management that improved by 10 percentage points over the same period. Performance in Human Resource Management and Development remained low despite the marginal improvement from 45% in 2020 to 49% in 2021.

The best performed indicators under Water included; Approval of WSS infrastructure by the Contracts Committee (99%); Complete Water project procurement files (98%); Water infrastructure projects following standard technical designs (96%); Incorporation of water infrastructure investments in AWP (96%); Accuracy of information on WSS facilities constructed (96%); and Training of WSCs on O&M (95%).

Inadequate performance was however registered on indicators related to; Increased functionality of WSCs (16%); Recruitment of the Natural Resources Officer (17%); Preparation of a training plan for water staff (18%); Budgeting for water projects in Sub counties below the district average (26%); and increase in functionality of water supply facilities (27%).

Microscale Irrigation – Key results:

The Microscale Irrigation assessment covered only 40 district LGs in which the intervention has been piloted; and was also based on two components of: 1) Minimum Conditions and 2) Performance Measures. In comparison to the 2020 assessment, there was a great improvement from 9% to 47% in 2021. This was largely because more indicators were applicable and could be assessed in 2021 as compared to 2020. Details of the same are highlighted in Figure 14 below.

Figure 14 shows the distribution of LGs across aggregate score categories for both Minimum Conditions and Performance Measures.

Figure 14: Distribution of LGs across aggregate score categories for both Minimum Conditions and Performance Measures



No. of LGs assessed = 40

Of the 40 assessed LGs, only one LG (Sembabule DLG) scored in the range 90% -100%. The highest number of LGs (7 LGs) scored in the range 71% - 80%, while 6 LGs registered scores between 61%-70%. The best performing LGs were Sembabule District (90%), Lwengo District (83%), Mpigi District (81%) and Rakai District (80%).

The lowest scoring LGs were Mubende and Sironko districts which registered 0% scores; followed by Ntungamo District (11%), Bududa District (16%) and Kapchorwa District (18%).

Figure 15: Aggregate scores for assessment areas under the Micro Scale Irrigation Minimum Conditions.



No. of LGs assessed = 154

The overall aggregate score for LGs' compliance to MCs for Microscale Irrigation was 71%; with Environment and Social Requirements scoring 85% compared to 65% for Human Resource Management and Development (which only specifically looked at the recruitment of the Senior Agricultural Engineer). Since Microscale projects are small in nature, LGs were only assessed on undertaking Environment, Social and Climate Change screening for investments, while the indicator on conducting Environment and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) was left out.

Figure 16: Aggregate scores per assessment area for Micro Scale Irrigation Performance Measures.



No. of LGs assessed = 40

The overall aggregate score across performance measures in Micro Scale Irrigation was 65%. The best-performed area was Human Resource Management and Development with an aggregate score of 73%; while the worst performed area was Environment and Social Safeguards with an aggregate score of 33%.

The best performing indicators included: Mobilization activities for farmers conducted (95%); Undertaking awareness training on micro-irrigation (95%); An up-to-date database of farmer applications (95%); Up-to-date data into MIS (93%0; LG visits to farmers (93%); Preparation of a micro-irrigation training plan (90%0; and producing quarterly reports based on information from LLGs (90%).

The worst performed indicators were: Use of the farmer co-funding as per guidelines (7%); Irrigation co-funding and allocations as per guidelines (12%); Taking corrective action on extension worker appraisal reports (29%); Investigation of micro-scale irrigation grievances (29%); and Reporting on irrigation grievances (29%).

Most indicators performed poorly due to the phased manner in which the Micro scale irrigation project is being implemented. Therefore, the activities within the areas of low performance had just commenced as per the design of the project; nonetheless the 2021 performance is better than that of the 2020 assessment.

PART C: ANNEXES

Annex 1: Ranked Overall Performance Results and Scores per Performance Area for LGMSD 2021 compared to 2020

Rank 2021	Vote	Score 2021	Rank 2020	Score 2020	Crosscutting Measures	Education Measures	Health Measures	Water Measures	Microscale Irrigation Measures[7]
1	Ibanda District	82	1	82	81	87	80	80	53
2	Isingiro District	77	2	79	74	82	79	75	N/A
3	Kira Municipal Council	70	40	46	71	77	63	N/A	N/A
4	Mpigi District	68	9	62	65	75	55	77	81
5	Gulu District	67	78	35	48	82	70	68	N/A
5	Njeru Municipal Council	67	41	45	71	91	39	N/A	N/A
7	Kamwenge District	65	30	49	40	81	86	50	79
8	Rubanda District	64	4	69	72	67	72	46	N/A
9	Sembabule District	63	18	56	57	78	49	67	90
10	Masindi Municipal Council	62	7	65	49	84	53	N/A	N/A
10	Kole District	62	83	32	48	84	72	42	N/A
12	Makindye-Ssabagabo Municipal Council	60	23	52	78	78	25	N/A	N/A
12	Mbarara District	60	7	65	48	68	60	65	N/A
14	Ibanda Municipal Council	59	25	51	53	52	74	N/A	N/A
14	Rakai District	59	28	50	38	85	59	52	80
16	Dokolo District	58	107	28	39	61	68	65	N/A
16	Omoro District	58	120	24	32	82	52	66	22
16	Kapchorwa Municipal Council	58	115	26	30	84	59	N/A	N/A
19	Kibuku District	57	34	48	27	88	66	49	N/A
19	Kibaale District	57	21	53	49	80	61	37	59
21	Kayunga District	56	30	49	56	58	69	41	25
21	Wakiso District	56	25	51	57	61	34	71	44
21	Lira District	56	58	41	42	82	74	25	N/A
24	Hoima District	55	28	50	54	80	39	46	N/A
25	Masindi District	54	30	49	46	76	46	50	N/A
25	Nebbi District	54	111	27	65	52	46	55	N/A
25	Iganga District	54	95	30	55	76	50	35	49
28	Maracha District	53	86	31	45	74	59	34	N/A

Rank 2021	Vote	Score 2021	Rank 2020	Score 2020	Crosscutting Measures	Education Measures	Health Measures	Water Measures	Microscale Irrigation Measures[7]
28	Kumi District	53	30	49	45	84	57	26	N/A
28	Jinja District	53	69	37	60	57	56	37	45
28	Bushenyi District	53	13	59	56	53	50	52	56
28	Kakumiro District	53	76	36	42	74	44	51	N/A
33	Nakaseke District	52	148	14	49	67	44	50	22
33	Mukono Municipal Council	52	67	38	61	48	48	N/A	N/A
33	Bugiri District	52	13	59	47	52	51	60	N/A
33	Masaka District	52	43	44	47	60	68	34	23
33	Oyam District	52	118	25	37	73	76	22	N/A
33	Yumbe District	52	86	31	39	76	45	47	N/A
33	Nansana Municipal Council	52	111	27	44	67	44	N/A	N/A
33	Nwoya District	52	63	39	38	63	55	50	69
41	Otuke District	51	132	21	42	60	41	63	N/A
41	Kiruhura District	51	37	47	45	65	44	52	N/A
41	Adjumani District	51	120	24	38	79	49	39	N/A
41	Namayingo District	51	107	28	47	60	55	42	N/A
41	Butambala District	51	37	47	50	44	54	56	79
41	Kisoro District	51	58	41	55	48	54	45	N/A
47	Kiboga District	50	43	44	45	47	52	57	N/A
47	Nebbi Municipal Council	50	120	24	55	49	46	N/A	N/A
47	Pallisa District	50	86	31	46	48	65	39	N/A
50	Mubende District	49	16	57	34	44	61	56	0
50	Kamuli District	49	95	30	35	70	34	56	64
50	Pader District	49	140	18	40	57	39	59	N/A
50	Kaberamaido District	49	132	21	39	45	53	59	N/A
50	Namutumba District	49	111	27	44	51	59	40	N/A
50	Buikwe District	49	21	53	53	48	52	41	24
56	Agago District	48	144	15	37	65	42	47	N/A
56	Kabarole District	48	2	79	49	55	21	65	N/A
56	Buyende District	48	86	31	42	57	45	47	N/A

Rank 2021	Vote	Score 2021	Rank 2020	Score 2020	Crosscutting Measures	Education Measures	Health Measures	Water Measures	Microscale Irrigation Measures[7]
59	Pakwach District	47	144	15	32	51	54	53	N/A
59	Budaka District	47	20	54	42	57	58	33	N/A
59	Mukono District	47	41	45	49	41	58	40	20
59	Moroto District	47	58	41	53	55	29	50	N/A
59	Moyo District	47	86	31	38	61	45	42	N/A
64	Rubirizi District	46	5	68	50	61	41	34	N/A
64	Amuru District	46	107	28	26	74	53	32	19
64	Zombo District	46	132	21	47	44	46	47	N/A
64	Katakwi District	46	43	44	29	75	41	39	N/A
64	Kalungu District	46	47	43	26	66	46	46	22
64	Apac District	46	126	23	39	39	71	35	N/A
70	Lwengo District	45	47	43	44	51	52	35	83
70	Soroti District	45	34	48	39	78	53	11	N/A
70	Bushenyi- Ishaka Municipal Council	45	9	62	29	73	34	N/A	N/A
70	Buvuma District	45	13	59	48	68	24	41	N/A
70	Rukungiri Municipal Council	45	34	48	33	50	52	N/A	N/A
70	Manafwa District	45	63	39	26	77	38	37	57
70	Luwero District	45	95	30	50	36	53	38	69
77	Kazo District	44	16	57	42	24	45	67	N/A
77	Kaliro District	44	69	37	33	46	60	37	N/A
77	Ngora District	44	6	66	24	68	63	20	N/A
77	Kumi Municipal Council	44	47	43	38	40	53	N/A	N/A
81	Bugweri District	43	153	5	40	57	48	29	N/A
81	Kiryandongo District	43	102	29	31	67	50	26	N/A
81	Bugiri Municipal Council	43	63	39	37	50	43	N/A	N/A
81	Bukomansimbi District	43	62	40	62	52	32	25	74
81	Napak District	43	102	29	36	82	23	30	N/A
86	Koboko District	42	132	21	47	44	31	47	N/A
86	Kapchorwa District	42	69	37	38	52	47	32	18
86	Bududa District	42	19	55	14	53	50	50	16

Rank 2021	Vote	Score 2021	Rank 2020	Score 2020	Crosscutting Measures	Education Measures	Health Measures	Water Measures	Microscale Irrigation Measures[7]
86	Mitooma District	42	69	37	38	58	44	28	N/A
86	Alebtong District	42	144	15	29	44	39	55	N/A
86	Nabilatuk District	42	120	24	44	59	27	37	N/A
86	Arua District	42	143	16	40	58	38	32	N/A
86	Kabale District	42	115	26	40	45	48	32	N/A
94	Sheema Municipal Council	41	11	60	53	62	9	N/A	N/A
94	Kisoro Municipal Council	41	78	35	27	62	34	N/A	N/A
94	Rwampara District	41	120	24	38	39	38	49	N/A
94	Kanungu District	41	47	43	44	24	38	59	N/A
94	Amolatar District	41	102	29	22	56	45	40	N/A
94	Iganga Municipal Council	41	81	34	35	69	18	N/A	N/A
94	Kween District	41	111	27	26	53	42	41	N/A
101	Bunyangabu District	40	25	51	37	61	31	32	N/A
101	Kyenjojo District	40	69	37	36	41	66	19	75
101	Lamwo District	40	131	22	30	38	39	55	N/A
101	Kasanda District	40	81	34	42	52	17	48	N/A
105	Kitgum District	39	86	31	23	43	49	42	N/A
105	Bundibugyo District	39	63	39	31	34	41	50	N/A
105	Kwania District	39	126	23	37	22	47	49	N/A
108	Kotido District	38	83	32	31	20	58	45	N/A
108	Sheema District	38	11	60	44	29	33	48	N/A
108	Koboko Municipal Council	38	118	25	33	35	47	N/A	N/A
108	Bulambuli District	38	57	42	21	24	37	70	N/A
112	Kotido Municipal Council	37	95	30	39	22	52	N/A	N/A
112	Rukungiri District	37	47	43	51	20	52	25	69
112	Butaleja District	37	95	30	25	48	26	47	N/A
115	Kalangala District	36	47	43	19	58	30	38	N/A
115	Gomba District	36	47	43	20	54	39	32	N/A
115	Bukedea District	36	58	41	23	70	40	11	N/A
115	Mityana Municipal Council	36	69	37	32	43	31	N/A	N/A

Rank 2021	Vote	Score 2021	Rank 2020	Score 2020	Crosscutting Measures	Education Measures	Health Measures	Water Measures	Microscale Irrigation Measures[7]
119	Amuria District	35	67	38	28	73	34	6	N/A
119	Tororo District	35	78	35	27	27	47	40	71
119	Buhweju District	35	47	43	22	49	19	49	N/A
119	Kyotera District	35	47	43	29	50	26	33	20
123	Abim District	34	149	11	32	37	40	28	N/A
123	Mayuge District	34	37	47	55	28	26	27	40
123	Kasese District	34	126	23	29	57	17	32	N/A
123	Karenga District	34	151	10	31	17	34	53	N/A
123	Madi-Okollo District	34	152	7	36	53	23	23	N/A
123	Mbale District	34	102	29	25	52	21	36	63
129	Kagadi District	33	43	44	16	54	30	34	N/A
129	Kaabong District	33	149	11	20	17	50	44	N/A
129	Mityana District	33	95	30	32	46	20	35	48
132	Sironko District	32	102	29	13	47	23	47	0
132	Lyantonde District	32	69	37	28	41	37	23	N/A
132	Ntungamo District	32	95	30	30	34	36	30	11
135	Butebo District	30	47	43	25	17	51	28	N/A
135	Serere District	30	23	52	28	19	41	33	N/A
135	Nakapiripirit District	30	132	21	23	13	35	49	N/A
135	Amudat District	30	142	17	27	39	31	22	N/A
139	Kikuube District	29	115	26	32	38	23	25	N/A
139	Kyegegwa District	29	76	36	43	27	24	25	70
141	Nakasongola District	28	107	28	29	38	21	24	N/A
142	Luuka District	27	140	18	18	47	17	26	55
143	Kyankwanzi District	26	126	23	34	0	38	33	N/A
144	Obongi District	25	144	15	27	35	23	16	N/A
144	Kapelebyong District	25	83	32	20	36	28	15	N/A

Rank 2021	Vote	Score 2021	Rank 2020	Score 2020	Crosscutting Measures	Education Measures	Health Measures	Water Measures	Microscale Irrigation Measures[7]
144	Kalaki District	25	120	24	15	18	38	28	N/A
147	Busia District	23	126	23	19	24	18	34	N/A
148	Terego District	21	N/A	N/A	27	16	22	19	0
148	Namisindwa District	21	139	20	8	23	30	22	N/A
150	Bukwo District	19	86	31	9	20	16	30	N/A
151	Rukiga District	18	132	21	18	20	26	9	N/A
152	Kitagwenda District	17	86	31	8	23	18	17	20
153	Buliisa District	16	132	21	15	18	29	2	N/A
154	Ntoroko District	15	86	31	26	16	9	10	N/A