### FOREWORD

I am very pleased to present to you the Report of the National Service Delivery Survey (NSDS) 2008. This Report is a manifestation of the commitment of the Government of Uganda to institutionalize strategies for encouraging service recipients to provide feedback regarding the efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery.

As you may be aware, under the Public Service Reform Programme, two National Service Delivery Surveys were conducted in 2000 and 2004. The overall objective of the 3<sup>rd</sup> National Service Delivery Survey 2008 was to provide a comprehensive assessment of the trends in service delivery in the areas that were covered in the previous surveys and to obtain a baseline position in the additional areas that were brought on board.

The study was conducted in all the regions of Uganda and covered the sectors of education, health, agriculture, infrastructure, water and sanitation, energy, justice, law and order, and public sector management and accountability. The survey established the availability, accessibility, cost and utilization of services and whether service recipients were satisfied with service delivery in terms of coverage, quantity and quality.

In each of the sectors covered, the survey provides feedback from service recipients regarding areas where progress has been made and the positive trends in service delivery. Likewise, for each area covered, the Survey Report also highlights areas where challenges are still being encountered.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend the following, who have been very instrumental in the National Service Delivery Survey 2008:

- a) The Uganda Bureau of Statistics that provided the technical expertise for the survey.
- b) The Inter-Ministerial Steering Committee that provided the over-sight policy direction to the survey.
- c) The Inter-Ministerial Technical Committee for the technical input and coordination of the survey.
- d) The field staff who collected information from the households all over the country.
- e) The households and focus groups that participated in the study and voluntarily and honestly provided the information.

- f) The service providers at the district and sub-county that provided useful information about service delivery at their different levels
- g) All Ministries and Local Governments for their input and support and;
- h) The Development Partners without whom the exercise would not have been possible.

I am confident that the findings of the National Service Delivery Survey 2008 will be greatly valued and will provide a springboard for new policy actions that will deepen the implementation of the various sector reforms and act as a basis for evaluating future performance of the Public Sector.

I enjoin all of you to read this Report and make use of it as an instrument to market the positive aspects of service delivery that have been registered by the Government and to identify policy actions that need to be undertaken to address the challenges that have been identified.

HENRY MUGANWA KAJURA SECOND DEPUTY PRIME MINSITER AND MINISTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

BTVET	Business, Technical and Vocational Education and Training
CBOs	Community Based Organisations
CID	Criminal Investigation Department
CWD	Children With Disabilities
DPP	Department of Public Prosecution
EA	Enumeration Area
ENT	Ears, Nose and Throat
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
НН	Household
HSSP	Health Sector Strategic Plan
IG	Inspectorate of Government
IGG	Inspector General of Government
JLOS	Justice Law and Order Sector
KII	Key Informant Interview
LC	Local Council
MAAIF	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MFI	Micro Finance Institutions
MFPED	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
МОН	Ministry of Health
MoJCA	Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs
MPS	Ministry of Public Service
NAADS	National Agricultural Advisory Services
NDP	National Development Plan
NEMA	National Environment Management Authority
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisations
NSDS	National Service Delivery Survey
OPD	Out-Patient Department
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PMA	Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture
SACCOS	Saving and Credit Cooperatives
SWAP	Sector Wide Approach
UBOS	Uganda Bureau of Statistics
UNADA	Uganda National Agro-input Dealers Association
UPE	Universal Primary Education
USE	Universal Secondary education
VEDCO	Volunteer Efforts for Development Concerns

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

F	OREWO	DRD	I
LI	ST OF A	ACRONYMS	. 111
T/	ABLE O	F CONTENTS	.IV
LI	ST OF	TABLES	VII
LI	ST OF I	FIGURES	XII
1	СНА	PTER ONE	1
	INTROD	UCTION	1
	1.1	BACKGROUND	1
	1.2	OBJECTIVES OF THE NATIONAL SERVICE DELIVERY SURVEY	2
	1.3	SAMPLING DESIGN	3
	1.4	SURVEY INSTRUMENTS	4
	1.5	RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF FIELDWORKERS	5
	1.6	COMPOSITION OF FIELD TEAMS	5
	1.7	DATA PROCESSING	5
	1.8	RESPONSE RATE	6
2	CHA	PTER TWO	7
	DEMO	GRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS	7
	2.1	INTRODUCTION	7
	2.2	HOUSEHOLD POPULATION	7
	2.3	HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION	.10
	2.4	MARITAL STATUS	. 10
	2.5	MAIN ACTIVITY AND OCCUPATION STATUS	.11
	2.6	SURVIVAL STATUS OF PARENTS	.14
	2.7	CONCLUSION	.15
3	СНА	PTER THREE	17
	EDUCA	ATION	.17
	3.1	INTRODUCTION	.17
	3.2	SCHOOLING STATUS	.17
	3.3	EDUCATION ATTAINMENT	.18
	3.4	CURRENT SCHOOLING STATUS BY CLASS AND AGE	. 19
	3.5	REASONS FOR NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL FOR PERSONS AGED 6 TO 12 YEARS	.20
	3.6	INCIDENCES OF PUPILS/STUDENTS LEAVING SCHOOL BY CLASS AND SUB REGION	.20
	3.7	SCHOOL MANAGEMENT	.24
	3.8	DISTANCE BY RESIDENCE AND SUB REGION OF PUPILS ATTENDING DAY SCHOOL	.25
	3.9	REASON FOR PUPILS LEAVING SCHOOL (6-17YEARS) BY RESIDENCE	.26
	3.10	PROVISION OF LUNCH AT SCHOOL	.27
	3.11	PAYMENTS FOR SERVICES BY PARENTS/GUARDIANS AND THEIR FREQUENCIES AT	
	SCHOOL		. 29
	3.12	AVAILABILITY OF SEPARATE TOILET AND FIRST AID FACILITIES	.31
	3.13	QUALITY OF EDUCATION	.32
	3.14 2.15	ADEQUACY OF FACILITIES	. 52
	3.13	IVIAIN SOURCE FOR DRINKING WATER AT SCHOOL	.32
Δ	5.10 СЦЛ		.34 35
+	UTA		55
	HEALT	Ή	.35
	4.1	INTRODUCTION	.35
	4.2	HOUSEHOLD HEALTH STATUS	.35
	4.3	MAJOR CAUSES OF MORBIDITY	.37

	4.4	MEDICAL ATTENTION SOUGHT	39
	4.5	DISTANCE TO HEALTH FACILITIES	41
	4.6	UTILISATION OF HEALTH SERVICES	43
	4.7	UNDER-FIVE IMMUNISATION	44
	4.8	PAYMENT FOR HEALTH SERVICES	47
	4.9	QUALITY OF HEALTH SERVICES	51
5	CHA	PTER FIVE	55
	WATE	Ο ΑΝΊΣ Ο ΑΝΊΤ ΑΤΊΩΝΙ	55
	WATE	X AND SANITATION	33
	5.1	WATER ACCESSIBILITY BY SEASON AND TYPE OF WATER SOURCE	55
	5.2	WATER ACCESSIBILITI BT SEASON AND TITE OF WATER SOURCE	50
	5.5	COLLECTION TIME FOR WATER	57
	5.5	PERCEPTION ON CHANGES IN THE AVAILABILITY OF WATER IN LAST 4 YEARS	
	5.6	REASONS FOR NOT USING WATER FROM SAFE SOURCES	60
	57	PAYMENTS FOR WATER	61
	5.8	COLLECTION PREPARATION AND STORAGE OF WATER	
	5.9	CONSTRAINTS LIMITING ACCESS TO SAFE WATER	64
	5.10	SANITATION FACILITIES	66
	5.11	CONCLUSION	69
~	0114		70
6	CHA	PTER SIX	70
	HOUSI	NG CONDITIONS AND ENERGY USE	70
	6.1	INTRODUCTION	70
	6.2	CONSTRAINTS IN CONSTRUCTING AND IMPROVING HOUSING	72
	6.3	DOMESTIC ENERGY USE	74
	6.4	SOURCE OF ELECTRICITY	77
	6.5	AVERAGE MONTHLY BILL	78
	6.6	MINING	78
	6.7	CONCLUSION	79
7	CHA	PTER SEVEN	80
7	CHA	PTER SEVEN	80
7	CHA AGRIC	PTER SEVEN	80 80
7	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80
7	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3	PTER SEVEN ULTURE Introduction Household Involvement in Agricultural Activities	80 80 80 80
7	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4	PTER SEVEN ULTURE Introduction Household Involvement in Agricultural Activities Crop Husbandry Agricultural inplits	80 80 80 80 82 82
7	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5	PTER SEVEN ULTURE INTRODUCTION HOUSEHOLD INVOLVEMENT IN AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES CROP HUSBANDRY AGRICULTURAL INPUTS	80 80 80 80 82 82 82 87
7	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6	PTER SEVEN ULTURE Introduction Household Involvement in Agricultural Activities Crop husbandry Agricultural inputs Extension services Marketing Information Services of Agricul tural Produce	80 80 80 82 82 82 87 93
7	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7	PTER SEVEN ULTURE INTRODUCTION HOUSEHOLD INVOLVEMENT IN AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES CROP HUSBANDRY AGRICULTURAL INPUTS EXTENSION SERVICES MARKETING INFORMATION SERVICES OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE CREDIT FACILITIES	80 80 80 82 82 82 87 93 94
7	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8	PTER SEVEN ULTURE INTRODUCTION HOUSEHOLD INVOLVEMENT IN AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES CROP HUSBANDRY AGRICULTURAL INPUTS EXTENSION SERVICES MARKETING INFORMATION SERVICES OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE CREDIT FACILITIES AVAILABILITY OF CREDIT FACILITIES AND CHALLENGES ACCESSING CREDIT IN TH	80 80 80 82 82 82 93 93 E
7	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU	PTER SEVEN ULTURE INTRODUCTION HOUSEHOLD INVOLVEMENT IN AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES CROP HUSBANDRY AGRICULTURAL INPUTS EXTENSION SERVICES MARKETING INFORMATION SERVICES OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE CREDIT FACILITIES AVAILABILITY OF CREDIT FACILITIES AND CHALLENGES ACCESSING CREDIT IN THI NITIES.	80 80 80 82 82 82 93 94 E 94
7	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9	PTER SEVEN ULTURE INTRODUCTION HOUSEHOLD INVOLVEMENT IN AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES CROP HUSBANDRY AGRICULTURAL INPUTS EXTENSION SERVICES MARKETING INFORMATION SERVICES OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE CREDIT FACILITIES AVAILABILITY OF CREDIT FACILITIES AND CHALLENGES ACCESSING CREDIT IN THINITIES CONCLUSION	80 80 80 82 82 82 93 94 E 94 95
7	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80 82 82 82 87 93 94 E 94 94
8	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9 CHA	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80 82 82 93 94 E 94 95 96
8	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9 CHA TRANS	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80 82 82 93 94 E 94 E 94 95 96
8	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9 CHA TRANS 8.1	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80 82 82 93 94 E 94 95 96 96
8	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9 CHA TRANS 8.1 8.2	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80 80 82 93 94 E 94 94 95 96 96 97
8	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9 CHA TRANS 8.1 8.2 8.3	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80 80 82 93 93 94 E 94 94 95 96 96 97 98
8	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9 CHA TRANS 8.1 8.2 8.3 8.4	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80 82 93 94 E 95 96 96 97 98
8	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9 CHA TRANS 8.1 8.2 8.3 8.4 8.5	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80 82 93 94 E 96 96 96 97 98
8	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9 CHA TRANS 8.1 8.2 8.3 8.4 8.5 CROSSII	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80 80 82 93 94 E 94 95 96 97 98 99 99
8	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9 CHA TRANS 8.1 8.2 8.3 8.4 8.5 CROSSII 8.6 9.7	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80 80 82 93 94 E 94 95 96 96 97 98 99 99
8	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9 CHA TRANS 8.1 8.2 8.3 8.4 8.5 CROSSII 8.6 8.7	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80 80 82 93 94 E 94 95 96 96 97 98 99 99 103 110
8	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9 CHA TRANS 8.1 8.2 8.3 8.4 8.5 CROSSII 8.6 8.7 CHA	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80 80 93 94 E 94 95 96 96 97 98 99 99 1103 .1115 117
8	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9 CHA TRANS 8.1 8.2 8.3 8.4 8.5 CROSSII 8.6 8.7 CHA	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80 80 93 94 E 94 95 96 96 97 98 99 99 103 .110 .115
8	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9 CHA TRANS 8.1 8.2 8.3 8.4 8.5 CROSSII 8.6 8.7 CHA JUSTIC 9.1	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80 80 93 93 94 E 94 95 96 96 97 98 99 99 99 91 103 115 1117
7 8 9	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9 CHA TRANS 8.1 8.2 8.3 8.4 8.5 CROSSII 8.6 8.7 CHA JUSTIC 9.1 9.2	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80 80 82 93 94 E 94 95 96 97 98 99 .103 .110 .115 117 .117 .117
7 9	CHA AGRIC 7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8 COMMU 7.9 CHA TRANS 8.1 8.2 8.3 8.4 8.5 CROSSII 8.6 8.7 CHA JUSTIC 9.1 9.2 9.3	PTER SEVEN	80 80 80 80 82 93 94 E 96 96 97 98 99 .103 .110 .115 117 .117 .117 .118

9.4	QUALITY OF AND SATISFACTION WITH ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGAL SERVICES	.121
9.5	PAYMENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGAL SERVICES	.123
9.6	MEMBERSHIP TO LOCAL COUNCIL 1 (LC 1)	.124
9.7	LOCAL COUNCIL 1 MEETINGS	.125
9.8	OPINION ABOUT LC 1 COMMITTEE REPRESENTING INTERESTS OF HOUSEHOLDS.	.127
9.9	INVOLVEMENT OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS IN DECISION MAKING PROCESSES WITH	IIN
THEI	R VILLAGES	.127
9.10	TRAVEL DOCUMENTS	.128
9.11	LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ON JUSTICE LAW AND ORDER SECTOR (GENERAL)	.130
9.12	Conclusion	. 131
10	CHAPTER NINE	132
PUB	BLIC SECTOR MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY	. 132
10.1	INTRODUCTION	.132
10.2	PERFORMANCE OF THE CIVIL SERVANTS IN UGANDA	.132
10.3	HOUSEHOLDS WITH MEMBERS IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT	.133
10.4	RATING OF GOVERNMENT RESOURCE UTILIZATION	.133
10.5	RATING OF HOUSEHOLD INVOLVEMENT IN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	.134
10.6	CORRUPTION IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR	.134
10.7	HOUSEHOLDS RETIRED MEMBERS/PENSIONERS	. 138
10.8	CONCLUSION	. 139
11	CHAPTER ELEVEN	140
OTH	IER SERVICE DELIVERY ISSUES	.140
11.1	INTRODUCTION	.140
11.2	PROJECTS CONSIDERED MOST IMPORTANT.	.140
11.3	PROJECTS IMPLEMENTED	.141
11.4	LEVEL OF BENEFITS ACCRUING FROM THE PROJECTS	.143
11.5	MAJOR IMPLEMENTER OF PROJECTS	.144
11.6	Conclusion	. 145
LIST C	DF REFERENCES	146
ANNE	x I	147
ANNE	X II	148

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 2.1: Estimated Household Population by Sex    7
Table 2.2: Estimated Household Population in 000' by Strata and Residence
Table 2.3: Distribution of Household Population by Age and Sex (%)
Table 2.4: Distribution of HH Population by age group and sex of House Hold Head
(%)10
Table 2.5: Percentage Distribution of Household Population Aged 10 Years and
Above by Marital Status and Sex
Table 2.6: Distribution of Household Population Aged 10Years and Above by Age and
Marital Status (%)11
Table 2.7: Distribution of Household Population Aged 14 Years and Above by Main
Activity Status and Residence (%)
Table 2.8: Distribution of Household Population Aged 14 Years and Above by Industry
and Residence (%)13
Table 2.9: Distribution of Household Population Aged 10 Years and Above by
Occupation and Residence (%)14
Table 2.10: Distribution of Children Aged Below 18 Years by Survival Status of
Parents by Sex, Age group and Region (%)15
Table 3.1: Distribution of Household Population Aged 6 - 12 Years by Schooling
Status and Residence (%)
Table 3.2: Education attainment by residence for person aged 6-24 years (%)19
Table 3.3: Distribution of Household Members Schooling By Class and Age (%) 19
Table 3.4: Distribution Of Household Members Aged 6-12 Years By Reason For Not
Attending School (%)
Table 3.5a: Distribution Of incidences of pupils leaving school by sub region and class
(%)21
Table 3.6b: Distribution Of incidences of students leaving school by class and Sub
region (%)
Table 3.7: Distribution Of how Primary schools are managed by sub region (%)24
Table 3.8: Distribution Of how secondary schools are managed by sub region (%)25
Table 3.9: Distribution Of Pupils attending day school By Distance to School,
residence and sub region (%)
Table 3.10: Distribution Of Service Providers By Reason For Children Leaving School
(6-17Years) by residence and Sex (%)27
Table 3.11: Distribution Of how Pupils get lunch By sub region (%)
Table 3.12: Distribution Of how students get lunch By sub region (%)
Table 3.13: Payments for services by parents/guardians and their frequencies at the
Primary school (%)
Table 3.14: Payments for services by parents/guardians and their frequencies at the
secondary school (%)

Table 3.15: Distribution of availability of toilet and first aid facilities at Primary school
premises (%)
Table 3.16: Distribution of availability of toilet and first aid facilities at Secondary
school premises (%)
Table 3.17: Distribution of rating quality of education in secondary schools (%)32
Table 3.18: Distribution of respondents by adequacy of facilities (%)
Table 3.19: Main source of drinking water at Primary schools by importance (%)33
Table 3.20: Main source of drinking water at secondary schools by importance (%).33
Table 4.1: Distribution of Household Members Who Fell Sick 30 Days Preceding the
Survey by stratum and age groups (%)
Table 4.2: Distribution of persons who fell sick by illnesses (%)
Table 4.3: Distribution of persons who fell sick by the first Source where Treatment
was sought (%)40
Table 4.4: Distribution of persons who fell sick by the first Source where Treatment
was sought and residence (%)
Table 4.5: Average Distance to Health facilities visited by residence (2008)42
Table 4.6: Distribution of persons by usage of health services and age (%)44
Table 4.7: Distribution of Children 12-23 months who received specific vaccines at
any time before the survey by source of information, Stratum and Residence $(\%)46$
Table 4.8: Distribution of Children who received specific vaccines at any time before
the survey by Age groups (%)46
Table 4.9: Distribution of children who have ever received Vitamin A by sex, stratum
and age of the children in months (%)47
Table 4.10: Distribution of respondents by payment for health service and ownership
of facility (%)
Table 4.11: Distribution of respondents by payment for health services in Government
Health facilities (%)49
Table 4.12: Distribution of Patients by Condition of Payment and Type of Service (%)
Table 4.13: Distribution of Patients Willing to pay when they actually paid for the
services (%)
Table 4.14: Distribution of HH by level of satisfaction with health Services (%)53
Table 5.1: Distribution of Households by Type of Water Source for Drinking during the
Dry Season (%)56
Table 5.2: Distribution of Households by Type of Water Source for Drinking During the
Wet Season (%)57
Table 5.3: Distribution of Households by Distance to Water Sources During the Wet
and Dry Season58
Table 5.4: Distribution of Households by Distance to Water Sources During the Dry
Table 5.4: Distribution of Households by Distance to Water Sources During the Dry         Season (%)

Table 5.6: Distribution of Households by Main Reason for Not Using Safe Water
Sources and Residence (%)61
Table 5.7: Sub-Regional Average Household Monthly Payments for Water by
Residence
Table 5.8: Distribution of Households by Household Member who Normally Collect
Water by Residence (%)63
Table 5.9: Distribution of Households by Drinking Water Storage Facility and
Residence (%)
Table 5.10: Distribution of Households by Residence and Constraints Faced in
Accessing Safe Water (%)
Table 5.11: Distribution of Households by Type of Sanitary Facility and Residence (%)
Table 5.12: Distribution of Households by Factors Limiting Construction of Toilet
Facilities (%)
Table 6.1: Distribution of Households by Type of Materials for the Dwelling Structure
and Residence
Table 6.2: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Cooking and Residence
(%)
Table 6.3: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Lighting by Residence
and Sub-region (%)
<b>o</b> ( )
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and Heating
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and Heating         Water by Residence (%)         77
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and HeatingWater by Residence (%)Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and HeatingWater by Residence (%)77Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)77Table 6.6: Distribution of Households by Source of Electricity and Residence (%)78
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and HeatingWater by Residence (%)Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)Table 6.6: Distribution of Households by Source of Electricity and Residence (%)Table 7.1: Distribution of agricultural households by Type and Source of inputs (%).84
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and HeatingWater by Residence (%)77Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)77Table 6.6: Distribution of Households by Source of Electricity and Residence (%)78Table 7.1: Distribution of agricultural households by Type and Source of inputs (%).8485
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and HeatingWater by Residence (%)77Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)77Table 6.6: Distribution of Households by Source of Electricity and Residence (%)78Table 7.1: Distribution of agricultural households by Type and Source of inputs (%).8485Table 7.2: Respondent perceptions of quality of major inputs85Table 7.3: Distribution of Households by rating for Change in Access to Inputs
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and HeatingWater by Residence (%)77Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)77Table 6.6: Distribution of Households by Source of Electricity and Residence (%)78Table 7.1: Distribution of agricultural households by Type and Source of inputs (%)84Table 7.2: Respondent perceptions of quality of major inputs85Table 7.3: Distribution of Households by rating for Change in Access to Inputs86
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and HeatingWater by Residence (%)77Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)77Table 6.6: Distribution of Households by Source of Electricity and Residence (%)78Table 7.1: Distribution of agricultural households by Type and Source of inputs (%).8485Table 7.2: Respondent perceptions of quality of major inputs85Table 7.3: Distribution of Households by rating for Change in Access to Inputs86Table 7.4: Percentage Household Demand for Agricultural Extension Services88
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and HeatingWater by Residence (%)77Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)77Table 6.6: Distribution of Households by Source of Electricity and Residence (%)78Table 7.1: Distribution of agricultural households by Type and Source of inputs (%).8484Table 7.2: Respondent perceptions of quality of major inputs85Table 7.3: Distribution of Households by rating for Change in Access to Inputs86Table 7.4: Percentage Household Demand for Agricultural Extension Services88Table 7.5: Households Visited by Agricultural Extension Workers by Activity (%)89
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and HeatingWater by Residence (%)77Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)77Table 6.6: Distribution of Households by Source of Electricity and Residence (%)78Table 7.1: Distribution of agricultural households by Type and Source of inputs (%).8485Table 7.2: Respondent perceptions of quality of major inputs85Table 7.3: Distribution of Households by rating for Change in Access to Inputs86Table 7.4: Percentage Household Demand for Agricultural Extension Services88Table 7.5: Households Visited by Agricultural Extension Workers by Activity (%)89Table 7.6: Distribution of Households by Activity and Source of Extension Service (%)
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and Heating         Water by Residence (%)       77         Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)       77         Table 6.6: Distribution of Households by Source of Electricity and Residence (%)       78         Table 7.1: Distribution of agricultural households by Type and Source of inputs (%)       84         Table 7.2: Respondent perceptions of quality of major inputs       85         Table 7.3: Distribution of Households by rating for Change in Access to Inputs       86         Table 7.4: Percentage Household Demand for Agricultural Extension Services       88         Table 7.5: Households Visited by Agricultural Extension Workers by Activity (%)       89         Table 7.6: Distribution of Households by Activity and Source of Extension Service (%)       89
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and HeatingWater by Residence (%)
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and Heating         Water by Residence (%)       77         Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)       77         Table 6.6: Distribution of Households by Source of Electricity and Residence (%)       78         Table 7.1: Distribution of agricultural households by Type and Source of inputs (%)       84         Table 7.2: Respondent perceptions of quality of major inputs       85         Table 7.3: Distribution of Households by rating for Change in Access to Inputs       86         Table 7.4: Percentage Household Demand for Agricultural Extension Services       88         Table 7.5: Households Visited by Agricultural Extension Workers by Activity (%)       89         Table 7.6: Distribution of Households by Satisfaction with Extension Services by Source and Region (%)       91
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and HeatingWater by Residence (%)77Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)77Table 6.6: Distribution of Households by Source of Electricity and Residence (%)78Table 7.1: Distribution of agricultural households by Type and Source of inputs (%)84Table 7.2: Respondent perceptions of quality of major inputs85Table 7.3: Distribution of Households by rating for Change in Access to Inputs86Table 7.4: Percentage Household Demand for Agricultural Extension Services88Table 7.5: Households Visited by Agricultural Extension Workers by Activity (%)89Table 7.6: Distribution of Households by Satisfaction with Extension Services by89Table 7.7: Distribution of Households by Satisfaction with Extension Services by89Table 7.8: Distribution of Households by Satisfaction with Extension Services by81Table 7.7: Distribution of Households by Satisfaction with Extension Services by81Source and Region (%)91Table 7.8: Distribution of Households by Change in the Quality of Government
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and Heating         Water by Residence (%)       77         Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)       77         Table 6.6: Distribution of Households by Source of Electricity and Residence (%)       78         Table 7.1: Distribution of agricultural households by Type and Source of inputs (%)       84         Table 7.2: Respondent perceptions of quality of major inputs       85         Table 7.3: Distribution of Households by rating for Change in Access to Inputs       86         Table 7.4: Percentage Household Demand for Agricultural Extension Services       88         Table 7.5: Households Visited by Agricultural Extension Workers by Activity (%)       89         Table 7.6: Distribution of Households by Satisfaction with Extension Services by Source and Region (%)       91         Table 7.8: Distribution of Households by Change in the Quality of Government Extension Services (%)       91
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and Heating         Water by Residence (%)       77         Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)       77         Table 6.6: Distribution of Households by Source of Electricity and Residence (%)       78         Table 7.1: Distribution of agricultural households by Type and Source of inputs (%)       84         Table 7.2: Respondent perceptions of quality of major inputs       85         Table 7.3: Distribution of Households by rating for Change in Access to Inputs       86         Table 7.4: Percentage Household Demand for Agricultural Extension Services       88         Table 7.5: Households Visited by Agricultural Extension Workers by Activity (%)       89         Table 7.6: Distribution of Households by Satisfaction with Extension Services by Source and Region (%)       91         Table 7.8: Distribution of Households by Change in the Quality of Government Extension Services (%)       92         Table 7.9: Constraints faced by the Extension workers have changed in the last 2       92
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and Heating         Water by Residence (%)       77         Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)       77         Table 6.6: Distribution of Households by Source of Electricity and Residence (%)       78         Table 7.1: Distribution of agricultural households by Type and Source of inputs (%)       84         Table 7.2: Respondent perceptions of quality of major inputs       85         Table 7.3: Distribution of Households by rating for Change in Access to Inputs       86         Table 7.4: Percentage Household Demand for Agricultural Extension Services       88         Table 7.5: Households Visited by Agricultural Extension Workers by Activity (%)       89         Table 7.6: Distribution of Households by Satisfaction with Extension Services by Source and Region (%)       91         Table 7.8: Distribution of Households by Change in the Quality of Government Extension Services (%)       92         Table 7.9: Constraints faced by the Extension workers have changed in the last 2 years       93
Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and Heating         Water by Residence (%)       77         Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)       77         Table 6.6: Distribution of Households by Source of Electricity and Residence (%)       78         Table 7.1: Distribution of agricultural households by Type and Source of inputs (%)       84         Table 7.2: Respondent perceptions of quality of major inputs       85         Table 7.3: Distribution of Households by rating for Change in Access to Inputs       86         Table 7.4: Percentage Household Demand for Agricultural Extension Services       88         Table 7.5: Households Visited by Agricultural Extension Workers by Activity (%)       89         Table 7.6: Distribution of Households by Satisfaction with Extension Services by       89         Table 7.7: Distribution of Households by Change in the Quality of Government       92         Table 7.8: Distribution of Households by Change in the Quality of Government       92         Table 7.9: Constraints faced by the Extension workers have changed in the last 2       93         Table 8.1: Distribution of HH By Type of The Nearest Road By Residence (%)       97

Nearest Road (%)
Table 8.4a: Distribution Of Households By Major Constraints Met When Using Roads
(%)-2008
Table 8.5b: Percentage Distribution Of Households By Major Constraints Met When
Using Roads (%)-2004
Table 8.6: Distribution Of Respondents By Current State of Road/Bridge/Culvert
Crossing and Type (%)
Table 8.7a: Distribution of respondents by Main Reason For Poor State of Roads (%)-
2008
Table 8.8b: Distribution of respondents by Main Reason For Poor State of Roads (%)-
2004
Table 8.9: Distribution Of Respondents By Quality of Maintenance and Type of
Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossing (%)104
Table 8.10: Distribution of Respondents by District Possession of Minimum Road
Maintenance Equipment (%)-2008104
Table 8.11a: Distribution Of Respondents By Frequency of Repair by Type of
Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossing (%)-2008106
Table 8.12b: Distribution Of Respondents By Frequency of Repair by Type of
Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossing (%)-2004106
Table 8.13: Distribution of Respondents by Constraints to Maintenance and Repair of
Roads by Degree of Seriousness (%)107
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert         Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings         (%)
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert         Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings         108
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert         Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert         Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings         108         Table 8.15a: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-2008
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert         Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings         108         Table 8.15a: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-2008         109         Table 8.16b: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert         Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings         108         Table 8.15a: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-2008         109         Table 8.16b: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-(2004)         109
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert         Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings         108         Table 8.15a: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-2008         109         Table 8.16b: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-(2004)         109         Table 8.17a: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert         Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings       (%)         108         Table 8.15a: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-2008       109         Table 8.16b: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-(2004)       109         Table 8.17a: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by         Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings (%)-2008
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert         Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings       (%)         108         Table 8.15a: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-2008       109         Table 8.16b: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-(2004)       109         Table 8.17a: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by         Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings (%)-2008       110         Table 8.18b: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert         Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings       (%)         108         Table 8.15a: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-2008       109         Table 8.16b: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-(2004)       109         Table 8.17a: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by         Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings (%)-2008       110         Table 8.18b: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by       110         Table 8.18b: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by       110         Table 8.18b: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by       110
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/CulvertCrossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings(%)108Table 8.15a: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type ofRoad (%)-2008109Table 8.16b: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type ofRoad (%)-(2004)109Table 8.17a: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings byType of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings (%)-2008110Table 8.18b: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings byType of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings (%)-2004110Table 8.18b: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings byType of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings (%)-2004110Table 8.18b: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings byType of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings (%)-2004110Table 8.19: Distribution of Households by Location of Water Transport (%)111
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert         Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings         108         Table 8.15a: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-2008         109         Table 8.16b: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-(2004)         109         Table 8.17a: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by         Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings (%)-2008         110         Table 8.18b: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by         Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings (%)-2004         110         Table 8.18b: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by         Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings (%)-2004         110         Table 8.19: Distribution of Households by Location of Water Transport (%)         111         Table 8.20: Type of Water Transport by Major Provider
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/CulvertCrossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings(%)
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert         Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings       (%)
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert         Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings       (%)
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert         Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings       (%)         108         Table 8.15a: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-2008       109         Table 8.16b: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-(2004)       109         Table 8.17a: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by         Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings (%)-2008       110         Table 8.18b: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by       110         Table 8.18b: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by       111         Table 8.18b: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by       110         Table 8.18b: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by       111         Table 8.19: Distribution of Households by Location of Water Transport (%)       111         Table 8.20: Type of Water Transport by Major Provider       112         Table 8.21: Type of Water Transport by payment for the Water Transport Service.113       114         Table 8.22a: Distribution of Households by Type of Water transport and Constraints       114         Table 8.23b: Distribution of Households by Type of Water transport and Constraints
Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert         Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings       (%)         108         Table 8.15a: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-2008       109         Table 8.16b: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of         Road (%)-(2004)       109         Table 8.17a: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by         Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings (%)-2008       110         Table 8.18b: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by       110         Table 8.18b: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by       110         Table 8.19: Distribution of Households by Location of Water Transport (%)       111         Table 8.20: Type of Water Transport by Major Provider       112         Table 8.21: Type of Water Transport by Payment for the Water Transport Service. 113       113         Table 8.22a: Distribution of Households by Type of Water transport and Constraints       114         Table 8.23b: Distribution of Households by Type of Water transport and Constraints       114         Table 8.23b: Distribution of Households by Type of Water transport and Constraints       114

Table 9.1: Distribution of Households which knew Institutions for Arbitration and
Conflict Resolution
Table 9.2: Distribution of Households which had an Issue/Case that required
Institutions/courts intervention in the last 4 years119
Table 9.3: Distribution of Households which actually used the Institutions/courts $\dots$ 121
Table 9.4: Distribution of Households by the Time it Took to Resolve the Issue/Case
by Institution (2004)121
Table 9.5: Distribution of Households by the Time it Took to Resolve the Issue/Case
by Institution (2008)122
Table 9.6: Distribution of Households Satisfied with Services of Institutions/Courts 122
Table 9.7: Distribution of Households that made payments
Table 9.8: Percentage Distribution of Households by Purpose of Payment for 124
Table 9.9: Percentage Distribution of Households by Purpose of Payment for 124
Table 9.10: Involvement/participation of Household members in LC 1 activities (%)125
Table 9.11: Involvement in decision making processes on issues concerning the
village (%)
Table 10.1: Rating of Government Employees (%)
Table 10.2: Rating of Government Resource Utilization    134
Table 10.3: Awareness about Government's effort to fight corruption (%)
Table 10.4: Rating of Pensioners (%)    138
Table 11.1: Distribution of households by the projects considered most important (%)
Table 11.2: Distribution of households by projects implemented (%)142
Table 11.3: Distribution of households by level of benefits from implemented projects
by project type (%)
Table 11.4: Major Project Implementers

## **LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 2.1: Estimated Household Population by Residence9
Figure 4.1: Distribution of Household members who fell sick 30 days prior to the
survey (%)
Figure 4.2: Rating of the frequency of diseases at health facilities in the last twelve months (%)
Figure 4.3: Distribution of patients by means of transport used to access source of treatment (%)
Figure 4.4: Distribution of persons who sought treatment by payment for Services (%)
Figure 4.5: Clients' Rating of the change in the quality of Health Services provided with reference to 2004 (%)
Figure 4.6: Distribution of Households by rating of the change in the quality of services provided since 2004 (%)
Figure 5.1: Distribution of Households by Change in the Availability of Safe Water (%)
Figure 5.2: Distribution of Households Reporting Paying for Water by Purpose of Payment (%)
Figure 5.3: Distribution of Households by Method of Preparing Drinking Water by
Residence (%)
Figure 6.1: Distribution of Households by Occupancy Tenure (%)70
Figure 6.2: Distribution of Households Engaged in Mining79
Figure 7.1: Distribution of Household Involvement in Agricultural Activities in 2008 (%)
Figure 7.2: Distribution of Households by Involvement in Agricultural Activities at the Time of the Survey (%)
Figure 7.3: Major crops grown in the communities
Figure 7.4: Distribution of households by reason for non-use of agricultural inputs (%)
Figure 7.5: Proportion of households by type of Agricultural Inputs (%)
Figure 7.6: Distribution of Households by Type of Inputs by Source of Market Information (%)
Figure 7.7: Distribution of Households Visited by Agricultural Extension Worker by Region (%)
Figure 7.8: Distribution of Households by Most Common and Preferred Forms of
Accessing Agricultural Extension Services (%)
Figure 7.9: Challenges faced by extension workers
Figure 7.10: Source of Information
Figure 7.11: Sources of credit for agricultural services
Figure 8.1a: Change in Road Maintenance in Last 2 Years (2008)

Figure 8.2b: Change in Road Maintenance in Last 2 Years (2004) 103
Figure 8.3: Distribution of Respondents by Reason why Sub-County could not access
Road Equipment from District (%)105
Figure 8.4: Distribution Of Respondents By Change in Maintenance Repair of Roads
(%)107
Figure 8.5: Distribution of Households by Frequency of Using Water Transport (%)111
Figure 8.6: Distribution of Households by Purpose of Payment for Ferry Transport $(\%)$
Figure 8.7: Distribution of Households Satisfied By Water Transport Services
Provided by Government (%)114
Figure 9.1: Nature of issue or Case Requiring Arbitration
Figure 9.2: Opinion about Frequency of LC meetings (%)126
Figure 9.3: Frequency of attending LC meetings by Household Members (%) 127
Figure 9.4: Opinion about LC Committees representing Household interests (%) $\ldots$ 127
Figure 9.5: Forms of Obtaining Passports (%)129
Figure 9.6: Ease of access to obtaining Passport (%-National)129
Figure 10.1: Performance of Civil Servants
Figure 10.2: Household members' involvement in Resource Management (%) 134
Figure 10.3: Rating of Corruption in the Public Sector (%)
Figure 10.4: Experience with corruption tendencies
Figure 10.5: Use of Pension

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Government has the obligation to provide services to its citizens and to steer economic growth and development through the provision of public services. The public service is the main implementing machinery for national development programmes and specifically, the delivery of public services. It is therefore very important for the public service to monitor and evaluate the delivery of public services and to obtain feedback from service recipients, regarding their efficiency and effectiveness. The National Service Delivery Survey has been institutionalised by Government as a key instrument to that effect.

The overall objective of this survey was to provide a comprehensive assessment of the trends in service delivery in the areas of Health, Education, Justice, Law and Order, Agricultural services, Transport services (Road Infrastructure and Water transport), Energy use, Water and Sanitation, Public Sector Management and Accontability. A summary of some of the findings are highlighted in this section.

The national household population was estimated at 30.1 million with Near East (Kamuli, Kaliro, Namutumba, Iganga, Bugiri, Mayuge and Jinja) registering the highest population among the seventeen Sub-regions. The survey findings indicated that the economically active population aged 15-64 years was less than half the estimated household population. Two thirds of household population aged 10 years and above were employed in the agriculture sector.

Eighty three percent of persons 6-12 years were attending school at the time of the survey while 65 percent of persons 6-24 years had attained primary education. Three in every ten persons aged 12 did not attend school because of the need to work. In addition, 30 percent of the pupils left school in Primary five while 31 percent of those in secondary left in S.3. Nine in every ten primary schools is managed by Government. Regarding access to day primary schools, close to 8 in every ten day pupils travelled 3 km or less to school. The high cost of education stands out as the main reason for leaving primary school. Only three in every ten households indicated that primary schools provided lunch for their pupils.

The burden of disease in Uganda is still high considering that 36 percent of household members reported that they fell sick or sustained an injury 30 days prior to the survey with majority (54%) being those 45 years and above. Malaria/fever remains the most common illness with 45 percent of the population suffering from it. Close to four in every ten persons that fell sick sought treatment from a Government health facility which are generally 6 km from the households. Seven in every ten children 12-23 months were fully immunised at the time of the survey while six in every ten children

under five years had received a Vitamin A capsule. Overall, 57 percent of the respondents indicated that the health services had improved compared to 2004.

About seven in every ten households had access to safe water with the average distance to a water source at less than one kilometre for both the dry and wet seasons. More than one in three of rural households (35%) did not have a bathroom and overall 12 percent of the households did not have a toilet facility. Water and sanitation being vital components of sustainable development and alleviation of poverty, strategies should be put in place to ensure better access to safe water in all sub-regions of the country.

Eight in ten households lived in owned dwelling units, a proportion higher than was reported in the 2004 NSDS. Almost two thirds of dwellings (63%) had iron sheets as roofing material, over one half were constructed with brick walls (some bricks were un-burnt though) and over seventy percent had earth floors.

Most of the households depended on firewood and charcoal for cooking and ironing. Most worryingly, the biggest proportion depended on traditional inefficient and 'wasteful' technologies that put the environment at risk. Moreover, electricity usage for both lighting and cooking is still very low (10% for lighting and less than one percent for cooking).

About 75 percent of households were involved in agricultural activities in 2008 compared to 64 percent in 2004.

Close to 14 percent of households reported use of at least one type of input while the other 86 percent did not use any input. More than half of the households attributed non usage to lack of knowledge while sixteen percent indicated high cost of acquiring the inputs.

Most households indicated that access to inputs improved between 2004 and 2008. Access to hybrid seeds and fungicides was reported to have improved by over 70 percent of the households. However, access to herbicides and animal feeds was reported to have worsened by about six percent of the households.

About 30 percent of the households did not require extension services, for crops while 57 percent never required services for animal husbandry. It is not surprising that about 95 percent of the households did not require extension services for fish farming since very few households are engaged in fish farming. Lack of transport equipment (41%) and inadequate funding (23%) were reported as the most serious constraints facing extension workers

SACCOs were the main source of agricultural credit with 45 percent of the household reporting so while only 24 percent got credit from Microfinance Institutions.

Community roads are the nearest type of road to the majority of households as reported by 64 percent of respondents. Poor maintenance was cited as the major reason for the poor state of roads/bridges/culvert crossings for all types of roads/bridges/culverts. Inadequate funding was the most serious constraint reported (66%). It was also the most serious constraint that hindered maintenance and repair of roads. Only 11 percent of households reported their household members having used water transport in the last 2 years. 93 percent of boat services are provided by private individuals while government only provides 7 percent. Only 38 percent of respondents reported that they were satisfied with government provided water transport services.

The Local Council 1 was appreciated as the most relevant in terms of local responsibility and lowest levels of corruption. This is in spite of the fact that less than 10 percent of household members were members of an LC 1 Committee.

Close to three out of four Households that used the various institutions/courts for arbitration or conflict resolution or redress in case of a problem were satisfied with the services received. About 77 percent of the cases that were reported to institutions/courts for arbitration took less than one month which is an improvement from 66 percent reported in the NSDS 2004.

Generally, the performance of civil servants was rated highly with only 14 percent reporting that it was poor. Likewise, the attitude of the civil servants towards their clients was highly rated.

A very low proportion of households reported having a member who was employed in Government service and of the few who had members in Government; slightly more than a half reported that their salaries were paid in time. About 40 percent of the households were of the view that the salary paid by Government was adequate.

Almost 90 percent of the households were of the view that Government buildings were properly utilized while only about one fifth of the households opined that Government vehicles were not appropriately used.

From the qualitative survey, the IG was most appreciated for taking a hard stand on corruption at national level, where 'big' people are concerned. However, it was also noted that IG faces challenges arising from political interferences, corruption amongst some of its staff, and having limited power over legal and policy frameworks.

The projects considered most important were water provision, electrification, new roads/bridges, roads rehabilitation and new markets. Agricultural-related projects continued to be rated as least important. These include Livestock improvement/restocking, Poultry/birds and Fish. Project implementation at community level was minimal as the majority of the respondents indicated no project was implemented in the 3 years preceding the survey. The only projects where one-half of respondents reported implementation were classroom construction, Roads/Bridges rehabilitation and demonstration garden.

## 1 CHAPTER ONE

#### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Background

Government has the obligation to provide services to its citizens and to steer economic growth and development through the provision of public services. The public service is the main implementing machinery for national development programmes and specifically, the delivery of public services. It is therefore very important for the public service to monitor and evaluate the delivery of public services and to obtain feedback from service recipients, regarding their efficiency and effectiveness. The National Service Delivery Survey has been institutionalised by Government as a key instrument to that effect.

Under the Public Service Reform Programme, two National Service Delivery Surveys were conducted in 2000 and 2004, in the sectors of education, health, road infrastructure, water and sanitation, agriculture and governance. The purpose of the surveys was to obtain information on the availability, accessibility, utilisation and satisfaction of the service receipients with regard to services that were being provided in those sectors. The National Service Delivery Survey 2008 provides an opportunity to examine the trends in service delivery. The additional sectors covered in the survey include energy, accountability and public sector management.

Government of Uganda has put in place provisions to ensure the realization of her long term objective of improving the quality of life of its citizens. Substantial resources have been committed towards improving service delivery in areas such as infrastructure development and maintenance, rural development, human development and governance, among others. In particular, it is noted that households do not only need income but also require adequate community infrastructure such as schools, health facilities, clean water, roads, energy, security, law and order etc. The implementation of these interventions would be incomplete without proper monitoring of inputs, outputs and outcomes.

The establishment of standards for service delivery and the monitoring of public services at central and local government level is a responsibility of many stakeholders. The different sectors require up to date data and statistical information

for monitoring the performance of the service delivery mechanism, an aspect that is critical for informing and guiding decision making in the decentralized setup.

The decentralization policy introduced in Uganda devolved service delivery function to Local Governments. The Districts and Sub counties became centres of focus in the implementation and administration of programmes within their area of jurisdiction. Decentralisation is intended to empower the communities and people within the communities to be capable of implementing and monitoring development programmes. It is one of the vehicles through which the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) was implemented and will continue being crucial in the implementation of the National Development Plan (NDP).

This is a Report of the National Service Delivery Survey (NSDS) 2008. The Survey was implemented by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) on behalf of the Ministry of Public Service (MoPS). The Report provides feedback obtained from service recipients on the public services provided by Government with regard to availability, accessibility, utilization and satisfaction of services.

#### 1.2 Objectives of the National Service Delivery Survey

The overall objective of this survey was to provide a comprehensive assessment of the trends in service delivery in the areas of Health, Education, Justice, Law and Order, Agricultural services, Transport services (Road Infrastructure and Water transport ), Energy use, Water and Sanitation, Public Sector Managemene and Accountability.

The specific objectives were to:

- Provide up to date information about the performance and impact of selected public services at national and local governments levels;
- (ii) Measure changes in service delivery in selected sectors;
- (iii) Identify constraints and gaps in the provision of selected public services by sectors;
- (iv) Provide recommendations for improvement in service delivery;
- Generate and disseminate information about the services offered by selected government sectors.

#### 1.3 Sampling Design

The sampling design used for collecting primary data was a multi-stage cluster sample. The first stage consisted of the selection of Enumeration Areas (EAs)<sup>1</sup> while at the second stage, households were selected from a list of all households in the sampled EA. The 2002 Population and Housing Census list of EAs was used as the Sampling Frame for the survey. Unlike in the 2004 NSDS, it was not be possible to get district estimates. However, a group of districts (17 district groupings – sub-regions) with almost the same socio-economic characteristics were formed in order to provide estimates at that level. The list of the groupings is as follows:

1. North East - Kaabong, Kotido, Moroto, Abim, Nakapiripirit

2. Upper East - Amuria, Katakwi, Kumi, Kaberamaido, Bukedea, Soroti

- 3. Far East Bukwo, Kapchorwa, Sironko, Bududa, Mbale, Manafwa
- 4. Mid East Pallisa, Budaka, Butaleja, Tororo, Busia
- 5. Near East Kamuli, Kaliro, Namutumba, Iganga, Bugiri, Mayuge, Jinja
- 6. Near Central Kayunga, Mukono
- 7. Capital Kampala
- 8. Mid Central Wakiso

9. Upper Central - Luwero, Nakaseke, Nakasongola, Kiboga, Mubende, Mityana, Mpigi

- 10. Lower Central Masaka, Kalangala, Sembabule, Rakai, Lyantonde
- 11. Lower West Isingiro, Kiruhura, Ibanda, Mbarara, Ntungamo, Bushenyi
- 12. Far West Kabale, Kisoro, Kanungu, Rukungiri
- 13. Mid West Kasese, Bundibugyo, Kabarole, Kamwenge, Kyenjojo
- 14. Upper West Kibaale, Hoima, Buliisa, Masindi
- 15. North West Nebbi, Arua, Koboko, Nyadri, Yumbe, Moyo and Adjumani
- 16. Upper North Amuru, Gulu, Kitgum, Pader
- 17. Lower North Oyam, Apac, Lira, Amolatar, Dokolo

A total of 1020 enumeration areas were sampled yielding a sample of 10,200 households.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> An enumeration area is an area that can be covered by one enumerator at the time of a Census, in most cases this area is equivalent to a village/ cell, while in other cases it is part of the village or many villages. The EA's were demarcated in preparation for the 2002 Population and Housing Census.



#### 1.4 Survey Instruments

The Survey used two types of questionnaires namely; the Household and the Service Provider questionnaires. The content of the questionnaires were based on the recommendations from the different sectors covered during the design phase of the study. Respondents were asked questions in the following areas:

- (1) Household characteristics (such as Activity status, Age, etc)
- (2) Education characteristics of household members( quality and access)
- (3) Health status (quality, quantity and access)
- (4) Access to and use of water

- (5) Housing and sanitation
- (6) Energy use at household level
- (7) Agricultural services (extension, marketing and other agricultural issues)
- (8) Road infrastructure and water transport services
- (9) Involvement and participation in LC activities, governance and management of public services

#### 1.5 Recruitment and training of Fieldworkers

UBOS recruited and trained appropriate field staff to serve as field interviewers and supervisors. Candidates were centrally recruited on the basis of maturity, friendliness, language skills, education level, and willingness to work away from home. All field staff were trained for a period of 12 days with two days of field practice. Training involved both classroom and practical demonstrations. The trainees were trained on the roles of fieldworkers, household sampling, how to fill the questionnaires, field supervision and handling of field returns.

#### 1.6 Composition of field teams

A total of 16 teams were formed to conduct the survey. Prior to field interviews, a listing exercise was undertaken in all the sampled EAs. Each listing team comprised of 3-4 persons. For the main survey, each team comprised of a team supervisor (Team Leader), 4 interviewers and a driver. The supervisor was responsible for the entire team, contacting local officials, selecting households to be interviewed and ensuring high quality of the work in the team.

#### 1.7 Data Processing

Data entry operators were recruited and trained to handle field returns and capture the data. Two office editors were recruited to support the data entry team with editing. The Directorate of Information Technology (DIT) at UBOS provided the programs for entering, editing and tabulating the survey data, as well as in training data processing staff. Data processing began one month after the commencement of fieldwork.

#### 1.8 Response Rate

The overall response rate was 96 percent. Table 1.1 summarises the distribution of the sample across the sub-regions. The rural response rate was higher (96%) than the urban (92%) and the Near East sub-region had the highest response rate of close to 100 percent as compared to the Capital with the lowest of 89 percent.

	Completed	Partially completed	Not done	Total	Response rate
		_			
Rural	8,217	5	325	8,547	96.2
Urban	1,470	6	128	1,604	92.0
Capital	521	4	65	590	89.0
Mid central	458	0	52	510	89.8
Upper Central	686	1	33	720	95.4
Lower Central	605	0	30	635	95.3
Near Central	542	0	8	550	98.5
Near East	785	1	4	790	99.5
Far East	539	1	30	570	94.7
Mid East	525	0	35	560	93.8
Upper East	515	0	15	530	97.2
Lower North	568	1	31	600	94.8
Upper North	444	0	74	518	85.7
North East	405	0	14	419	96.7
North West	649	0	11	660	98.3
Lower West	732	1	7	740	99.1
Far West	543	0	7	550	98.7
Mid West	641	1	18	660	97.3
Upper West	529	1	19	549	96.5
Total	9,687	11	453	10,151	95.5

#### Table 1.1: Response rates by subregion

This report comprises of other ten chapters. These include the Demographic Characteristics, Education, Health, Water and Sanitation, Housing Characteristics and Energy Use, Agriculture, Justice, Law and Order, Public Sector Management and Accountability and concludes with a chapter on Other Service Delivery Issues.

## 2 CHAPTER TWO

#### **DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS**

#### 2.1 Introduction

Population studies have proved that quite a number of services required in society are specific to certain socio-economic characteristics. Therefore, the 2008 National Service Delivery Survey (NSDS), collected information on personal socio-economic characteristics of all household members. The characteristics on which information was collected included sex, age, relationship to the household head, marital status, activity and occupation status, and orphan hood. This chapter presents the main findings about the demographic characteristics of households and household members.

#### 2.2 Household Population

The household population was estimated at 30.1 million The household population has been estimated by sex and residence. A household is defined as a group of people who normally eat and live together. Table 2.1 presents the estimated household population by sex in the two surveys. The estimated household population increased from 26.3 million in the 2004 NSDS to 30.1 million in the 2008 NSDS. This estimate is close to 29.6 million for the mid-year projected population of 2008. As it was in the 2004 survey, females (15.3 million) were slightly more than males (14.8 million). This translates into a sex ratio of 96.7 males per 100 females.

Table 2.1: Estimated Household Po	pulation by	Sex
-----------------------------------	-------------	-----

	2004		2008		
Sex	Pop. (million)	Percent	Pop. (million)	Percentage (%)	
Male	13.0	49.4	14.8	49.3	
Female	13.3	50.6	15.3	50.7	
Total	26.3	100	30.1	100.0	

Table 2.2 is a presentation of the estimated household population in 000' by strata and residence. The strata were formed by grouping districts with the same socioeconomic characteristics. Kampala (Central) and Wakiso (Mid Central) each was taken as a stratum on its own because of their unique socio-economic characteristics compared to other districts.

# Near East had the highest estimated household population of 3,318,000

The findings in Table 2.2 indicate that the seven districts of Kamuli, Kaliro, Namutumba, Iganga, Bugiri, Mayuge and Jinja constituting Near East had the highest estimated household population of 3,318,000. This was followed by Upper Central (Luwero, Nakaseke, Nakasongola, Kiboga, Mubende, Mityana and Mpigi) with an estimated household population of 2,504,000. On the other hand North East (Kaabong, Kotido, Moroto, Abim and Nakapiripirit) had the lowest estimated household population of 882,000.

In all the strata the urban estimated household population was very minimal as compared to the rural population. Far West (Kabale, Kisoro, Kanungu and Rukungiri) had the lowest urban population of 65,000 followed by Upper West (Kibaale, Hoima, Buliisa and Masindi) with 76,000.

Stratum		nesidence	
	Urban	Rural	Total
Capital	1,835	-	1,834
Mid Central	318	1,084	1,402
Upper Central	195	2,309	2,504
Lower Central	176	1,604	1,780
Near Central	239	1,101	1,341
Near East	163	3,155	3,318
Far East	146	1,243	1,389
Mid East	142	1,460	1,602
Upper East	85	1,469	1,553
Lower North	106	1,640	1,746
Upper North	262	938	1,200
North East	100	782	882
North West	262	1,760	2,023
Lower West	188	2,304	2,492
Far West	65	1,253	1,319
Mid West	160	2,049	2,209
Upper West	76	1,469	1,545
Total	4,519	25,620	30,139

#### Table 2.2: Estimated Household Population in 000' by Strata and Residence

Figure 2.1 is a summary of household population by residence. The household population by residence is population categorized as urban and rural. The rural population constitutes a bigger percentage of the population with 85 percent compared to its counterpart, urban, with only 15 percent. This type of population setting is characteristic of developing economies whose demand for basic services is paramount.





The economically active population aged 15-64 years was less than half the estimated household population Bearing in mind that some services are age and sex specific, an estimated population based on age-group and sex is presented in Table 2.3. The economically active population aged 15-64 years was less than half the estimated household population in both surveys; and reduced from 49 percent in 2004 to 47 percent in 2008. Half of the population was aged 0-14 (includes the infants, the under five and the official school going age). This is the population to be targeted if development is to be realized and sustained in future.

		2004			2008	
ae aroup			Total			Total
ngo group	Male	Female		Male	Female	
0-14	49.3	47.5	48.4	50.2	48.8	49.5
15-64	47.9	50.1	49.0	46.8	48.0	47.4
65+	2.7	2.4	2.6	3.0	3.2	3.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

 Table 2.3: Distribution of Household Population by Age and Sex (%)

#### 2.3 Household Composition

Table 2.4 presents the percentage distribution of household population by age group and sex of household head. For the age groups 0-17 and 18-24, there is no significant variation in percentage shares of the population due to the sex of the household head. However, more than half of the population for both household headed by male and female belong to age group 0-17. For the age groups 25-34 and 35-44, the male headed households registered higher percentage share in population with 13.4 and 8.9 percent respectively. Their counterpart female headed households have only 9.2 and 6.5 percent for respective age groups. It is worth noting that the households with members aged 45+ are mainly headed by females with a share of 14 percent compared to less than 10 percent that are headed by males in that group.

Age Group	Male Headed	Female Headed	Both
0-17	56.1	58.0	56.6
18-24	12.0	12.3	12.1
25-34	13.4	9.2	12.4
35-44	8.9	6.5	8.3
45+	9.6	14.0	10.6
Total	100	100	100

Table 2.4: Distribution of HH Population by age group and sex of House Hold Head (%)

#### 2.4 Marital Status

The information on marital status for all household members aged 10 years and above was solicited. A question was asked to all household members aged 10 years and above whether one was married, single, divorced/separated or widowed. The findings are presented in Table 2.5.

The majority of the household population aged 10 years and above were married (44.8%). These are closely followed by those who were single (44.1%). The singles were more pronounced among females at nearly 50 percent compared to the males who are around 39 percent. The findings also indicate that there were some significant variations in household population distribution for the divorced/separated and widowed in terms of sex. In both categories, the males registered higher percentages of 6.2 and 9.2 percent compared to the females with only 2.6 and 1.2 percent respectively.

Marital Status	Male	Female	Both
Married	44.5	45.1	44.8
Single	38.7	49.7	44.1
Divorced/separated	6.2	2.6	4.4
Widowed	9.2	1.2	5.3
Not stated	1.4	1.4	1.4
Total	100	100	100

Table 2.5: Percentage Distribution of Household Population Aged 10 Years and Above by Marital Status and Sex.

In addition, an analysis on household population aged 10 years and above was made by age group and marital status. The information is summarized in Table 2.6. The findings indicated that two percent of the children aged 10-17 were married. This conflicts with the constitution of Uganda. The adult age is stipulated as 18 years when marriage can occur. The age group 35-44 registered the highest percentage of married people (82%) as compared to other age groups. The findings in Table 2.6 also indicated that the divorced and widowed increase with age.

Age Group	Married	Single	Divorced	Widowed	Notstated	Total
10-17	2.0	95.9	0.3	0.0	2.8	100
18-24	38.6	57.1	3.1	0.2	1.0	100
25-34	76.9	14.5	6.2	1.9	0.5	100
35-44	82.4	3.3	7.9	5.7	0.7	100
45+	64.7	2.3	8.6	23.7	0.7	100
Total	44.8	44.1	4.4	5.3	1.4	100

Table 2.6: Distribution of Household Population Aged 10Years and Above by Age and Marital Status (%)

#### 2.5 Main Activity and Occupation Status

The findings indicated that 2% of the children

(10-17) were married

Information was collected on main activity status and occupation during the last seven days. Activity status was defined in relation to the person's position at their place of work and mode of remuneration. The occupation referred to the actual type of work that is carried out by the person.

Majority of people aged 10 years and above had their main activity as own account worker with 39%. The main activity status of all household members aged 14 years and above during the seven days that preceded the survey was investigated and the findings are presented in Table 2.7. The findings indicated that the main activity for the majority of people aged 10 years and above during seven days prior to the date of investigation was own account worker (39%). This was more pronounced in the rural areas where 41.5 percent were own account workers compared to urban areas with only 27.5 percent. The unpaid family workers registered a substantial percentage of 16.3 percent and again this was more a rural phenomenon with 19.0 percent compared to only 3.8 percent in urban areas.

Table 2.7: Distribution of Household Population Aged 14 Years a	and Above by
Main Activity Status and Residence (%)	-

Activity Status	Urban	Rural	Total
Employer	0.1	0.4	0.4
Own Account Worker	27.5	41.5	39.0
Government Employee	4.6	1.7	2.2
Private Employee	20.8	6.5	9.0
Unpaid Family Worker	3.8	19.0	16.3
Has job/enterprise (did not work)	0.8	0.6	0.6
Not worked for at least one hr. but looked for work	2.1	0.4	0.7
Not working & not looking for work	2.8	2.2	2.3
Domestic Worker	11.1	5.7	6.6
Full time student	24.7	19.7	20.6
Too young/too old	1.1	1.8	1.7
Others	0.6	0.6	0.6
Total	100	100	100

Table 2.8 presents the percentage distribution of household population aged 14 years and above by industry and residence. Industry (employment sector) refers to the type of economic activity carried out by the enterprise where a person is working.

Two thirds of household population aged 14 years and above were employed in the agriculture sector. The findings indicated that the majority of household population aged 14 years and above were employed in agriculture sector with 69.3 percent share. This is generally typical of less developed countries. The agriculture sector was followed by sales and services, which registered 13.5 percent. It is important to note that the sales and services industry was more relevant for the urban with 40.8 percent compared to only 8.7 percent for rural areas.

Industry	Urban	Rural	Total
Agriculture, Forestry	13.6	79.1	69.3
Fisheries	0.4	1.6	1.5
Mining & Quarrying	0.7	0.3	0.4
Manufacturing	7.2	2.1	2.9
Electricity, gas & water	1.3	0.1	0.3
Construction	5.5	1.2	1.9
Sales & Services	40.8	8.7	13.5
Hotels & Restaurants	4.7	0.7	1.3
Transport & Comm.	9.5	1.6	2.8
Public Administration	2.8	0.6	0.9
Education	6.0	2.6	3.1
Health & Social Work	3.3	0.9	1.2
Financial Intermediation	1.6	0.1	0.3
Others	2.7	0.5	0.8
Total	100	100	100

 Table 2.8: Distribution of Household Population Aged 14 Years and Above by

 Industry and Residence (%)

Table 2.9 reports a summary of percentage distribution of household population aged 14 years and above by occupation and residence. The occupation refers to the actual type of work carried out by the person.

The findings showed that the majority of household population were involved in agriculture and fisheries as their occupation registering 68.6 percent. Service and sales accounted for 14.6 percent. The percentages registered were the highest compared to other occupation as it was the case with industry (see Table 2.8 for employment sector).

Occupation	, Urb	an Rura	Total
Legislators & Managers	0.	1 0.3	0.3
Professionals	5.4	4 0.9	1.6
Tech. & Associate Prof.	8.	9 2.6	3.5
Clerks	1.3	8 0.2	0.4
Service & Sales Workers	43	.5 9.5	14.6
Agriculture & Fisheries	12	.6 78.4	68.6
Crafts & Related Workers	5.	6 2.0	2.5
Plant & Machinery Operators assemblers	& 4.	7 0.7	1.3
Elementary Occupation	16	.4 5.4	7.0
Others	0.9	9 0.2	0.3

## Table 2.9: Distribution of Household Population Aged 10 Years and Above by Occupation and Residence (%)

#### 2.6 Survival Status of Parents

Orphanhood directly increases with age of the children

An orphan is a child below the age of 18 who has lost one or both parents. The survey asked a question to establish whether the biological parents of each household member aged below 18 years were still alive. The findings are presented in Table 2.10 by sex, age group and stratum. The findings indicated that over 85 percent of the children were not orphaned and there was no significant sex differential. However, the table shows that orphanhood increases directly with age of the child.

Sex/Age group/Stratum	Not Orphan	Single Orphan	Orphan	Total
Sex				
Male	86.4	10.8	2.8	100
Female	86.7	10.6	2.7	100
Age Group				
0-4	96.1	3.4	0.5	100
5-9	88.4	9.6	2.0	100
10-14	80.4	15.4	4.2	100
15-17	73.2	20.4	6.4	100
Stratum				
Kampala	83.8	11.8	4.4	100
Mid Central	83.7	11.0	5.3	100
Upper Central	86.3	11.2	2.5	100
Lower Central	81.4	13.8	4.8	100
Near Central	87.0	9.9	3.1	100
Near East	90.0	8.7	1.3	100
Far East	933	5.6	1.1	100
Mid East	89.3	9.5	1.2	100
Upper East	85.9	12.5	1.6	100
Lower North	83.6	12.8	3.6	100
Upper North	76.6	15.8	7.6	100
North East	89.0	8.8	2.2	100
North West	86.5	11.5	2.0	100
Lower West	86.2	11.3	2.5	100
Far West	88.6	9.8	1.6	100
Mid West	88.3	9.6	2.1	100
Upper West	88.8	9.0	2.2	100

Table 2.10: Distribution of Children Aged Below 18 Years by Survival Status of Parents by Sex, Age group and Region (%)

#### 2.7 Conclusion

The national household population was estimated at 30.1 million with Near East (Kamuli, Kaliro, Namuntumba, Iganga, Bugiri, Mayuge and Jinja) registering the highest population among the seventeen strata.

The survey findings indicated that the economically active population aged 15-64 years was less than half the estimated household population.

Two thirds of household population aged 10 years and above are employed in the agriculture sector.

## **3 CHAPTER THREE**

#### **EDUCATION**

#### 3.1 Introduction

Over the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) period, the education sector continued to attract substantial resources to improve human capital base. The commencement of the Universal Primary Education (UPE) in 1997 resulted in a drastic increase in primary school enrolment. Subsequently, beginning with the financial year 2007/08, the government introduced Universal Secondary education (USE). This meant that more financial resources were put in the education sector. Approximately Uganda shillings 59 billion were allocated to support the USE implementation and also for supporting Business, Technical and Vocational Education and Training (BTVET). In fact, in 2007/08 the education sector accounted for the largest share of the national budget estimated at 18 percent.

This chapter profiles the schooling status of the household population, highest education attainment level, currently attending for those who are currently schooling, reason for not attending, and reasons for leaving school. Information was also collected about the school management as well as distance travelled from the household to the school. For those currently attending government primary schools, information was collected on whether or not lunch was being provided at school. Information on the amount paid for educational services in the school in the last 12 months was sought. In addition, information was collected on the quality and factors limiting use and provision of the services.

#### 3.2 Schooling Status

83 percent of persons 6-12 years were attending school The respondents were asked to give information about the schooling status of all household members aged between 6 and 12 years. Table 3.1 shows that 83 percent of the household population aged 6 - 12 years were attending school at the time of the survey. Slightly more children were attending school in urban (85%) compared to 82 percent in rural areas. The prevalence of non attendance appears to be almost the same for both males and females, but it seems to be higher in rural areas compared to urban areas.

	Urban			Rural			Uganda		
Schooling									
Status	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Never attended	10.8	14.1	12.4	16.5	16.1	16.3	15.8	15.9	15.9
SCHOOL									
left school	0.9	1.3	1.1	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.0
Currently schooling	86.2	84.1	85.2	81.9	82.7	82.3	82.4	82.9	82.6
Not stated	2.1	0.6	1.3	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.7	0.3	0.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

## Table 3.1: Distribution of Household Population Aged 6 – 12 Years by Schooling Status and Residence (%)

#### 3.3 Education Attainment

65 percent of persons 6-24 had attained primary education Table 3.2 shows education attainment of all those persons aged 6 to 24 years. The majority had primary schooling (65%) followed by those who had no schooling (20%). There is no significant difference between rural and urban population as far as upper primary education is concerned but at lower primary education, there are more pupils in rural areas as compared to urban areas. At higher levels, higher percentage in urban areas attained secondary education, 30 percent compared to 11 percent in rural areas. Overall, 20 percent had no formal education.

Class	Urban	Rural	Total
No schooling	12.1	21.7	20.2
Lower Primary	22.3	33.8	32.1
Upper Primary	32.0	32.5	32.4
Secondary Education	29.7	11.2	14.0
Post Primary Certificate	0.6	0.3	0.4
Post Sec, Certificate	1.8	0.3	0.5
Degree and above	1.3	0.1	0.3
Dont Know	0.3	0.1	0.1
Total	100	100	100

Table 3.2: Education attainment by residence for person aged 6-24 years (%)

#### 3.4 Current schooling status by class and age

52 percent of persons aged 13-24 were attending upper primary Table 3.3 shows the distribution of all household members that were schooling and were aged 6 to 24 years. Around 87 percent of persons aged 6 years had no formal education and the percentage goes on decreasing as the years increase. Persons aged 10 years constitute the highest percentage among the persons in the lower primary which is 74 percent. The Table shows that 52 percent of the persons aged 13 to 24 were in upper primary, while nearly 27 percent of the persons aged 13 to 24 years were in secondary education.

	Age							
Class	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13 – 24
No schooling	86.7	66.4	45.8	26.3	14.6	7.1	5.9	4.4
Lower Primary	13.3	33.2	52.9	69.2	74.0	68.1	55.4	14.5
Upper Primary	0.0	0.0	1.3	4.4	11.3	24.7	38.4	52.0
Secondary Education	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	26.6
Certificate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Post Sec, Certificate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Degree and above	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Dk	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.2
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

 Table 3.3: Distribution of Household Members Schooling By Class and Age (%)
# 3.5 Reasons for not Attending School for persons aged 6 to 12 years

Table 3.4 shows distribution of all household members aged 6 to 12 years by reason for not attending (never attended) school. Approximately 64 percent of persons aged 6 years reported the reason as being too young. Nearly 33 percent of persons aged 12 years reported need to work as their reason for not attending school. The corresponding figure from the NSDS 2004 findings was 22 percent implying that there are now more 12 year olds that that need to work instead of attending school.

Table 3.4: Distribution Of Household Members Aged 6-12 Years By Reason For Not Attending School (%)

	Age								
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
too young	63.7	19.7	11.3	2.5	1.5	0.3	0.4	100	
long distance	47.4	22.4	15.1	7.4	3.6	0	4.2	100	
high cost	26.7	26.9	17.7	11.8	12.0	1.9	3.0	100	
Lack of interest by parent	28.5	17.5	21.6	9.8	9.2	5.6	7.7	100	
Lack of interest by child	12.0	29.7	24.5	13.8	7.5	5.0	7.6	100	
Disability	15.9	30.6	14.8	4.7	12.8	11.7	9.5	100	
Need to work	7.2	8.0	20.1	3.5	20.1	8.2	32.9	100	
Other	54.6	23.8	11.2	5.8	2.4	0.3	2.0	100	
Total	53.5	21.1	13.6	4.6	3.5	1.3	2.4	100	

# 3.6 Incidences of pupils/students leaving school by class and sub region

30 percent of pupils left school in P.6 while 31% of those in secondary left in S.3 Table 3.5a shows the distribution of incidences of pupils leaving school by class. Pupils mostly leave school after primary six accounting for 30 percent. This is consistent with the findings from NSDS 2004 where most children were also leaving primary school after primary six accounting for 35 percent. In the Mid East slightly over 59 percent of the pupils left school after primary five. As for the Far East, 54 percent of the pupils left school after primary six.

20

persons aged 12 do not attend school because of the need to work

percent

of

33

_	Class								
Sub region	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Total	
Capital	2.3	22.7	6.8	4.6	29.6	29.6	4.6	100.0	
Mid central	3.2	9.7	22.6	3.2	12.9	41.9	6.6	100.0	
Upper Central	11.1	5.6	7.4	11.1	22.2	37.0	5.7	100.0	
Lower Central	3.7	7.4	7.4	7.4	18.5	44.4	11.1	100.0	
Near Central	12.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	6.0	34.0	22.0	100.0	
Near East	27.7	2.1	12.8	6.4	19.2	31.9	0.0	100.0	
Far East	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	53.9	42.3	100.0	
Mid East	3.7	7.4	0.0	3.7	59.3	22.2	3.7	100.0	
Upper East	10.7	10.7	7.1	3.6	32.1	32.1	3.6	100.0	
Lower North	9.8	7.3	9.8	4.9	17.1	46.3	4.9	100.0	
Upper North	4.4	2.2	2.2	2.2	35.6	44.4	8.9	100.0	
North East	43.8	25.0	15.6	12.5	3.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	
North West	25.8	4.6	3.0	7.6	53.0	6.1	0.0	100.0	
Lower West	29.2	4.2	6.3	10.4	12.5	29.2	8.3	100.0	
Far West	11.8	0.0	5.9	14.7	35.3	26.5	5.9	100.0	
Mid West	8.0	6.0	16.0	18.0	20.0	20.0	12.0	100.0	
Upper West	4.2	0.0	8.3	16.7	33.3	33.3	4.2	100.0	
Total	13.7	7.3	8.4	8.0	24.6	30.1	7.9	100.0	

Table 3.5a: Distribution Of incidences of pupils leaving school by sub region and class (%)

Table 3.5b shows the distribution of incidences of students leaving secondary school by class. Overall students mostly drop out after senior two, indicated by about 42 percent. The senior two drop out incidence is highest in the Lower North as indicated by almost 83 percent.

Sub region	S1	S 2	S3	S 4	Total
Capital	7.0	62.8	30.2	0.0	100.0
Mid control	21.4	17.9	60.7	0.0	100.0
	23.4	48.9	25.5	2.1	100.0
Opper Central	4.6	4.6	50.0	40.9	100.0
Lower Central	14.9	44.7	25.5	14.9	100.0
Near Central	34.1	18.2	36.4	11.4	100.0
Near East	4.6	63.6	27.3	4.6	100.0
Far East	17.7	47.1	35.3	0.0	100.0
Mid East	32.0	52.0	16.0	0.0	100.0
Upper East	2.0	92.0	0.0	4.0	100.0
Lower North	2.4	02.9	9.0	4.9	100.0
Upper North	20.6	47.1	32.4	0.0	100.0
North East	52.0	24.0	0.0	24.0	100.0
North West	17.7	41.9	27.4	12.9	100.0
Lower West	41.5	28.3	22.6	7.6	100.0
Far West	2.9	48.6	48.6	0.0	100.0
Mid West	21.4	42.9	35.7	0.0	100.0
	0.0	28.6	66.7	4.8	100.0
Total	19.6	42.4	30.8	7.2	100.0

 Table 3.6b: Distribution Of incidences of students leaving school by class and

 Sub region (%)

In the qualitative module, the survey explored the reasons for not attending and dropping out of school as perceived by the community members and other key stakeholders in the education service provision. Focus Group Discussions (FGD) and key informant data from rural and urban sites concurred on these factors.

#### 3.6.1 Physical Causes for Missing School

Physical causes included long distance to school and terrain which deter school boys and girls. This was mentioned in 9 out of 24 sites which were fairly distributed by region. However it was cited in Nakasongola where the nearest government primary school was 2km from the study site.

#### 3.6.2 Economic Causes for Missing School

Economic causes were mentioned in 14 out of 24 sites as causes for children missing school. Lack of money to meet school requirements due to household poverty was a more outstanding factor in 4 out of the 6 sites in northern Uganda. Parents' failure to

raise money for meeting school requirements such as exercise books, lunch, examination fees, was also reported in Soroti, Manafwa, Kasese, Mbarara and Mukono. In Mayuge it was reported that some parents exchange maize for school requirements so children miss school whenever the harvest is poor. In communities near landing sites, boy children do not see the immediate value of schooling and they opt to join fishing to get quick income. This was reported in Nakasogola and Kamuli near Lake Kyoga and Wakiso site near Lake Victoria.

#### 3.6.3 Education System Causes

Education System causes like lack of UPE schools, coupled with high cost of education in private schools, inadequate school buildings and insufficient number of teachers, insufficient basic services such as water and separate toilets for boys and girls were reported to be contributory factors for not attending school. In Kampala district, FGD participants at Muzaana Zone reported lack of a UPE school while the private schools in the area were perceived to be expensive and unaffordable with their endless list of requirements. In Nakasongola, Kamuli, Abim and Mukono it was reported that lack of adequate school buildings, limited teaching staff coupled with absenteeism were making children spend a full day without being taught and therefore discouraging them from going to school.

#### 3.6.4 Social and Cultural Causes

Social and cultural causes included parents' decisions about who among the household children goes to school, not valuing education, spending most of their time and resources in alcohol consumption and other non-productive things as well as ignoring preparation of meals for the children; as well as refusal by children due to apathy, early pregnancies and marriages.

Parents who attach less value to education were neither sending their children nor interact with teachers to follow up their progress at school. FGD data in Nakasongola, Mayuge, Nebbi and Kibaale revealed that some parents had neglected their responsibilities and children were left to make their own decisions. Reports from Kasese, Mayuge and Mbarara revealed that negative attitude towards education featured significantly among illiterate parents. One elderly woman remarked, "I have never attended school but am alive and surviving." (FGD, Nkokonjeru, Mbarara).

#### 3.6.5 Political and Security Causes

Insecurity especially in the sites from northern Uganda was reported to have been responsible for many children dropping out of school. One female FGD participant, in

Abim, said, "In 2006 many soldiers were deployed and some girls got married to them and thus dropped out of school."

#### 3.6.6 Disability and Illness

Disability and illness of the affected children were also reported to affect school attendance. The type, nature and extent of disability were reported to determine the affected child's ability to walk long distance to school as well as defy stigma. This was reported in 5 study sites of Manafwa, Busia, Soroti, Abim and Nebbi districts. In Abim district it was reported that Children with Disabilities (CWDs) end up not attending school for fear of being laughed at while in Kibaale, parents were reported to deny CWDs education claiming that they cannot achieve anything in life. Children suffering from common ailments such as malaria and typhoid were reported not to attendance in Masaka and Mayuge.

#### 3.7 School Management

in every

primary schools is

9

managed

Government

ten

by

Table 3.7 shows the distribution of how Primary schools are managed. Nearly 92 percent of the primary schools are managed by government. The table further shows that government is still playing a significant role in providing primary education facilities in all the sub regions.

Sub-region	Government	Private	NGO/Religious organization	Other	Total
Capital	65.5	32.8	1.7	0.0	100.0
Mid central	75.0	21.9	3.1	0.0	100.0
Upper Central	85.3	13.1	1.6	0.0	100.0
Lower Central	81.5	14.8	3.7	0.0	100.0
Near Central	81.5	11.1	7.4	1.7	100.0
Near East	91.4	6.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Far East	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Mid East	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Upper East	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Lower North	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Upper North	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
North East	97.3	0.0	0.0	2.7	100.0
North West	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Lower West	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Far West	97.7	2.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Mid West	95.9	0.0	2.0	2.0	100.0
Upper West	96.4	3.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Total	91.8	6.6	1.2	0.4	100.0

Table 3.7: Distribution Of how Primary schools are managed by sub region (%)

24

Table 3.8 shows the distribution of how secondary schools are managed. Approximately 65 percent of the secondary schools are managed by Government. The private sector takes around 27 percent. The private sector provides secondary education in nearly all sub regions. On the other hand private primary schools do not provide services in nine out of 17 sub regions.

Sub-region	Government	Private	NGO/Religiou s organization	Other	Total
Capital	51.0	41.2	7.8	0.0	100.0
Mid central	15.6	81.3	3.1	0.0	100.0
Upper Central	52.8	37.7	9.4	0.0	100.0
Lower Central	52	48.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Near Central	47.2	47.2	3.8	1.9	100.0
Near East	55.2	31.0	5.2	8.6	100.0
Far East	80.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	100.0
Mid East	79.0	15.8	0.0	5.3	100.0
Upper East	62.2	5.4	5.4	27.0	100.0
Lower North	93.0	2.3	2.3	2.3	100.0
Upper North	75.7	13.5	0.0	10.8	100.0
North East	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
North West	69.8	22.2	0.0	7.9	100.0
Lower West	60.7	35.7	3.6	0.0	100.0
Far West	71.8	12.8	15.4	0.0	100.0
Mid West	80.0	17.8	2.2	2.0	100.0
Upper West	79.3	13.8	0.0	6.9	100.0
Total	64.7	26.6	3.9	4.9	100.0

Table 3.8: Distribution Of how secondary schools are managed by sub region (%)

### 3.8 Distance by residence and sub region of Pupils attending Day School

Table 3.9 shows the distances travelled by day pupils from households to their respective schools. The findings revealed that at the national level about 79 percent of the pupils travelled a distance of less than 3 km to their respective schools and only one percent travelled a distance of more than 10 kilometres. The corresponding figure for less than 3 km to primary school from the NSDS 2004 findings was 84 percent implying a slight reduction. The slight reduction is explained by the rural areas. The percentage for urban areas remained the same between the two survey periods. On

Close to 8 in every ten day pupils travelled 3km or less to school the other hand, the percentage for those that covered more than 10 km remained almost constant at one percent.

	0 – 3km	>3km – 5km	>5km – 10k	>10km	Total
Residence					
Urban	90.2	7.1	2.0	0.6	100
rural	77.3	18.4	3.3	1.1	100
Sub-region					
Capital	88.0	9.4	2.6	0.0	100
Mid central	73.4	18.4	4.4	3.8	100
Upper Central	71.5	23.9	3.3	1.3	100
Lower Central	67.3	26.9	5.3	0.5	100
Near Central	74.8	19.0	5.3	0.9	100
Near East	86.0	12.3	1.4	0.3	100
Far East	78.7	17.5	2.3	1.5	100
Mid East	83.9	14.0	2.1	0.1	100
Upper East	80.7	18.9	0.3	0.1	100
Lower North	69.7	24.0	4.0	2.3	100
Upper North	80.2	8.5	6.8	4.5	100
North East	89.8	8.6	1.6	0.0	100
North West	86.0	11.8	1.8	0.4	100
Lower West	79.3	15.9	4.0	0.8	100
Far West	78.0	18.3	3.5	0.1	100
Mid West	76.0	20.4	2.3	1.4	100
Upper West	75.4	18.8	4.9	0.9	100
Total	78.6	17.2	3.1	1.1	100

Table 3.9: Distribution Of Pupils attending day school By Distance to School, residence and sub region (%)

### 3.9 Reason for pupils Leaving School (6-17Years) by residence

Table 3.10 shows the reasons for Primary pupils leaving school as given by service providers. The findings revealed that there was no significant difference between the reasons that led the pupils to leave schools in urban and rural areas. The most common reason was high cost contributing nearly 43 percent in urban areas and 31 percent in rural areas. This was followed by lack of interest which was about 26 percent in rural areas and about 15 percent in urban areas with almost 25 percent overall.

High cost of education stands out as the main reason for leaving primary school

	Residence			Sex			
	Urban	Rural	Total	Male	Female	Total	
Completed desired level	2.6	1.2	1.3	1.0	1.7	1.3	
Need to work	6.0	3.9	4.2	4.8	3.4	4.2	
High cost	42.6	30.7	32.2	35.4	29.0	32.2	
Long Distance	0.0	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Poor quality of school	0.0	2.2	1.9	2.2	1.6	1.9	
Orphaned	7.7	6.0	6.2	5.0	7.5	6.2	
Sickness/ calamity in	12.4	12.5	12.5	12.2	12.3	12.3	
Pregnancy	5.8	3.2	3.5	0.0	7.0	3.5	
Marriage	1.2	2.8	2.6	0.6	4.5	2.6	
War/insecurity	0.7	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.4	1.2	
Parent decision	1.6	6.1	5.5	4.4	6.7	5.6	
Lack of interest	16.6	25.8	24.6	29.2	20.4	24.7	
Other	3.0	3.2	3.2	0.3	0.0	0.1	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

Table 3.10: Distribution Of Service Providers By Reason For Children Leaving School (6-17Years) by residence and Sex (%)

#### 3.10 Provision of lunch at school

Table 3.11 shows how pupils get lunch while attending primary school. The Table shows that about 33 percent of the children overall are provided with lunch at school whereas 28 percent go without lunch. It is also shown that in the region of North East all pupils (100%) have lunch provided at school, whereas there is no school that provide lunch in the Far West. The Table reveals that in the Far West, 56 percent of the pupils go back home for lunch while 39 percent pack their lunch from home.

Only three in every ten households indicated that primary school provide lunch for their pupils

Sub-region	Lunch at school	Packed from home	Go back home	No lunch	Total
Capital	81.0	12.1	3.4	3.5	100
Mid central	78.8	12.1	3.0	6.1	100
Upper Central	50.9	17.5	3.5	28.1	100
Lower Central	30.7	50.0	7.7	11.5	100
Near Central	67.9	3.8	3.8	24.5	100
Near East	30.5	0.0	10.1	59.3	100
Far East	12.9	0.0	3.2	83.9	100
Mid East	18.5	7.4	14.8	59.3	100
Upper East	25.0	0.0	12.5	62.5	100
Lower North	19.1	0.0	31.0	50.0	100
Upper North	28.6	0.0	38.1	33.3	100
North East	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
North West	1.5	0.0	78.8	19.7	100
Lower West	5.5	72.7	21.8	0.0	100
Far West	0.0	39.0	56.1	4.9	100
Mid West	6.5	45.7	13.0	34.8	100
Upper West	4.4	78.2	8.7	8.7	100
Total	33.4	18.1	20.3	28.1	100

Table 3.11: Distribution Of how Pupils get lunch By sub region (%)

Table 3.12 shows how students get lunch while attending secondary school. It is shown from the table that about 73 percent overall are provided with lunch at school while about 15 percent go without lunch. It is also shown that again in the region of North East all students (100%) are provided with lunch at school, while in the Far East about 54 percent go without lunch.

In the qualitative module, it was found out that although, provision of lunch to school children under UPE is a function of parents, it was not standardized and therefore varied across regions and schools. The parents' responsibility to ensure that school children get lunch was either by making contributions to the school in cash and kind so that children get meals from schools, making children carry packed lunch or through encouraging them to come home for lunch. In sites such as in Busia and Nakasongola where lunch was reported to be provided at school, FGD and KII data revealed that parents contributed maize or maize flour and firewood as well as payments for milling the maize and the for the school cook. One key stakeholder in education reported that, "Parents contribute 2 tins of maize and Shs. 500 for milling maize and payment of the school cook while those with cash, contribute Shs. 3, 000 per pupil, per term" [KII, Busia].

Sub-region	Lunch at school	Packed from home	Go back home	No lunch	Total
Capital	68.0	18.0	4.0	10.0	100
Mid central	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	100
Upper Central	64.6	14.6	0.0	20.8	100
Lower Central	81.8	4.6	0.0	13.6	100
Near Central	66.0	0.0	0.0	34.0	100
Near East	69.1	0.0	7.3	23.6	100
Far East	45.8	0.0	0.0	54.2	100
Mid East	68.4	0.0	15.8	15.8	100
Upper East	27.8	0.0	22.2	50.0	100
Lower North	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
Upper North	64.3	0.0	25.0	10.7	100
North East	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
North West	85.5	0.0	12.9	1.6	100
Lower West	92.9	7.1	0.0	0.0	100
Far West	66.7	7.7	15.4	10.3	100
Mid West	80.0	7.5	0.0	12.5	100
Upper West	64.4	36.0	0.0	0.0	100
Total	73.0	6.4	5.9	14.7	100

Table 3.12: Distribution Of how students get lunch By sub region (%)

#### 3.11 Payments For Services by Parents/Guardians And Their Frequencies at School

Table 3.13 shows the percentage distribution of various charges made by parents/guardians for their children at school and when they make these payments. It is shown that overall about 12 percent of the schools charge at least for one of the items listed and it is shown that most of the schools charge Development /building fees indicated by about 37 percent while one in every three schools charged lunch fee. The corresponding figures from the NSDS 2004 for each of development/building fee and lunch fee was 32 percent. Whereas the percentage of schools that charged development/building fee increased between the survey periods, the percentage that charged lunch fee reduced slightly.

Considering the qualitative module, it was reported that with regard to payments or additional fees, different definitions emerged according to the purpose of the payment. Thus, for primary schools there were payments for improving infrastructure and other utilities, enhancement of school learning, pupils' welfare, academic performance, teachers' welfare, and institutional fees. Regarding improvement of infrastructure and other utilities, the payments included for security guards, development fees, construction, repair of school infrastructure, water structures such as repair of pipes, tank and boreholes, buying of brooms, toilet paper, and installation of solar power source as well as for security. Across 15 out of the 24 sites there was an emerging consensus about contribution in the name of development fees. FGD participants revealed that: "Development fees are used to repair desks and other facilities not

catered for by government. Besides parents pay for small school projects in form of repair and completion of classroom blocks and pit latrines" (KII Abim, District).

Item	Charge	Annual	Per term	Monthly	When required	other	Total
Development/building fees	37.4	18.0	76.9	0.0	3.7	1.5	100.0
Lunch Fee	30.8	2.7	96.0	0.9	0.5	0.0	100.0
School Uniform	10.4	29.6	4.2	0.0	66.2	0.0	100.0
Exercise Books	0.5	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Text books	0.6	20.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Pens and Pencils	0.4	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Geometry Sets	0.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Rulers	0.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Coaching Fees	2.3	11.8	52.9	17.7	11.8	5.9	100.0
Others	35.5	10.6	80.2	1.8	6.2	1.3	100.0
Total	11.5	12.8	76.1	1.1	9.0	1.0	100.0

Table 3.13: Payments for services by parents/guardians and their frequencies at the Primary school (%)

Table 3.14 shows the percentage distribution of various charges made by parents/guardians for their children at secondary schools and when they make these payments. Overall most payments are paid on term basis. From the Table, 77 percent pay their dues termly.

Item	Charge	Annual	Per term	Monthly	When required	other	Total
Development/building fees	47.1	10.9	83.6	0.0	1.6	4.0	100.0
Lunch Fee	71.1	2.0	97.3	0.0	0.2	0.5	100.0
School Uniform	35.0	16.3	7.0	0.5	67.9	8.4	100.0
Exercise Books	0.8	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Text books	5.6	17.1	71.4	0.0	2.9	8.6	100.0
Rulers	0.2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Coaching Fees	2.1	8.3	75.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	100.0
Others	57.1	7.3	90.2	0.0	1.5	0.9	100.0
Total	21.7	8.1	77.1	0.1	11.9	2.8	100.0

Table 3.14: Payments for services by parents/guardians and their frequencies at the secondary school (%)

The qualitative Survey revealed that payments in secondary school included school fees, payment for counter books for the children to use all the year round, school meals and solar project. Similar to primary schools, although the payments at secondary schools were perceived fair by parents in Pajobi, Nebbi district, many felt that they are not affordable because most parents are poor and this was reported to be responsible for high drop out rates as one parent pointed out: "Every term, children are sent home because of these payments and the parents struggle hard to find

money to send them back" (Parent Secondary School Child, Education FGD, Thilal Village, Nebbi).

#### 3.12 Availability of Separate Toilet and First Aid Facilities

Table 3.15 shows the availability of services for toilet and first aid facilities at the primary school premises. It is indicated that most schools (about 96%) have separate toilet facilities for boys and girls. On the other hand, there are few schools (34%) with first aid facilities at the school premises. It is also shown that few schools (37%) had toilet facilities to cater for the physically impaired.

Table 3.15: Distribution of availability of toilet and first aid facilities at Primary school premises (%)

Facility	Yes	No	Total
Separate toilet facilities for boys and girls	96.4	3.6	100.0
Separate toilet facilities for teachers	65.7	34.3	100.0
Toilet facilities to cater for physically impaired	36.7	63.3	100.0
First aid facilities at school premises	34.0	66.0	100.0

Table 3.16 shows the availability of services about toilet and first aid facilities at the Secondary school premises. It is indicated that most schools, about 99 percent have separate toilet facilities for boys and girls while there are a few schools, about 19 percent with toilet facilities catering for physically impaired at the school premises. Diverging from primary schools there are more schools with first aid facilities than in primary schools.

Table 3.16: Distribution of availability of toilet and first aid facilities at Secondary school premises (%)

Facility	Yes	No	Total
Separate toilet facilities for boys and girls	98.8	1.2	100.0
Separate toilet facilities for teachers	84.2	15.8	100.0
Toilet facilities to cater for physically impaired	18.5	81.5	100.0
First aid facilities at school premises	62.0	38.0	100.0

#### 3.13 **Quality of Education**

One in every three

secondary schools

were rated to be of

good quality

Table 3.17 shows the rating of quality of secondary education. It is observed that one in every three schools were rated as good in terms of quality of education. The biggest proportion of households (60%) reported the quality as average.

Sub-region	Good	Average	Poor	Total	
Capital	43.1	56.9	0.0	100.0	
Mid central	46.9	53.1	0.0	100.0	
Upper Central	28.0	68.0	4.0	100.0	
Lower Central	50.0	41.7	8.3	100.0	
Near Central	37.7	58.5	3.8	100.0	
Near East	39.7	58.6	1.7	100.0	
Far East	33.3	66.7	0.0	100.0	
Mid East	21.1	79.0	0.0	100.0	
Upper East	27.0	67.6	5.4	100.0	
Lower North	15.9	50.0	34.1	100.0	
Upper North	22.2	69.4	8.3	100.0	
North East	48.0	52.0	0.0	100.0	
North West	38.7	48.4	12.9	100.0	
Lower West	37.0	57.4	5.7	100.0	
Far West	13.5	81.1	5.4	100.0	
Mid West	34.9	53.5	11.6	100.0	
Upper West	12.5	87.5	0.0	100.0	
Total	33.0	60.3	6.7	100.0	

 Table 3.17: Distribution of rating quality of education in secondary schools (%)

#### 3.14 **Adequacy of Facilities**

Table 3.18 shows the percentage distribution of respondents by adequacy of facilities in primary schools. Overall the facilities were not adequate (about 63%).

Facility	Adequate	Not Adequate	Total
Classrooms	33.3	66.7	100.0
Teacher's houses	10.7	89.3	100.0
Library	32.5	67.5	100.0
laboratory	0.0	100.0	100.0
Workshop	53.3	46.7	100.0
Toilet/Latrine	34.5	65.5	100.0
Store	35.8	64.2	100.0
Staffroom	50.7	49.3	100.0
Head teachers' office	56.9	43.1	100.0
Total	37.3	62.7	100.0

..... - 10/1 ... .

#### Main Source For Drinking Water At School 3.15

From Table 3.19, most primary schools (about 42%) have the main source as borehole. Of these 25 percent of the boreholes were at school while 17 percent were outside the school. Only 17 percent had piped water at school

Source	Main	Alternative	2 <sup>nd</sup> Alternative
Piped water at school	17.4	2.6	0.8
Piped water outside school	2.1	2.5	1.7
Bore hole at school	25.3	3.9	1.7
Bore hole outside school	16.8	13.3	10.9
Rain water	12.3	32.3	31.1
Protected spring/well	13.1	20.0	15.9
Lake/river/stream/dam/pond	7.5	13.7	21.0
Other	5.4	8.6	16.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 3.19: Main source of drinking water at Primary schools by importance (%)

From Table 3.20, a slightly higher proportion of secondary schools (25 %) were using piped water for drinking as compared to oly 17 percent for primary. Boreholes are still the main source of water for drinking for seconadary school students.

Source	Main	Alternative	2 <sup>nd</sup> Alternative
Piped water at school	25.4	6.6	2.4
Piped water outside school	1.3	2.4	4.3
Bore hole at school	33.1	4.8	0.0
Bore hole outside school	16.0	22.2	6.1
Rain water	7.0	27.0	44.5
Protected spring/well	8.9	17.6	12.2
Lake/river/stream/dam/pond	1.7	9.6	17.1
Other	6.7	9.8	13.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 3.20: Main source of drinking water at secondary schools by importance (%)

### 3.16 Conclusion

Eighty three percent of persons 6-12 years were attending school at the time of the survey while 65 percent of persons 6-24 had attained primary education. Three in every ten persons aged 12 do not attend school because of the need to work. In addition, 30 percent of the pupils left school in Primary five while 31 percent of those in secondary left in S.3.

Nine in every ten primary schools were managed by Government. Regarding access to day primary schools, close to 8 in every ten day pupils travelled 3 km or less to school. The high cost of education stands out as the main reason for leaving primary school. Only three in every ten households indicated that primary school provided lunch for their pupils.

A key factor affecting the quality of education was highlighted as inadequate facilities. While enrolment numbers have grown significantly in primary education since 1997, completion rates have remained low. The need to monitor the quality of education being offered to children through inspection, minimization of resource wastage and leakage is central to the improvement of service delivery in this sector.

## **4 CHAPTER FOUR**

#### HEALTH

#### 4.1 Introduction

The Government of Uganda has developed several policies and programmes to help improve the health status and life of its people. The National Health Policy (MoH, 1999) states that; the mission of the health sector is "the attainment of a good standard of health by all people in Uganda." Good standard of health promotes a healthy and productive life.

The Government has come up with various sector strategic plans in order to meet national health targets. The National Health Sector Strategic Plan 2005/06-2009/10 (HSSP II) and its predecessor HSSP I were developed with the exclusive purpose of improving health service provision in the country. The HSSP II is a consolidation and extension of HSSP I. The Health Sector plan prioritizes the fulfilments of the health sector contribution to the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). The 2008 NSDS study sought to measure achievements made by the Government in meeting the sector targets as defined in various policies and programmes since 2004.

This chapter presents findings on the prevalence of ill health, household accessibility to and utilization of health services as well as their perception on the adequacy of health services. Information was also collected on the quality of services and reasons for the current health service access and utilization levels. An effort was made to monitor and evaluate the changes in the indicators since 2004.

#### 4.2 Household Health Status

36 percent of household members fell sick or sustained an injury

During the survey, data on the health status of all usual and regular household members in the 30 days preceding the survey was collected. The findings in Figure 4.1 show that overall, 36 percent of household members fell sick or sustained an injury. A comparison of this finding with the 2004 NSDS shows an increase in the incidence of sickness from 31 percent.





54 percent of the persons who reported sickness were 45 years and above Table 4.1 further shows the distribution of persons who fell sick 30 days prior to the survey by sub region and age groups. The table indicates that the population in the Upper North registered the highest proportion of household members that suffered from any sickness or injury (45%) followed by those in the Near Central region (44%). Variations by age group show that household members aged 45 and above were the most affected by sickness or injury (approximately 54%) compared to other age groups.

Stratum	Yes	Νο	Total
Capital	30.1	69.9	100.0
Mid central	41.1	58.9	100.0
Upper Central	41.5	58.6	100.0
Lower Central	34.5	65.5	100.0
Near Central	43.6	56.4	100.0
Near East	39.6	60.4	100.0
Far East	35.0	65.0	100.0
Mid East	33.0	67.0	100.0
Upper East	40.5	59.5	100.0
Lower North	43.3	56.7	100.0
Upper North	44.7	55.3	100.0
North East	35.1	64.9	100.0
North West	41.7	58.3	100.0
Lower West	32.8	67.2	100.0
Far West	20.8	79.2	100.0
Mid West	26.8	73.2	100.0
Upper West	26.3	73.7	100.0
Age Categories			
0-17	33.6	66.4	100
18-24	29.2	70.8	100
25-34	36.2	63.8	100
35-44	39.9	60.1	100
45+	53.5	46.5	100
Total	36.1	63.9	100.0

Table 4.1: Distribution of Household Members Who Fell Sick 30 Days Preceding the Survey by stratum and age groups (%)

#### 4.3 Major Causes of Morbidity

In Uganda today, malaria is still responsible for more illness and death than any other single disease. Malaria is more prevalent during the rainy season of March to June and August to November (Ministry of Health, 2005). The 2005/06 Uganda National Household Survey (UBOS 2006) revealed that half of the population that fell sick reported malaria/fever as their major cause of sickness in the 30 days preceding the survey. In addition, the Poverty Status Report (2003) still highlighted malaria as a major health problem experienced by most people in the country.

45 percent of the population that fell sick reported malaria/fever as the most common illness Respondents that reported falling sick in the 30 days prior to the survey were further asked to specify the type of sickness or injury they had suffered from. Table 4.2

shows that 45 percent of the population that fell sick reported malaria/fever as the main illness. However, this is a significant reduction of ten percentage points when compared with the findings of 2004. Flu/Cold remained the second common disease (17%) which reflects an increase from 11 percent in 2004.

Illness	2008	2004
Fever/malaria	44.7	55.2
Flu & Cold	17.0	10.6
Respiratory	6.4	4.5
Intestinal infections	4.4	4.1
Skin infections	3.3	2.6
Diarrhoea	3.2	4.4
Accident	1.7	1.3
Dental	1.4	1.3
Ulcers	1.3	1.3
Hypertension	1.4	1.8
Birth-related	1.0	1.2
Mental illness	0.7	1.5
Measles	0.8	2.1
STI/HIV/AIDS	0.9	0.7
Other	11.8	7.3
Total	100	100.0

Table 4.2: Distribution of persons who fell sick by illnesses (%)

Heads of health facilities were asked to rate the frequency of different diseases in their health facilities in the last 12 months. Figure 4.2 shows the distribution of diseases that were rated as high in the health facilities. The findings in the pie chart confirm that cases of Malaria/Fever (35%) was the most common at the different health facilities followed by Acute respiratory Infection (20%) and Diarrhoea (13%) irrespective of whether they were by OPD or admission.



Figure 4.2: Rating of the frequency of diseases at health facilities in the last twelve months (%)

#### 4.4 Medical Attention Sought

Consistent with the Health Sector Strategic Plan 2005/06-2009/10 (HSSPII), the Government of Uganda in collaboration with NGOs and the Private Sector are collectively undertaking efforts to increase and improve the delivery of health services through health centres II-IV. During the 2008 NSDS survey, information on the source of treatment sought for the sickness or injury suffered in the last 30 days before the survey was also collected.

The findings in Table 4.3 show the percentage distribution of persons that fell sick by where they sought treatment first. Overall, the majority of persons who fell sick reported that they sought treatment from a Government health facility (37%) followed by Private Health facilities (27%).

However, it is worth noting that there was an increase in the proportion of persons that did not seek treatment from four percent in 2004 to seven percent in 2008. In addition, there was a drop in the proportions of those that indicated using self/home medication from eleven to eight percent.

37 percent of the population that fell sick sought treatment from a Government health facility

Source of treatment	2008	2004
None	7.1	3.8
Government health facility	36.7	33.1
Private health facility	27.1	28.6
Pharmacy / drug shop	16.1	17.8
Home/self medication	8.0	10.6
Religious / Mission facility	2.9	2.7
Traditional healer	0.6	1.1
NGO health facility	0.8	1.0
Other	0.3	0.9
Community health worker	0.3	0.4
Total	100	100

Table 4.3: Distribution of persons who fell sick by the first Source where Treatment was sought (%)

Scrutiny of the differentials in the source where treatment was first sought by the residence of the respondents in Table 4.4 shows that more urban residents sought treatment from private health facilities (32%) compared to the rural counter parts (26%). It is noted that more rural residents (38%) sought treatment from Government health facilities compared to the urban residents (29%).

There are variations in the proportions of persons from where treatment was first sought when 2008 findings are compared with those of 2004. Table 4.4 further shows that the proportion of patients in urban areas that sought treatment from government health facilities in 2004 had dropped by six percentage points while that of their rural counter parts had increased by two percentage points. There was also an increase in the proportion of urban dwellers that sought treatment from private health facilities. The proportion increased to 32 percent in 2008 from 25 percent in 2004. It should also be noted that there were increases in the proportions of persons who did not seek any treatment in both urban and rural areas of two and four percentage points respectively.

	2008		2004	
First source of treatment	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
None	4.7	7.5	2.6	4.2
Home/self medication	9.9	7.7	10.6	10.2
traditional healer	0.6	0.7	0.8	1.1
Government health facility	28.6	38.1	34.8	35.8
Private health facility	32.2	26.2	24.5	27.7
Religious / mission facility	4.6	2.7	2.2	3.0
Pharmacy / drug shop	18.4	15.7	21.6	15.4
Community health work	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.5
NGO health facility	0.5	0.8	1.6	1.2
Other	0.7	0.3	0.8	0.8
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 4.4: Distribution of persons who fell sick by the first Source where Treatment was sought and residence (%)

#### 4.5 Distance to health Facilities

The Government of Uganda defines access to health facilities as 5 km radius to the communities. In a bid to monitor the trend of Government performance in regard to increasing access to health facilities, the NSDS 2008 collected information on the distance travelled to the health facilities.

TheaveragedistancetoaGovernmenthealthfacility is 6 km

Table 4.5 presents the distribution of the average distances travelled to Government and other health facilities by residence of the persons who reported that they had fallen sick 30 days to the survey. Overall, the average distance to a Government health facility was 6 km while that to any other health facilities is 5 km.

Rural-Urban differentials further show that overall, people in the rural areas travelled 6 km to access a Government health facility compared to those in the urban areas who travelled a distance of about 4 km. In addition, the distance travelled to access any other health facilities is 5 km in the rural areas compared to about 3 km in the urban areas.

	Goverr	Other	Health Faci	lity		
Stratum	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total
Capital	3.3		3.3	2.0		2.0
Mid central	3.5	8.2	6.9	2.4	5.2	4.4
Upper Central	5.3	7.2	7.0	2.5	5.2	4.9
Lower Central	2.6	5.6	5.4	1.3	4.6	4.3
Near Central	6.3	8.4	8.1	3.1	4.9	4.7
Near East	2.9	5.5	5.4	3.9	3.7	3.8
Far East	2.8	4.0	3.9	2.0	3.5	3.4
Mid East	1.5	4.4	4.1	1.1	3.5	3.3
Upper East	1.4	6.1	5.9	1.4	4.4	4.3
Lower North	1.3	9.2	8.9	1.0	6.3	6.1
Upper North	8.3	6.3	6.5	5.7	6.5	6.4
North East	2.6	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.5	4.5
North West	2.8	4.9	4.7	2.2	4.3	4.1
Lower West	1.7	7.1	6.9	2.4	6.2	6.0
Far West	1.9	4.2	4.2	2.2	5.5	5.3
Mid West	4.5	5.8	5.7	3.9	6.1	6.0
Upper West	2.1	6.8	6.6	1.1	5.5	5.4
Total	3.8	5.9	5.7	2.5	5.0	4.7

Table 4.5: Average Distance to Health facilities visited by residence (2008)

63 percent of the population that fell sick walked to the source of treatment Other than those who fell sick but did not seek medical attention at all and those who utilized home/self medication, information on the means of transport used to access the source of treatment by those who sought treatment was collected. Figure 4.3 presents the distribution of the persons who sought medical attention by the means of transport used. The results in Figure 4.3 reveal that the majority of persons who fell sick reported that they walked (63%) to the source of treatment followed by those who used a private bicycle (20%).

In contrast, information from the Key Informants indicates that the provision of ambulances to health centres like Maziba Health centre IV in Kabale district had improved delivery of referral services in the catchment areas.





#### 4.6 Utilisation of Health services

38 percent of the patients that accessed health services were women seeking antenatal and delivery care services Table 4.6 presents the percentage distribution of patients that accessed health services in the last 12 months prior to the survey by age group. Overall, 38 percent of the patients that accessed the health services were children aged 0 to 14 with the majority (97%) seeking immunization services. It should also be noted that 35 percent of the patients that accessed the health services were aged 25 to 54 with most of them seeking antenatal and delivery care services which clearly indicated that more women than men in this age group sought health services.

Health service	0-14	15-24	25-54	55+	Total
Consultation	37.7	13.9	35.5	12.9	100
Drugs	41.4	14.6	32.1	12.0	100
Immunisation	96.9	1.0	2.0	0.1	100
Antenatal	0.9	42.1	57.0	0.0	100
Delivery	0.7	42.0	57.4	0.0	100
Laboratory	22.6	21.5	47.9	8.0	100
X-ray	13.9	11.9	55.7	18.4	100
ENT	42.9	16.7	26.3	14.1	100
Eye care	32.2	13.1	37.1	17.6	100
Dental	22.7	19.9	46.8	10.6	100
Surgery	13.6	15.8	49.3	21.3	100
Other, specify	26.0	20.8	42.3	10.9	100
Total	38.3	17.4	35.3	9.1	100

Table 4.6: Distribution of persons by usage of health services and age (%)

#### 4.7 Under-Five Immunisation

According to the Uganda Demographic and Health Survey (UBOS, 2006), many of the diseases in early childhood can be prevented by immunizing children against preventable diseases and ensuring that children receive prompt and appropriate treatment when they become ill. Universal immunization of children against the eight vaccine-preventable diseases (namely; Tuberculosis, Diphtheria, Whooping Cough (*Pertussis*), Tetanus, Hepatitis B, Haemophilus influenzae, Polio and measles) is crucial for reducing infant and child mortality. Vaccination coverage information focuses on the age group 12 to 23 months.

The 2008 NSDS collected information on whether a child had been immunized against the six killer diseases excluding Hepatitis B and Haemophilus Influenzae; and where the antigen had been obtained from. This information is important for programme planning and targeting resources to areas that most need them. Table 4.7 shows the percentage of children 12-23 months who received the various vaccinations by source of information, i.e. from vaccination card or from mother, Stratum and Residence.

73 percent of children 12-23 months were fully immunised at the time of the survey The findings show that 73 percent of children aged 12-23 months were fully immunized at the time of the survey, 94 percent had received the BCG vaccination while 84 percent had been vaccinated against measles. Since DPT and polio are administered at the same time, they are usually expected to have the same vaccination coverage which is evident in Table 4.7.

Variations by stratum show that generally, over 80 percent of children 12-23 months in the Western region of Uganda had been fully immunized with 95 percent in the Far West being the highest. The central region registered the lowest proportions of children who had been fully immunized. There are no wide variations in the proportions of children who had been fully immunized by residence.

The qualitative findings revealed that the process of the massive immunization coverage was hampered. For instance, in Muzana zone Kampala district some community members suspected that vaccines used for immunization were bad and could cause death and in rare cases if a child was immunized, he/she developed slow learning behaviour. Furthermore, in Ssazi Lulongo, Wakiso district, some fathers were reported to have undermined the immunization exercise thinking that it was a means of reducing the numbers of their community members, therefore were not keen to have their children immunized. However, a good number of women would take their children to be immunized without their husbands' knowledge.

			DPT		POLIO					
	BCG	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	Measles	all basic vaccinations*
Source of information	of			-						
Card seen	55.7	55.2	53.0	47.5	45.5	54.3	52.2	49.0	49.7	43.6
Card not seen	37.8	36.7	35.5	31.2	33.7	36.5	35.5	33.5	33.7	29.2
Either Source	93.5	92.0	88.5	78.7	79.2	90.9	87.7	82.5	83.5	72.8
Stratum										
Capital	91.1	88.6	89.0	85.8	81.3	89.0	85.8	82.2	80.2	75.3
Mid central	97.0	97.0	95.4	93.0	92.9	93.3	91.9	91.5	90.7	87.5
Upper Central	87.8	52.5	87.8	83.7	76.4	86.4	82.3	76.3	73.9	63.2
Lower Central	88.2	52.5	88.2	76.7	69.8	88.2	77.0	68.3	77.1	63.7
Near Central	88.9	70.3	87.3	78.6	69.0	86.9	81.2	71.0	57.6	53.1
Near East	87.5	60.9	84.4	80.9	74.2	81.6	78.2	70.8	63.4	57.9
Far East	97.2	80.3	95.5	93.6	89.3	95.9	93.6	90.2	80.8	71.9
Mid East	94.0	88.2	91.9	89.0	82.3	89.8	89.0	82.3	74.8	69.3
Upper East	98.5	98.5	97.9	92.7	89.8	97.9	92.7	88.8	81.5	80.5
Lower North	94.2	67.9	92.2	82.7	77.1	88.7	83.8	75.8	71.2	59.1
Upper North	93.5	83.0	97.2	91.9	86.3	95.9	89.6	86.3	85.6	79.8
North East	93.1	93.1	90.7	90.7	83.4	88.9	88.9	81.5	83.1	78.5
North West	98.3	92.8	96.3	96.6	85.8	94.3	92.5	84.6	75.0	71.2
Lower West	97.9	78.0	93.9	93.7	91.1	93.9	93.9	92.4	89.8	88.6
Far West	95.9	94.6	98.6	98.6	98.6	98.6	98.6	97.3	98.6	94.6
Mid West	96.6	91.7	93.6	92.2	91.6	93.6	93.2	90.5	90.8	86.0
Upper West	96.6	96.6	96.6	98.0	98.0	96.8	91.9	91.9	90.7	86.9
Residence										
Urban	93.9	90.2	85.9	82.1	86.3	90.6	85.6	82.7	79.2	74.7
Rural	93.4	92.2	88.9	83.7	78.1	90.9	88.0	82.5	78.7	72.6

Table 4.7: Distribution of Children 12-23 months who received specific vaccines at any time before the survey by source of information, Stratum and Residence (%)

\* BCG, measles and three doses each of DPT and polio vaccine (excluding Polio 0 given at birth)

Table 4.8 shows the vaccination coverage among children 12-59 months by age group of the child. The analysis of the results shows that the proportion of children fully immunized increased with an increase in the age of the child.

Table 4.8: Distri	bution of Child	lren who	received	specific	vaccines	s at any	time			
before the survey by Age groups (%)										

			DPT		POLIO					
	BCG	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	Measles	all basic vaccinations*
Age group (months)										
12-23	93.5	92.0	88.5	83.5	79.2	90.9	87.7	82.5	78.7	72.8
24-35	94.6	94.1	92.0	89.7	82.4	93.6	91.2	88.6	87.0	82.3
36-47	93.9	93.6	91.6	89.0	81.6	92.9	91.7	89.3	88.2	84.4
48-59	93.6	93.1	90.6	88.8	82.8	93.2	90.3	88.9	88.8	85.6

\* BCG, measles and three doses each of DPT and polio vaccine (excluding Polio 0 given at birth)

Six in every ten children under five years had received a Vitamin A capsule Other than immunization, respondents were also asked to provide information on whether the children under five years by the time of the survey had received a Vitamin

A capsule. Table 4.9 shows that overall, six in every ten children under five (irrespective of whether they were male or female) had ever received Vitamin A capsule.

Variations by age categories show that close to 70 percent of children aged 24 to 35 years had ever received a Vitamin A capsule. Differentials by stratum show that 73 percent of children under five in the Upper East region of Uganda had ever received a Vitamin A capsule followed by 70 percent in the North West.

Strutum and age of the	unnai ci		3 ( /0 )			
sex	0-11	12-23	24-35	36-47	48-59	Total
Male	33.3	65.8	70.8	68.1	67.1	60.6
Female	34.2	70.0	68.1	68.2	67.2	61.6
Stratum						
Capital	30.3	66.8	71.1	70.0	58.3	56.6
Mid central	25.8	72.0	77.7	75.0	78.3	64.2
Upper Central	31.7	53.8	62.8	64.7	57.0	53.2
Lower Central	38.8	67.5	77.1	69.3	69.5	64.3
Near Central	44.4	71.9	67.3	67.2	68.1	62.4
Near East	31.4	58.5	69.2	62.6	66.8	56.9
Far East	59.0	73.5	70.8	71.9	72.4	66.4
Mid East	30.2	60.1	61.3	58.1	59.6	52.6
Upper East	49.9	81.9	79.9	79.6	77.9	72.8
Lower North	15.9	46.4	50.9	51.9	52.0	42.8
Upper North	26.5	69.2	69.9	58.1	58.1	55.7
North East	39.1	75.9	79.3	82.1	79.9	59.5
North West	29.3	71.3	55.7	64.3	59.2	70.2
Lower West	37.2	80.6	70.8	78.4	66.8	54.7
Far West	35.3	76.3	76.8	82.0	83.3	66.5
Mid West	31.0	80.9	73.0	62.9	66.2	69.9
Upper West	30.3	66.8	71.1	70.0	58.3	61.8
Total	32.3	67.6	68.8	67.7	66.3	60.2

Table 4.9: Distribution of children who have ever received Vitamin A by sex, stratum and age of the children in months (%)

### 4.8 Payment for Health Services

63 percent of persons that had accessed and received health services paid for them The respondents who reported that they had obtained health services from Traditional healers, Government health facilities or Private health facilities were asked whether any payment was made for the services received. Figure 4.4 shows that overall, 43 percent of the persons had paid for the services received. Comparing with the 2004 NSDS findings, there was a decrease in the proportion of persons that paid for the services from 50 percent in 2004 to 43 percent in 2008.



Figure 4.4: Distribution of persons who sought treatment by payment for Services (%)

#### 4.8.1 Payment for Health Services by ownership of Facility

Further analysis of payment for health services by ownership of the facility in Table 4.10 shows that the 15 percent of the respondents that obtained the service from a government health facility reported that they paid for it.

Ownership of facility	Yes	No	Total
Government health facility	15.2	84.8	100.0
Private health facility	81.7	18.3	100.0
NGO health facility	64.6	35.4	100.0
Other Health facility	66.3	33.7	100.0
Total	42.8	57.2	100.0

Table 4.10: Distribution of respondents by payment for health service and ownership of facility (%)

Table 4.11 presents the survey findings on the percentage distribution of respondents who indicated that they had paid for the health services obtained from government health facilities. Respondents revealed that the health services that they paid for in the government health facilities were mainly X-ray (54%), Surgery (52%) Dental (51%) and delivery (33%).

Health service	Yes	No	Total
Consultation	6.5	93.5	100.0
Drugs	15.5	84.5	100.0
Immunisation	1.9	98.1	100.0
Antenatal	14.8	85.2	100.0
Delivery	33.0	67.0	100.0
Laboratory	19.0	81.0	100.0
X-ray	54.4	45.6	100.0
ENT	20.0	80.0	100.0
Eye care	19.7	80.3	100.0
Dental	51.0	49.1	100.0
Surgery	51.6	48.4	100.0
Other, specify	58.2	41.8	100.0
Total	15.2	84.8	100.0

Table 4.11: Distribution of respondents by payment for health services in Government Health facilities (%)

34 percent of persons that sought Antenatal and ENT services indicated that payment was demanded from them Table 4.12 further shows the conditions under which payments for the health services were made. Overall, 25 percent of household members who sought medical attention reported that payment for the services they received was demanded for; which reflects a reduction by five percentage points when compared with 2004 findings. Demand for payment was most common among those who sought for Antenatal care and ENT services (34%). The findings from the two surveys still indicate relatively high proportions of people that sought for birth-related services reporting that payment was demanded. However, majority (90%) of the heads of the most commonly used health facilities in the districts visited indicated that patients do not pay for most of the services offered.

		2008					2004	
						Token		
		Token			Official	of	Demanded	
health service	Official	of thanks	Demanded	Total		thanks		Total
Consultation	83.2	0.8	16.0	100	70.8	1.6	27.7	100
Drugs	72.2	0.7	27.0	100	68.5	0.7	30.8	100
Immunisation	68.7	0.8	30.5	100	72.3	2.4	25.3	100
Antenatal	63.9	2.6	33.5	100	61.6	3.6	34.8	100
Delivery	61.3	10.4	28.3	100	62.8	9.7	27.5	100
Laboratory	80.0	0.6	19.4	100	72.7	1.1	26.1	100
X-ray	78.8	1.0	20.2	100	67.1	1.1	31.9	100
ENT	64.6	2.0	33.5	100	-	-	-	
Eye care	74.2	0.6	25.2	100	-	-	-	
Dental	74.2	0.9	24.9	100	-	-	-	
Surgery	67.6	0.4	32.0	100	71.5	5.2	23.3	100
Other, specify	83.3	0.0	16.7	100	-	-	-	
Total	73.2	1.5	25.3	100	68.4	1.6	30.0	100

Table 4.12: Distribution of Patients by Condition of Payment and Type of Service (%)

Respondents were also asked to reveal whether they are always willing to pay for the services sought after as was the case during the 2004 NSDS. The findings in Table 4.13 show that overall, there was tremendous increase in the proportion of persons willing to pay for the services from 34 percent in 2004 to 66 percent in 2008.

However, the results from the qualitative module reveal that health seekers were unwilling to pay for health services at the Government facilities though some opted to pay in order to quicken the process. Respondents from Busia, Mayuge and Kabale districts admitted that patients had to pay in order to access a service quickly.

50

Health service		2008			2004	
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Consultation	63.3	36.7	100	34.0	66.0	100
Drugs	68.9	31.1	100	37.9	62.1	100
Immunisation	51.0	49.1	100	16.9	83.1	100
Antenatal	62.5	37.5	100	29.0	71.0	100
Delivery	63.2	36.9	100	40.0	60.0	100
Laboratory	68.2	31.8	100	40.6	59.4	100
X-ray	63.2	36.8	100	36.9	63.1	100
ENT	51.6	48.4	100	-	-	
Eye care	60.3	39.8	100	-	-	
Dental	60.4	39.6	100	-	-	
Surgery	61.9	38.1	100	40.7	59.3	100
Other	46.6	53.4	100	-	-	
Total	65.7	34.3	100	33.7	66.3	100

Table 4.13: Distribution of Patients Willing to pay when they actually paid for the services (%)

#### 4.9 Quality of Health Services

Irrespective of the type of provider, Figure 4.5 shows that 62 percent of respondents at household level reported that there had been an improvement in the services offered. This is a slight decline from 66 percent in 2004. There was also a slight increase in the proportion of persons who indicated that the health services remained the same.

Seven in every ten heads of health facilities indicated that the quality of services they provide has improved compared to 2004. It is worth noting that at least eight in every ten of the heads of health facilities reported that their Antenatal care (83%), HIV/AIDS testing (80%) and HIV/AIDS awareness services (82%) had improved.

57 percent of the persons indicated that the services had improved compared to 2004 Overall, at the household level, 57 percent of persons who had received at least one health service indicated that the service had improved compared to 2004. Close to six in every ten persons that used Antenatal care (58%) while 56 percent who had received delivery indicated that the service had improved compared to 2004.



Figure 4.5: Clients' Rating of the change in the quality of Health Services provided with reference to 2004 (%)

#### 4.9.1 Quality of Government Health Services

To establish the general performance of the health sector, respondents were asked to give their perceptions on whether or not they were satisfied with the health services that are provided by the Government health facilities. Analysis of the findings in Table 4.14 shows that there was a general increase in the proportion of households reporting that the quality of services was good across all the listed categories. This reflects an improvement in the performance of the health sector with respect to the overall quality of services provided, responsiveness of the staff, availability of drugs and cleanliness of the health facilities.

Results from the qualitative research confirm that good quality services were reported in Nebbi, Kasese, Busia, Kampala and Mayuge districts. This is attributed to the active role that government health centres had played in improving sanitation in households. Furthermore, good relations between medical personnel and clients were reported. Malaria drug distributors had also rendered a commendable service and essential drugs (Paracetamol and Septrine) were reportedly available in Government health centres. Most importantly, the HIV/AIDS sensitization programmes had been enhanced since 2004. During a Focus Group Discussion, one female respondent from Muzaana zone in Kampala district said *"In government health centres some of the health workers are good and understanding especially when it comes to giving attention and good care to T.B and HIV/AIDS patients"*.

			2008					2004		
Current situation	Good	fair	poor	Don't know	Total	Good	fair	poor	Don't know	Total
Overall quality of services	40.8	41.5	14.0	3.7	100.0	32.8	39.3	16.0	11.9	100.0
Responsiveness of the staff	44.4	37.7	14.2	3.8	100.0	33.4	37.9	17.0	11.7	100.0
Availability of drugs	25.4	35.5	35.4	3.7	100.0	18.1	27.8	42.3	11.8	100.0
Cleanliness	69.5	23.4	3.5	3.6	100.0	58.7	25.3	4.8	11.3	100.0
Total	45.0	34.5	16.8	3.7	100.0					100.0

## Table 4.14: Distribution of Households by level of satisfaction with health Services (%)

During the survey, data on the respondents' perceptions on how the quality of health services had changed compared to 2004 were collected. Figure 4.6 shows the percentage distribution of households by rating of the change in quality of health services provided since 2004. The majority of households (48%) indicated that the overall quality of health services provided has improved compared to 2004. It is worth noting that the highest improvement was registered in regard to cleanliness of the health facilities (62%). However, it should also be noted that 21 percent of the households reported that the availability of drugs in the Government health facilities had worsened.

According to the qualitative information collected, frequent drug stock outs also contributed to poor quality of service delivery in the Government health centres. In Nebbi, Masaka, Kyenjojo and Kasese districts, community members also pointed out that most of the medical staff own private clinics where they send patients to buy the drugs that are allegedly stolen from government health centres.



Figure 4.6: Distribution of Households by rating of the change in the quality of services provided since 2004 (%)

#### 4.10 Conclusion

The burden of disease in Uganda is still high. Findings from the NSDS 2008 highlight that 36 percent of household members fell sick or sustained an injury 30 days prior to the survey with majority (54%) of the persons who reported sickness being those 45 years and above. Malaria/fever remains the most common illness with 45 percent of the population suffering from it.

Close to four in every ten persons that fell sick sought treatment from a Government health facility which are generally 6 km from the households while the other health facilities are 5 km away. The patients that accessed health services were mainly women seeking antenatal (38%) and delivery care services (38%). Its worth noting that 63 percent of persons that had accessed and received health services paid for them.

Seven in every ten children 12-23 months were fully immunised at the time of the survey while six in every ten children under five years had received a Vitamin A capsule. Overall, 57 percent of the respondents indicated that the health services had improved compared to 2004.

## **5 CHAPTER FIVE**

#### WATER AND SANITATION

#### 5.1 Introduction

The water sector encompasses development and management of (i) domestic water supply (water for drinking and other domestic uses); (ii) water for production (water for livestock, industry, hydropower generation, aquiculture, marine transport, tourism, and environmental conservation); and (iii) sanitation and hygiene (household sanitation and sanitation in schools and other public places). Clearly, all these components directly impact on the quality of life of the people and overall productivity of the population. For instance, easy access to safe and clean drinking water saves time and money for other productive work and leisure. However, this study limited itself to domestic water supply and sanitation.

In terms of domestic water, government aims to provide clean and safe water within easy reach to 77% and 100% of the population in the rural and urban areas, respectively, by 2015. This will be attained by constructing and maintaining piped water systems, boreholes, protected springs, gravity-fed schemes and rainwater harvesting facilities. On sanitation, government's focus is on ensuring a safe water chain, by advocating and implementing strategies for safe disposal of human excreta, garbage and waste water from the environment.

The institutional framework for delivering sector services includes; (i) the Ministry of Water and Environment as the lead technical agency for policy and standards setting, (ii) the Ministry of Health and Ministry of Education and Sports for household sanitation and for sanitation in schools, respectively; (iii) Local Governments for planning and implementation of sector activities; (iv) the beneficiary communities for demanding and maintaining the facilities and (v) the Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development for adequate and timely funding. Other stakeholders are the development partners, NGOs and private sector.

Accordingly, the focus for data collection and assessment in the 2008 NSDS was on; access to safe drinking water, collection time, payments for water, safe water chain, and availability and management of facilities for safe disposal of human excreta, garbage and waste water.
## 5.2 Water Accessibility by Season and Type of Water Source

The Survey solicited information on access to water during the dry and wet season by type of source, distinguishing between safe and other water sources. The sources which are considered to be safe were the piped water systems, borehole, protected springs, gravity flow schemes and harvested rainwater.

## 5.2.1 Dry Season

There is no significant change in access between 2004 and 2008 The results (Table 5.1) revealed that the overall accessibility to safe water in 2008 was 72 percent, which is only 2 percent above the figure reported in the 2004 NSDS. The distribution by residence showed that 66 percent of the rural and 93 percent of the urban households were obtaining drinking water from safe sources as compared to 60 and 88 percent for rural and urban respectively in the 2004 Survey.

Over 50 percent of the households were accessing safe water for drinking from boreholes, protected springs and gravity flow schemes.

Water Source		2004			2008	
	Rural	Urban	National	Rural	Urban	National
Piped Water in Dwelling	1.1	9.0	3.7	0.2	5.4	1.1
Piped Water in Compound	0.7	12.5	4.6	1.1	14.4	3.5
Piped Water Outside Compound	4.4	27.3	12.0	1.3	16.3	3.9
Public Tap	-	-	-	4.1	26.2	7.9
Borehole/Protected Springs &	54.1	39.2	49.2	59.7	31.0	54.6
Gravity Flow Scheme						
Rain Water	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.6
Total (Safe Sources)	60.8	88.3	69.9	67	93.6	71.6
Unprotected Source	22.4	8.0	17.7	19.6	4.2	16.8
Lake/River/Stream/Pond/Dam	16.7	3.0	12.2	13.1	0.8	11.0
Other	0.1	0.7	0.3	0.5	1.3	0.6
Total (Other Sources)	39.2	12.7	30.2	33.2	6.4	28.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 5.1: Distribution of Households by Type of Water Source for Drinking during the Dry Season (%)

No information was collected about public tap water in the 2004 Survey.

Few households (less than one percent) reported rain water as a source of water for drinking which shows lack of capacity on the part of the households to harvest rainwater and store it for a long time.

## 5.2.2 Wet Season

Use of rain water common in the wet season

The percentage distribution of households by type of water source and use during the wet season is shown in Table 5.2. The main sources of water for the majority of the households during the wet season were boreholes, protected sources, and gravity flow scheme. The findings revealed that access to safe water was slightly higher in the wet season than the dry season. During the wet season, the proportion of households having access to safe water was much higher (80 percent for rural and 95 percent for urban) than during the dry season. This is attributed to many households using rain water which is abundant during the rainy season.

Table 5.2: Distribution of Households by Type of Water Source for Drinking During the Wet Season (%)

Water Source	2004			2008			
	Rural	Urban	National	Rural	Urban	National	
Piped Water in Dwelling	1.0	8.9	3.6	0.2	5.1	1.0	
Piped Water in Compound	0.7	11.8	4.4	0.8	13.4	3.0	
Piped Water Outside Compound	4.0	24.2	10.7	1.0	15.4	3.6	
Public Tap	-	-	-	3.0	24.2	6.8	
Borehole/Protected/ Gravity Flow	46.0	33.0	41.7	48.2	24.3	44.0	
Rain Water	18.4	13.2	16.7	26.7	12.4	24.0	
Total (Safe Sources)	70.1	91.1	77.1	79.9	94.8	82.4	
Unprotected Source	16.5	6.2	13.1	11.8	3.3	10.3	
Lake/River/Stream/Pond/Dam	13.2	2.1	9.6	8.2	0.6	6.9	
Other	0.1	0.6	0.4	0.3	1.2	0.5	
Total (Other Sources)	39.9	8.9	22.9	20.2	5.2	17.6	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

## 5.3 Walking distance to Water Sources

Distance to water sources improved since the year 2004 The findings revealed that the average distance to a water source was 0.9 and 0.6 km during the dry and wet season respectively. The 2004 NSDS showed an average distance of 1.1 and 0.9 km during the dry and wet season respectively. The findings suggested that water was more accessible at the time of the Survey than four years ago. The percentage distribution of households by distance to a water source during the wet and dry season is presented in Table 5.3. The majority of the households were accessing water within a distance of 0.5 km in both seasons just as was the case in the 2004 NSDS.

Distance in Km	20	04	2008		
	Wet Season	Dry Season	Wet Season	Dry Season	
0.00 to 0.5	65.0	56.5	69.0	57.1	
0.51 to 1.00	18.2	21.9	14.4	19.2	
1.01 to 1.50	11.7	14.9	2.2	2.8	
1.51 to 3.00	11.7	14.9	9.6	14.5	
Above 3.00	5.2	6.7	4.8	6.5	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

Table 5.3: Distribution of Households by Distance to Water Sources During the Wet and Dry Season

Considering residence, the proportion of households who walk less that half a kilometre to a water source during the dry season increased for both the rural and urban areas from the figure reported in 2004. Table 5.4 shows that the proportion of households who walk less that half a kilometre was 52 percent in urban areas compared to 48 percent in 2004. Similarly the proportion of households who walk less that a kilometre in urban areas increased from 75 percent in 2004 to 87 percent in 2008. The proportion of households who walked for more than three kilometres also reduced.

Distance in Km	20	04	2008		
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	
0.00 to 0.5	47.5	75.1	51.7	86.5	
0.51 to 1.00	21.4	14.0	21.6	8.3	
1.01 to 1.50	3.5	1.7	3.4	0.3	
1.51 to 3.00	18.8	7.0	16.8	4.2	
Above 3.00	8.8	2.6	6.6	0.8	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

Table 5.4: Distribution of Households by Distance to Water Sources During the Dry Season (%)

## 5.4 Collection time for water

Households were spending more time to access water during the dry season than during the wet season (Table 5.4).

	2004			2008				
Description	Dry Season		Wet Season		Dry Season		Wet S	Season
Description	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Waiting Time at Water Source	50	38	32	25	29	22	13	10
(Minutes)								
Time Taken to and from Water	43	22	31	17	37	13	24	10
Source (Minutes)								
Total Water Collection Time	93	60	63	42	66	35	37	20
(Minutes)								
Average amount of water used	79	89	77	84	76	70	72	70
per day (litres) by household								

#### Table 5.5: Average Time to Drinking Water Sources

About 30 minutes taken on average to and from a water source during the dry season by rural households The water and sanitation sector performance measurement target for water collection time in rural areas is 27 minutes, while for the urban areas is 7 minutes. Drinking water collection time was considered and the waiting time at the source as well as the time to and from water source. For the rural areas, the Survey revealed 66 minutes during the dry season and 37 minutes during the wet season.

However, for the urban areas, the total water collection time was 35 minutes during the dry season and 20 minutes during the wet season as shown in Table 5.4. The reasons for the long water collection time were unreliable water sources, long distances and long queues at water points. The 2004 NSDS revealed that households were on average spending 93 and 63 minutes at a water source during the dry and wet season respectively, in the rural area.

Households reported using less water in 2008 as compared to 2004 though no major variations were noted between the amounts of water used during the dry or wet seasons.

# 5.5 Perception on Changes in the Availability of Water in Last 4 Years

The respondents were required to state how the availability of safe water for household consumption had changed in the community over the 4 years that preceded the survey. More than half (52 percent) of the households reported it had improved since the 2004 Survey while 37 percent were of the view that there had been no change. Only 5 percent reported that the availability of safe water had worsened. (Figure 5.1). The findings by spatial distribution presented in Annex II Table B 2.1 shows that 63 percent of the households in the Upper North reported an improvement in the availability of safe water over the past 4 years. The least

improvement was noted in the Far West (45%). It is also important to note that 12 percent of the households in the North East reported that the availability of safe water over the past 4 years had worsened.



Figure 5.1: Distribution of Households by Change in the Availability of Safe Water (%)

## 5.6 Reasons for Not Using Water from Safe Sources

The households that did not report accessing safe water sources were asked to state the main reason. Out of the total surveyed households, about 28 and 18 percent were not accessing safe water during dry and wet season respectively. The major reason for not accessing safe water, reported by 43 percent of the households, was long distance (see Table 5.6). Other important reasons given were unreliability, long queues and requiring contribution.

However, the pattern changed when the responses were analysed by residence. In this case, more rural respondents reported long distance, compared to their counterparts in the urban setting. The urban residents reported the requirement for cash contribution as the main constraint.

Main Reason	Rural	Urban	National
Long distance	43.4	26.0	42.6
Unreliable	9.6	10.1	9.7
Water does not taste good	1.8	2.4	1.8
Require contribution	4.2	12.3	4.6
Long queues	5.1	5.6	5.2
Open source is okay	3.2	7.6	3.4
Other	32.6	35.9	32.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 5.6: Distribution of Households by Main Reason for Not Using Safe Water Sources and Residence (%)

## 5.7 Payments for Water

About 39% of the Households were paying for water

About 39 percent of the households in both rural and urban areas indicated paying for the water they use. More urban households (75%) than their rural counterparts (31%) reported paying for water. Figure 5.2 presents the percentage distribution of households reporting paying for water by purpose of payment by Survey year. Most of the rural households paid for maintenance of the water points (85%), whereas the majority of the urban households (78%) were paying user fees. Generally most of those paying for the water pay for maintenance costs (56%) while 42 percent pay user fees/tariffs. There was no change in the distribution of payment for water from the 2004 Survey.





Table 5.7 presents the average monthly household payments for water by residence and region. Urban dwellers were paying over four times higher than their rural counterparts (Ug. Shs 9,790 for Urban compared to Ug. Shs. 2,320 for Rural. At regional level, the average monthly payments for water ranged from Ug. Shs 660 in the Upper North to Ug. Shs 14,420 in Mid Central. Overall, households were willing to pay less for water than what they were actually paying.

Description	Household Monthly Expenditure on Water (Ug. Shs)	Amount Household is Willing to Pay (Ug. Shs)	Difference Between Actual and Willing to Pay (Ug. Shs)
Residence			
Rural	2,320	920	1,400
Urban	9,790	4,540	5,250
Sub-Region			
Capital	10,960	5,610	5,350
Mid Central	14,430	5,550	8,880
Upper Central	4,200	1,970	2,230
Lower Central	6,450	2,350	4,100
Near Central	5,150	2,520	2,630
Near East	1,780	660	1,120
Far East	6,250	2,210	4,040
Mid East	3,560	1,310	2,250
Upper East	2,020	660	1,360
Lower North	1,620	760	860
Upper North	660	560	100
North East	2,580	990	1,590
North West	1,300	980	320
Lower West	7,790	2,250	5,540
Far West	4,740	1,950	2,790
Mid West	4,080	2,130	1,950
Upper West	2,550	1170	1,380
National	4,690	2,080	2,610

Table 5.7: Sub-Regional Average Household Monthly Payments for Water by Residence

## 5.8 Collection, Preparation and Storage of Water

The findings show that women were responsible for collection of water in almost 50 percent of the total households as shown in Table 5.8. The findings also revealed that water vending was more common in the urban areas (6%) than in the rural areas.

Collection of Water	Rural	Urban	National
Boys	18.5	13.2	17.7
Girls	17.0	16.1	16.8
Women	50.3	48.9	50.4
Men	15.6	11.2	11.9
Vendors	3.1	6.4	3.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 5.8: Distribution of Households by Household Member who Normally Collect Water by Residence (%)

Figure 5.3 presents the percentage distribution of households by method of preparing drinking water. Overall, most of the households (51%) were not preparing water before drinking. The same trend was depicted in the 2004 NSDS. However, there was a four percent increase in the proportion of the households boiling water before drinking between 2008 (42 percent) and 2004 (38 percent). At the same time, however, the proportion of households that did nothing to the water worsened, from 49 percent in 2004 to 51 percent in 2008.



Figure 5.3: Distribution of Households by Method of Preparing Drinking Water by Residence (%)

The most common way of storing drinking water was using a pot (Table 5.9). Most of the pots used in storing drinking water were covered. The other important storage facility for drinking water was a jerrycan. The pot and the jerrycan contributed about 95 percent of the storage facilities of the water for drinking.

Storage Facility	2008				
	Covered	Uncovered	Total		
Pot	98.1	1.9	48.1		
Jerrycan	83.2	16.8	46.6		
Saucepan	87.8	12.2	0.4		
Drums	100	0.0	0.1		
Jug/Kettle	96.2	3.8	2.7		
Other	82.5	17.5	2.0		
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0		

Table 5.9: Distribution of Households by Drinking Water Storage Facility and Residence (%)

## 5.9 Constraints Limiting Access to Safe Water

Total

The Survey revealed inadequate safe water sources as a major constraint that limited access to safe water (Table 5.10). Forty percent of the households reported inadequate safe water sources as the major limiting factor compared with 50 percent in the 2004 Survey. The other important constraints mentioned were; long distance and high cost of safe water. However, over 70 percent of the households were accessing water within one kilometer.

2004 2008 Constraint Rural Urban National Rural Urban National 27.0 36.1 Long Distance 31.0 17.6 39.8 13.1 Inadequate Sources 50.4 54.5 41.9 41.8 29.6 40.2 High Cost 4.7 10.0 33.0 13.1 5.0 41.3 Other 9.8 7.5 9.1 13.4 16.0 13.7

100.0

 Table 5.10: Distribution of Households by Residence and Constraints Faced in

 Accessing Safe Water (%)

From the qualitative module, a number of constraints were highlighted as hindrances to access to safe water. These included institutional arrangements, congestion at water sources, contamination, physical factors, economic factors and willingness to pay user fees.

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

#### 5.9.1 Institutional arrangements

In Nebbi and Abim districts, institutions that have water sources within the villages were reported to be having measures in place that prohibit community members from accessing those sources. Consequently, access to safe water by the community members was reported to be limited. *"For us we are not allowed to fetch water from Adel primary school. The people who are allowed have marks on their jerry cans and if you do not have that mark your jerry can will be taken by the guard".* (Female Participant Thilal Nebbi FGD)

#### 5.9.2 Congestion at the few water sources

In six districts of Nakasongola, Kamuli, Nebbi, Dokolo, Mayuge, Kyenjojo and Wakiso districts, congestion at water sources was mentioned to limit access to safe water. Community members reported long time at the water source. As a result other unsafe sources like the swamps, lakes and open wells are used. If the borehole has many people collecting water, there is no option for safe water. *"One just gets water from the swamps or wells because a lot of time can be spent waiting yet there is a lot of work to be done in the home and in the gardens"*. (Female Participant FGD Buseera Mayuge district)

#### 5.9.3 Quality and reliability of safe water sources

Contamination was reported to affect quality and reliability of safe water sources. Deterioration in quality of safe water in two urban sites of Mukono and Kyenjojo were reported to be due to contamination from town developments such as construction of roads and buildings near the sources.

#### 5.9.4 Physical Factors That Limit Accessibility to Safe Water Sources

The Low water table in some districts was mentioned as a constraint to providing improved safe water in communities hence hindering access to safe water sources. In Mayuge district it was reported that the nature of an areas' hydrology determines the depth of sinking boreholes. Many communities were reported to be having problems related to this hence inability to access safe water. It was also reported that it requires expensive feasibility studies and technologies in attempt to provide safe water yet some of the districts reported incapacity due to low levels of funding.

#### 5.9.5 Economic Factors That Limit Access to Safe Water sources

In Kamuli, Kiruhura, Soroti, Kasese, Nebbi, and Mayuge districts the monthly user charges at safe water sources were reported to limit community access to safe water due to affordability. Use of borehole water in Nebbi district was reported to require monthly fee of Shs. 3,000/= for repairs and motivation of the borehole guard. *"When there is need to buy spares or make repairs, each household has to pay 1,500/=. "This year alone we have so far paid three times. We are just coerced to pay due to the need for having safe water and if you fail to pay you will not access it." (Female participant FGD Kakira Kamuli district)* 

## 5.9.6 Willingness to Pay User Fees

Reliability of safe water sources in six (6) districts of Dokolo, Nakasongola, Nebbi, Soroti, Kyenjojo and Rakai was reported to depend on willingness by the community members to pay user fees for maintenance. In Ddagala Nakasongola district, failure of community members to pay user fees was reported to result in poor maintenance and non functionality of water sources leading to reduced reliability and access.

## 5.10 Sanitation Facilities

Information was sought on selected household sanitary facilities and hygienic practices. The focus was on; kitchen availability, garbage disposal and availability and use of bathroom, toilet and hand washing facilities. Table 5.11 presents the percentage distribution of households by type of sanitary facility and residence.

#### 5.10.1 Kitchens

Slightly over thirty percent of the households (33%) lacked kitchens. Where kitchens existed, 57 percent of the households reported that they were located outside the dwelling place.

#### 5.10.2 Garbage Disposal

Pits and gardens were the most common methods for garbage disposal in both rural and urban areas. Forty one percent of rural households were disposing garbage in gardens, while 34 percent of the urban residents were disposing in pits. These figures are not very different from what was reported in the 2004 NSDS. Another important method of garbage disposal was the bush with 18 percent of the households reporting using it.

#### 5.10.3 Bathrooms

In terms of sanitary facilities by type of bathrooms and toilets for the households, the analysis shows variations by residence and sub-region. In the rural areas, makeshift bathrooms were common (34%), while in the urban areas, outside built bathrooms were common (64%). In the rural areas, 35 percent of the households did not have any form of bathroom while only 9 percent of urban dwellers had none.

## 5.10.4 Toilets

Most of the urban households (56%) were using shared covered pit latrines compared to 21 percent in rural households. The biggest proportion of households in rural areas (50%) had private covered pit latrines. Overall, 12 percent of the households had no toilet facility. Considering the sub regions, 22 percent of the households in the North East did not have a toilet facility as compared to less than one percent of Kampala residents.

## 5.10.5 Hand Washing

In total, nearly one in every four households had hand washing facilities after toilet use. Close to 74 percent of rural and 72 percent of urban households lacked hand washing facilities after toilet use.

Characteristics	Rural	Urban	Total
Type of Kitchen			
Inside	3.6	13.8	5.4
Outside (Built)	64.7	20.6	57.0
Makeshift	5.1	2.3	4.6
None	26.6	63.2	33.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Garbage Disposal			
Pit	33.7	34.1	33.8
Skip	2.4	32.3	7.7
Bush	20.6	8.5	18.4
Garden	41.1	10.1	35.6
Other	2.2	14.8	4.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Type of Bathroom			
Inside	3.2	15.6	5.4
Outside Built	28.1	64.2	34.4
Makeshift	33.6	11.0	29.7
None	35.1	9.1	30.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Type of Toilet			
Covered pit latrine (private)	49.9	21.6	44.9
Covered pit latrine (shared)	20.5	55.7	26.7
Uncovered pit latrine	13.9	4.6	12.2
Other	2.1	16.2	4.7
No Toilet	13.6	1.9	11.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Provision of Hand Washing Facility	After Toilet Use		
Yes	25.9	28.2	26.3
No	74.1	71.8	73.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 5.11: Distribution of Households by Type of Sanitary Facility and Residence (%)

The respondents were asked to state the major factors that limit construction of toilet facilities. The findings revealed that ignorance and high cost were the major factors limiting toilet facility construction (Table 5.12). It should be noted that 9 percent of the households lacked information on the factors limiting community members from constructing toilet facilities. The rural dwellers were more likely to be limited by ignorance than their urban counterparts, whereas the issue of high cost affected both urban and rural dwellers almost equally (i.e. 32 and 29 percent respectively). Considering the sub-regions, ignorance was highly reported in the Lower West (31%) while high cost was highest in Upper East (59%). Close to 13 percent of households in the North East reported culture as a limiting factor.

Residence/ Location	Ignorance	High Cost	Soil Type / Terrain	Culture	None	Don't Know	Other	Total
Rural	19.2	28.9	10.0	0.8	14.1	8.3	18.8	100.0
Urban	9.4	31.5	6.1	0.7	19.4	14.9	18.1	100.0
Region								
Capital	4.3	28.8	6.6	0.1	15.8	18.4	26.0	100.0
Mid-Central	7.1	35.3	3.0	0.5	16.5	19.4	18.2	100.0
Upper Central	14.8	30.8	14.1	1.2	14.6	8.3	16.3	100.0
Lower Central	12.2	30.5	9.5	0.6	3.3	8.0	35.9	100.0
Near Central	10.8	36.8	13.9	0.2	9.1	8.5	20.6	100.0
Near East	19.5	25.2	11.3	0.3	17.5	11.2	15.1	100.0
Far East	28.1	22.3	22.9	0.0	4.7	9.2	12.8	100.0
Mid East	27.2	28.1	18.0	0.3	10.1	4.0	12.4	100.0
Upper East	7.3	59.1	12.7	0.2	1.8	3.4	15.3	100.0
Lower North	20.0	45.6	3.2	0.5	12.7	4.2	13.8	100.0
Upper North	10.7	43.8	2.6	0.0	10.1	1.5	31.5	100.0
North East	24.8	48.5	9.8	13.3	0.4	0.5	2.7	100.0
North West	16.1	25.4	13.3	0.5	18.7	10.9	15.2	100.0
Lower West	30.6	17.3	2.3	0.1	11.8	12.0	25.9	100.0
Far West	21.0	14.2	4.8	0.6	25.3	9.3	24.8	100.0
Mid West	20.0	18.0	4.3	0.1	33.7	9.8	14.1	100.0
Upper West	22.1	18.4	5.9	0.7	32.6	9.5	10.8	100.0
Total	17.5	29.3	9.3	0.8	15.0	9.5	18.7	100.0

Table 5.12: Distribution of Households by Factors Limiting Construction of Toilet Facilities (%)

## 5.11 Conclusion

In both the dry and wet season, slightly over seven in every ten households had access to safe water within one kilometre. The Ministry of Water and Environment estimates for to safe water is 63 percent (MWE/SPR 2008).

The average waiting time at a water source improved, but is still high. It was about half an hour, compared to the sector target of 7 minutes.

The proportion of the households that did nothing to increase the safety of drinking water worsened, from 49 percent in 2004 to 51 percent in 2008.

More than one in three of rural households (35%) did not have a bathroom and overall 11 percent of the households did not have a toilet facility. The North East sub-region has the lowest latrine coverage with 88 percent reporting no toilet facility.

## 6 CHAPTER SIX

## HOUSING CONDITIONS AND ENERGY USE

## 6.1 Introduction

Housing conditions are of significant importance in the understanding of the sanitation and health status of the households. Poor housing conditions are associated with pests and diseases that are a menace to the health of the household members. Inadequate sanitation and hygiene arising out of poor housing and sanitary facilities is a major cause of poor health and poverty. Also the condition of the house is a good indicator of the welfare status of its occupants.

The 2008 NSDS analyzed types of housing focussing mainly on the materials used for roof, wall and floor in rural and urban households of Uganda. The types of power/fuel used for lighting, cooking and ironing were also analyzed.

## 6.1.1 Housing Occupancy Tenure

Figure 6.1 presents the percentage distribution of households by occupancy tenure and residence. Owner occupied was still the most common form of housing occupancy tenure. The proportion of owner occupied households increased from 71 percent in 2004 to 80 percent, whereas the proportion of households staying in rented and free houses reduced slightly.



Figure 6.1: Distribution of Households by Occupancy Tenure (%)

## 6.1.2 Housing by Type of Materials

Table 6.1 presents the percentage distribution of households by type of materials for the dwelling structure. Over 60 percent of the dwelling structures were roofed with iron sheets. The percentage of households reporting their dwelling structures to be roofed with iron sheets varied from 58 percent in the rural areas to 85 percent in the urban area in 2008 as compared to 51 and 80 percent respectively in 2004. This reflects an increase of 7 percentage points in the proportion of rural households with Iron sheets.

		2004			2008	
Housing Characteristics	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Material of Roof						
Thatched	47.7	18.1	37.8	41.3	12.6	36.2
Iron Sheets	51.2	79.0	60.4	58.1	84.6	62.8
Other	1.1	2.9	1.8	0.4	2.8	1.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Material of Wall						
Thatched	2.5	0.7	1.9	0.8	0.1	0.7
Mud and Poles	55.0	19.4	43.2	47.7	11.5	41.3
Unburnt Bricks	17.1	13.5	15.9	18.7	9.4	17.1
Burnt Bricks with Mud	8.3	8.7	8.5	9.0	5.1	8.3
Burnt Bricks with Cement	15.1	52.0	27.4	21.6	69.7	30.1
Other	2.0	5.7	3.1	2.2	4.2	2.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Material of Floor						
Earth	41.3	16.6	33.1	49.8	15.6	43.7
Earth and Cow dung	44.0	16.9	34.9	32.6	8.6	28.4
Cement Screed	12.4	55.3	26.7	16.2	72.1	26.1
Other	2.3	11.2	5.3	1.4	3.7	1.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

 Table 6.1: Distribution of Households by Type of Materials for the Dwelling

 Structure and Residence

Overall, mud and poles was the most common type of wall for the dwelling structures. The percentage of households reporting mud and poles houses varied from 11 percent in the urban areas to 48 percent in the rural areas. The 2004 NSDS revealed a percentage of 19 and 55 for the urban and rural respectively. Close to 70 percent of the households in urban areas reported using burnt bricks and cement for the walls, an improvement from 52 percent reported in the 2004 Survey.

Further examination of the housing material types by type of floor revealed earth as the most common type of floor (44%), followed by earth with cowdung (28%) and cement screed (26%). It is important to note that 72 percent of the households in the urban areas had their floors cemented compared to only 55 percent reported in the 2004 Survey.

In the qualitative survey, communities were asked about their perceptions of a good house and a bad one. Urban communities felt a good house should have a good ceiling, well plastered with good ventilation and windows. "A good house should have a tiled floor, brick walls with mortar, plastered and painted walls. It should also have running water and electricity", (FGD, Mbarara – Urban site).

In the rural sites, the general description of a good house was that it should have concreted brick walls with good black clay, roofed with spear grass, eucalyptus poles, bamboo for steeple, ropes of sisal, good timber and smeared with cow dung. "If you are in such a house, you sleep well and have a comfortable home," (a female participant in Kamuli District). Commenting on a bad house, they were of the view that for a bad housing situation the owners do not have separate sleeping rooms and cooking facilities. The other attribute of a bad house is when human beings share the house with livestock. "Human beings share the house with animals, like chicken, goats and the smell is very bad," (FGD Apado, Dokolo).

"A bad house is one where the floor and wall are not well plastered. The roof leaks and the grass is not uniform. Some parts of the roof are destroyed either by rats or wind, and in some cases it might be totally removed and it leaks," (a female participant, FGD - Thilal Village Nebbi).

## 6.2 Constraints in Constructing and Improving Housing

In the qualitative survey, communities were asked the major constraints that affected them in having good housing structures. A number of constraints were mentioned which included financial, beauracracy, restrictions, access to land, physical features and environmental constraints.

## 6.2.1 Economic Constraints

Most people did not own good houses due to financial constraints. "Building materials are increasingly becoming expensive, yet our incomes and production levels are declining. For example a brick currently costs between Ug. Shs 50-80 and one iron sheet costs Ug. Shs 25,000," (FGD, Ddagala village, Nakasongola District).

#### 6.2.2 Bureaucracy

In Kampala, Soroti and Kyenjojo it was reported that authorities require fees for approving plans of buildings before any construction starts. "Strict city council regulations make it difficult to build a house. For example, to approve a plan might cost Ug. Shs. 500,000, which is not easily affordable to the community members. (Male participant Makindye, Kampala). A member in a focus group discussion in Kyejonjo responded, "The major constraint to building is the expensive building plan where one is supposed to pay Ug. Shs.180, 000 to get the plan approved."

## 6.2.3 Restrictions

The enforcement of government policy on environment has restricted access to natural resources, the main sources of building material such as timber, reeds and grass, which are cheap and affordable. Communities reported that the Uganda Forestry Authority and National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) were restricting the use of these resources.

"Stones, sand and bricks are now becoming more difficult to get. We used to easily get these from the swamps but NEMA has gazetted them as wetlands. This has limited our access to them and has also led to increases in pricing of these items". (Male participant FGD on housing and sanitation).

#### 6.2.4 Access to Land

Across all study areas there was a report of decreasing access to land. This was making it difficult for some sectors of population to construct houses. "If you have no land then how can you build? Many people own just small plots and cannot build or expand existing homes so that they improve on their housing," (FGD Male participant, Wakiso District).

#### 6.2.5 Physical features

Although it was only in two study areas out of the 24sites, hilly terrain presented constraints to constructing and improving housing in these areas. Community members reported problems of transport because the areas are not easily accessible. "In other areas, the building sites are made inaccessible due to bad roads. Inaccessibility of roads hinders transportation of building materials and also makes it more expensive," (FGD, Kyenjojo).

In addition, it is also more expensive to work on these areas. "Hilly terrain makes grading very expensive. Grading ranges from Ug. Shs. 360,000 – to 800,000 depending on the size of the plot," (Kabale FGD).

Other study areas reported rocky surfaces, which make construction difficult. "Steep terrain makes transport expensive, whereas rocky surface makes it difficult to dig the foundation," (FGD, Kasangari, Kasese).

#### 6.2.6 Environmental Constraints

The locally available material would be affordable but in some areas with environmental degradation it is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain the materials. In Soroti, and Abim districts, it was reported that lack of local materials is a major limitation. This is more so when it comes to the grass that is used in thatching huts.

"Women have to go as far as five or six kilometres to harvest grass for thatching since it is their responsibility. They carry it on heads from that far back home and are often harassed. Owners of the plots from which the grass is obtained at times beat them if they do not have money for buying it and just access it without permission".

(Male participant FGD, Soroti).

## 6.3 Domestic Energy Use

The sources of energy and technology used for domestic cooking and lighting purposes have an impact on the health of household members and the environment around them. 'The lack of clean fuels has a direct impact on rural households which depend on wood and charcoal for cooking.'<sup>2</sup> The technology that is used in cooking impacts on both indoor and environmental pollution. One of the targets of Millennium Development Goal number seven is to integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources such as forests and trees. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that Uganda's forests are being seriously degraded, and encroachment is to blame for this (PEAP). This is why the Government through the Ministry of Energy is promoting the use of efficient cooking technologies so as to reduce the pressure on the trees and forest resources, reduce pollution and save financial resources of households.

The 2008 NSDS solicited information on sources of energy that households used for lighting, cooking, heating water and ironing purposes.

#### 6.3.1 Main Source of Cooking and Lighting Fuel

Use of wood Fuel for cooking is almost universal Table 6.2 reveals that 75 percent of the households depended on firewood for cooking and 22 percent on charcoal. Overall, 96 percent of the households depended on wood fuel for cooking purposes which is still a challenge to achieving the MDG targets and promotion of environmental sustainability. Almost no households reported using electricity for cooking. Variations in residence show that charcoal was mainly used in urban areas (75%) while firewood was more prominent in rural areas (87%). The Upper East sub-region had highest proportion of the households (94%) using firewood while Kampala had the lowest (2%). Other than Kampala and other Central sub-regions, the Far East and Upper North reported considerable use of charcoal (14%).

	Source of Energy for Cooking					
Residence	Firewood	Charcoal	Kerosene	Electricity	Other*	Total
Rural	87.4	10.7	0.4	0.1	1.4	100
Urban	15.8	75.4	3.1	0.4	5.3	100
Region						
Capital	1.5	86.9	5.2	0.6	5.8	100
Mid-Central	29	66.5	1.7	0.4	2.4	100
Upper Central	76.2	22.0	1.2	0	0.6	100
Lower Central	83.3	13.3	0.9	0	2.5	100
Near Central	63.5	33	1.5	0.2	1.8	100
Near East	82.8	15.6	0	0.2	1.4	100
Far East	81.9	14.5	0	0	3.6	100
Mid East	85.3	11.5	0.6	0	2.6	100
Upper East	94.1	5.6	0.2	0	0.1	100
Lower North	89.7	9.8	0	0	0.5	100
Upper North	85.6	14.2	0	0	0.2	100
North East	90.6	8.6	0	0	0.8	100
North West	87.5	11.8	0.3	0	0.4	100
Lower West	83.9	12.2	0.6	0.2	3.1	100
Far West	92.1	5.0	0.2	0	2.7	100
Mid West	84.9	12.2	0.3	0.2	2.4	100
Upper West	83.5	13.2	1.1	0	2.2	100
Uganda	74.8	22.2	0.9	0.1	2	100

Table 6.2: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Cooking and Residence (%)

\*includes LP gas, saw dust, biogas

Figures showing Zero are not necessarily zero but are less than 0.05

Kerosene is still the major source of fuel for lighting In Table 6.3, it is shown that the majority of the households (84%) used Kerosene for lighting purposes which may contribute to indoor pollution through smoke and soot that is emitted. Only 10 percent of households used electricity as the main source of

lighting which is consistent with what was reported in the UNHS 2005/06. Variations by residence show that the proportion of households using electricity in rural areas was very small (3%) whereas 41 percent of the households in urban areas used electricity as the main source of lighting. Close to 3 percent of the households used firewood for lighting. Considering the sub-regions, it is worth noting that 67 percent of the households in the North East depend on wood for lighting and less than one percent in that region had access to electricity for lighting.

Lighting Fuel					
Residence	Paraffin	Wood	Electricity	Other*	Total
Rural/Urban					
Rural	90.5	3.7	3	2.8	100
Urban	51.8	0.3	41.3	6.6	100
Region					
Capital	30.4	0	61.6	8	100
Mid-Central	59.9	0.4	37.1	2.6	100
Upper Central	90.8	0.3	6.2	2.7	100
Lower Central	92.2	0.4	5.9	1.5	100
Near Central	86	1.2	10.2	2.6	100
Near East	95	0.8	3.8	0.4	100
Far East	93.4	2.8	3.1	0.7	100
Mid East	93.6	2	3.6	0.8	100
Upper East	93.5	3.3	2	1.2	100
Lower North	93.5	0.9	2.2	3.4	100
Upper North	85.7	5.5	4.1	4.7	100
North East	24	67	0.7	8.3	100
North West	87.6	1.7	2	8.7	100
Lower West	90.3	0.7	3.2	5.8	100
Far West	92.2	2	2.9	2.9	100
Mid West	92.8	1	2.8	3.4	100
Upper West	96.6	1.1	1.4	0.9	100
Uganda	83.7	3.1	9.8	3.4	100

Table 6.3: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Lighting by Residence and Sub-region (%)

\*Includes solar, biogas, dung/crop residue etc

#### 6.3.2 Main Source of energy for Ironing and Heating Water

Electricity usage for ironing is still very low The survey also investigated the main sources of fuel used for ironing and heating water. The results in Table 6.4 reveal that the most widely used fuel for ironing is charcoal (30%). The Rural-Urban distribution shows that 50 percent of urban households use it for ironing compared to 26 percent households in rural areas. Electricity usage for ironing is still low and almost only available in urban areas where 33 percent of the household used it. It is important to note that 27 percent of the

households do not iron their clothes. Firewood is the most common form of fuel used for heating water where 66 percent reported using it. Again, this is predominant in rural areas (76%) as compared to 15 percent for urban households. Notice also that the majority of households (72%) in urban areas used charcoal for heating water.

Table 6.4: Distribution of Households by Source of Energy for Ironing and Heating Water by Residence (%)

	Ironing			Heating Water		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Charcoal	26	50	30.2	10.1	71.7	21
Wood	41.1	7	35.1	76.5	15.3	65.7
Electricity	1.7	32.9	7.3	0.2	2.3	0.6
None/Never	30.5	8.5	26.6	12.2	5.7	11
Other*	0.7	1.6	0.8	1	5	1.7
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

\*includes gas, Kerosene Stove,

For those using wood as source of fuel for cooking, lighting, ironing or heating water, a question was asked about the source of the firewood. Table 6.5 shows that most of the households got the firewood from the Bush (66%) and a sizeable proportion (38%) of urban dwellers got it from the market.

Source	Rural	Urban	Total
Natural Forest	11.1	5.0	10.8
Wood lot	12.7	11.5	12.6
Bush	66.9	36.2	65.8
Market	4.7	38.4	6.0
Other	4.7	8.8	4.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

 Table 6.5: Distribution of Households by Source of Firewood and Residence (%)

## 6.4 Source of Electricity

For those who reported using electricity, a question was asked about the source. The findings reveal that most of the households got electricity from the National or Regional or Town Grid as depicted in Table 6.6.

Source	Rural	Urban	Total
Electricty from National Grid	87.9	84.1	85.4
Regional/Town Grid	6.2	15.9	13.6
Personal generator	0.8	0.0	0.2
Solar Home System	1.1	0.0	0.3
Other	2.3	0.0	0.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6.6: Distribution of Households by Source of Electricity and Residence(%)

## 6.5 Average Monthly Bill

For those using electricity, information was solicited on the average monthly bill and the basis of the bill. Table 6.7 shows that the average monthly bill for urban residents was Ug Shs 24,000 which is not different from that of rural residents who use electricity paying Ug. Shs 23,000. Over 80 percent of electricity consumers reported having meters with 39 percent having own meters and 43 percent sharing.

 
 Table 6.7: Distribution of Household's Average Monthly Electricity Bill and Basis of the Bill by Residence (%)

Source	Rural	Urban	Total
Average monthly Bill	23,330	24,300	24,000
Basis of the monthly Bill			
Own meter	53.2	34.8	39.1
Shared Meter	37.2	44.6	42.9
Included in rent	8.6	14.4	13.0
Flat Rate	0.0	6.0	4.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

## 6.6 Mining

Information was further collected from households whether any members were engaged in mining. The results show that less that two percent of the households reported having a member engaged in this activity



## Figure 6.2: Distribution of Households Engaged in Mining

## 6.7 Conclusion

Eight in ten households lived in owned dwelling units, a proportion higher than was reported in the 2004 NSDS. Almost two thirds of dwellings (63%) had iron sheets as roofing material, over one half were constructed with brick walls (some bricks were un-burnt though) and over seventy percent had earth floors.

Most of the households depended on firewood and charcoal for cooking and ironing. Most worryingly, the biggest proportion depended on traditional inefficient and 'wasteful' technologies that put the environment at risk. Moreover, electricity usage for both lighting and cooking is still very low (10% for lighting).

Serious attention should, therefore, be put to the plight of the poor households whose day-to-day subsistence is often directly linked to the natural resources around them. Provision and promotion of alternative and relatively cheap but clean and renewable energy resources is the ideal way to reverse the loss of environmental resources, protect the remaining natural resources and promote a healthy lifestyle among households.

# 7 CHAPTER SEVEN

## AGRICULTURE

## 7.1 Introduction

Agriculture still remains to be the main stay of Uganda's economy. Of the population of over 29.6 million people (est. June 2008), 85% live in the rural areas and mainly depend on agriculture for their livelihoods either as pure subsistence farmers or with a little semi-commercial farming. Agricultural output comes almost exclusively from the approximately 3 million rural small holders most of who have less than two hectares of land per capita. Food crop dominates the sector, in terms of acreage accounting for over 92 percent of the land under cultivation while export crops account for only 5 percent (MAAIF 2000).

This chapter presents the findings relating to policy implementation within the agriculture sector with a focus on delivery of the key services highlighted within the Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA). Specifically the service areas assessed during this survey included those that fall directly within the mandate of the agricultural sector. These are livestock epidemic diseases and pest control, plant pests and disease control, regulation and certification, provision of agricultural inputs in the communities; provision of extension or advisory services; provision of credit facilities in the communities; marketing information services for agricultural produce. The key findings are presented according to these specific areas and based on the main issues considered and assessed during the study.

## 7.2 Household Involvement in Agricultural Activities

Households were asked the activities in which they were engaged at the time of the survey. According to the findings, about 75 percent of households were involved in agricultural activities in 2008 compared to 64 percent in 2004. This could be attributed to the return of people from camps in the North and North East to their villages where they are now engaged in agriculture.

Four in every five households were engaged in Agriculture



Figure 7.1: Distribution of Household Involvement in Agricultural Activities in 2008 (%)

Households involved in agricultural activities were asked to specify which agricultural activities they were involved in. It should be noted that a number of households were involved in more than one agricultural activity. For the two survey periods, Crop Husbandry still dominated the rest of the agricultural activities (74%) since those engaged in other agricultural activities were more likely to be engaged in crop farming. Fish Farming on the other hand is still the agricultural activity least engaged in with only about one percent of the households as shown in Figure 7.2 below.



Figure 7.2: Distribution of Households by Involvement in Agricultural Activities at the Time of the Survey (%)

There was, however a considerable decline in both crop and animal husbandry activities

## 7.3 Crop husbandry

Households were asked whether they are currently producing selected crops for sale. The crops included Matooke, Maize, Sorghum/millet, Groundnuts, Beans, Sweet potatoes, Irish potatoes, Oranges, Cotton, Coffee and Tobacco. Figure 7.3 shows the proportion of households that reported that they currently produce the selected crops. Coffee is the most commonly grown cash crop (75%) followed by Irish potatoes (60%), rice and cotton. Sweet potatoes and groundnuts are least grown for commercial purposes. This could imply that they are mostly grown for subsistence. This is in conformity with the qualitative findings from 24 sites confirm that Sweet potatoes were the most commonly grown food crop, with a score of 18/24 (was mentioned in 18 sites out of 24 visited). This was closely followed by maize with a score of 17/24.



#### Figure 7.3: Major crops grown in the communities

## 7.4 Agricultural inputs

## 7.4.1 Use of Agricultural Inputs

About 14 percent of households reported use of at least one type of input while the other 86 percent did not use any input. The survey investigated the reasons for not using agricultural inputs.

Figure 7.4 shows that more than half of the households attributed non usage to lack of knowledge while sixteen percent indicated high cost of acquiring the inputs. In the

Focus Group Discussions, farmers in most of the sites noted that access to agricultural inputs is constrained by long distances on poor road networks, low returns from agricultural produce and lack of appropriate technology in some instances.



Figure 7.4: Distribution of households by reason for non-use of agricultural inputs (%)

## 7.4.2 Types of Agricultural inputs

Most common inputs mentioned were planting materials The household survey collected information on agricultural inputs used by households during the 12 months preceding the date of interview. Figure 7.5 shows that the most common inputs mentioned by households were planting materials (56%) followed by veterinary drugs (34%). Use of Artificial insemination and Fish Fry's was least reported (1% and 0.3% respectively).



## Figure 7.5: Proportion of households by type of Agricultural Inputs (%)

## 7.4.3 Source of Agricultural inputs

Currently the provision of agricultural inputs is done through Uganda National Agroinput Dealers Association (UNADA), stockists, Development Assistance programmes and some government projects. Households that indicated having used at least one input in the 12 months that preceded the survey were asked for the source of the input. From the findings, the highest percentage of households (66%) obtained agricultural inputs from markets, shops and local vendors as shown in Table 7.1.

<u> </u>	Shops/local					
	vendors/	Agricultural	Veterinary			
Input	markets	staff	staff	NGOs	Other	Total
Veterinary drugs	57.6	7.5	33.1	0.9	1.0	100
Hybrid seeds	66.4	17.4	0.6	10.1	5.6	100
Planting materials	74.8	13.7	0.3	6.7	4.6	100
Pesticides	86.6	5.0	3.5	1.5	3.5	100
Herbicides	91.2	4.0	1.3	1.3	2.2	100
Fungicides	89.6	5.9	1.3	0.9	2.3	100
Artificial fertilizer	73.1	9.1	1.0	3.8	13.1	100
Animal feeds	91.1	4.4	2.4	1.3	0.8	100
Pasture seed	57.0	23.9	1.7	7.1	10.3	100
Organic manure	72.2	15.3	2.1	2.4	8.1	100
Breeding stock	29.9	29.8	5.4	22.5	12.4	100
Irrigation Equipment	77.2	11.3	0.0	4.6	6.9	100
Artificial						
insemination	16.0	25.7	51.9	3.8	2.7	100
Fish fry/ fingerings	14.7	58.2	8.2	8.3	10.5	100
Others, specify	89.6	5.5	2.4	2.6	0.0	100

Table 7.1: Distribution of agricultural households by Type and Source of inputs (%)

## 7.4.4 Quality of Agricultural inputs

The households that rated the quality of inputs as good were above 70 percent for all the inputs used as shown in Table 7.2. The table further shows that the households that rated the quality of inputs as poor were all below five percent. This shows an improvement over the 2004 rating in almost all the quality variables.

Input	Good	Fair	Poor	Total	Freq.
Planting materials	71.4	26.1	2.5	100	4,274
Veterinary drugs	88.3	11.2	0.6	100	2,633
Hybrid seeds	83.1	14.2	2.7	100	2,288
Organic manure	82.5	16.2	1.3	100	1,801
Pesticides	83.8	13.9	2.3	100	1,261
Herbicides	81.6	13.9	4.6	100	835
Fungicides	87.7	10.1	2.2	100	704
Artificial fertilizer	89.2	10.6	0.2	100	545
Animal feeds	85.2	13.0	1.8	100	505

Table 7.2: Respondent perceptions of quality of major inputs

Regarding quality of inputs, farmers in the Focus Group Discussions in four (4) sites reported that the quality of some inputs was good. For example in Kyenjojo district farmers said that the hybrid seeds provided by NAADS were of good quality because they were resistant to diseases, their yields were higher compared to indigenous seeds, and that they matured early and were resistant to drought. In Nkokonjeru village, Mbarara district, farmers noted that the banana suckers they received were of good quality because they grew fast and produced good bunches though they did not taste as good as the indigenous ones.

Reports from Wakiso and Soroti districts farmers noted that the quality of inputs had been deteriorating over the years due to counterfeit agricultural inputs in the market. "When you buy a good quality product today, tomorrow there is a counterfeit", (Male participant, FGD, Wakiso district). The community in Majengo Soroti district also felt that poor storage facilities have a negative impact on the quality of drugs used for vaccination of livestock. "When drugs stay for long in stores and are exposed to heat they got spoiled and became ineffective," (Male farmer FGD). Yet another farmer raised another point regarding seeds; "Some of the seeds take long to mature and this might be caused by improper storage facilities like exposure to heat" (male participant, Majengo village, Soroti district.).

#### 7.4.5 Trends of Access to Inputs Since 2004

Findings in Table 7.3 show that most households indicated that access to inputs improved between 2004 and 2008. Access to hybrid seeds and fungicides was reported to have improved by over 70 percent of the households. However, access to herbicides and animal feeds was reported to have worsened by about six percent of the households.

Input	Improved	same	worsened	Total
Planting materials	55.0	43.5	1.5	100.0
Veterinary drugs	69.0	29.4	1.6	100.0
Hybrid seeds	73.0	25.0	2.0	100.0
Organic manure	61.8	37.2	1.1	100.0
Pesticides	68.9	29.5	1.7	100.0
Herbicides	64.8	29.1	6.1	100.0
Fungicides	71.0	25.5	3.5	100.0
Artificial fertilizer	65.5	31.6	2.9	100.0
Animal feeds	57.9	36.6	5.5	100.0
Pasture seed	57.8	38.9	3.3	100.0
Breeding stock	68.6	29.8	1.6	100.0

Table 7.3: Distribution of Households by rating for Change in Access to Inputs between 2004 and 2008 (%)

Farmers in the focus group discussions also revealed that inputs have become increasingly available. In Mabaare village, Kiruhura district, farmers noted that returns from milk production had increased because most farmers had replaced the local breeds with exotic or cross breeds. The increased returns provided the resources for farmers to purchase the inputs required.

In Kubo West Village, Busia district, it was reported that in 2004 there were no organisations providing inputs in the community. Individual farmers were buying inputs from farm supply shops at the district headquarters. However, by 2006, NAADS introduced advisory services and distribution of improved seeds to farmer groups. By 2007, improved seeds and fertilizers were provided to farmers involved in on-farm trials by the National Crop Resources Research Institute (NaCRRI) formerly known as Namulonge Research Station. The establishment of a demonstration farm in the same year, supported by NAADs, improved the situation even further. Farmers in Kakira village, Kamuli district, also noted that by 2004 access to agricultural inputs was hard because there were no local sources of inputs. However by 2005 NAADs had established demonstration sites for rice and maize resulting in increased supply of seeds to farmers' groups in 2006.

#### 7.4.6 Source of Market Information for Inputs

Market information on inputs is mainly received from other farmers Within the framework of PMA, it is envisaged that the process of modernizing agriculture will among other ways be achieved through access to information on inputs. Figure 7.6 shows the source of market information for each of the inputs. More than 90 percent of households received market information for inputs either through other farmers or Radio. While the source from other farmers is appreciated, there is need for technical personnel to follow up on proper usage.



Figure 7.6: Distribution of Households by Type of Inputs by Source of Market Information (%)

## 7.5 Extension services

The delivery of extension services involves on-farm support to farmers especially in the forms of farmer training, demonstrations, group mobilisation, on farm visits, sensitisation meetings, exchange visits/field days and study tours. These services are supposed to be provided by the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS). Other providers include the traditional extension system in areas not yet covered by NAADS, other government projects and programmes and the private sector, including NGOs.

## 7.5.1 Demand for Agricultural Extension Services

Almost three in ten households did not require extension services for crops Households that were involved in any agricultural activity were asked to state how often they required extension services. About 30 percent did not require extension services, for crops while 57 percent never required services for animal husbandry. It is not surprising that about 95 percent of the households did not require extension services for fish farming since very few households are engaged in fish farming. Most households that required extension services indicated that they needed them at least once a month particularly for Animal Husbandry (14%) and Crop Husbandry (20%).

			More than				
		Once a	once a	Once in	Once in 6		
Activity	Never	month	month	3 months	months	Annually	Total
Crop Husbandry	30.1	19.9	12.9	21.2	11.6	4.3	100.0
Animal Husbandry	56.7	14.4	11.4	10.8	4.6	2.2	100.0
Fish Farming	94.5	1.6	1.7	1.3	0.8	0.2	100.0
Total	68.9	9.4	6.9	8.7	4.4	1.8	100.0

#### Table 7.4: Percentage Household Demand for Agricultural Extension Services

#### 7.5.2 Availability and Utilization of Agricultural Extension Services

Respondents were asked whether they had ever been visited by an agricultural extension worker in the 12 months that preceded the survey. This was irrespective of whether they were involved in the relevant activity or not. The findings indicated that overall, only about 14 percent of the households had been visited by an extension worker within 12 months before the survey. The situation differed across sub regions as shown in Figure 7.7 below. The proportion of households visited by extension workers was highest in Northern region (21%) and relatively lower for Central, Western and Eastern regions.





Households that indicated having been visited by an extension worker were asked how often they were visited. Table 7.5 below shows the frequency of visits by the agricultural extension workers. More than 20 percent of the households were visited by agricultural extension workers at least once in every 3 months. However, for all the other types of activities, the frequency was less regular.

Only 14 percent of the households had been visited by an extension worker in the past 12 months

	Once a	More than once a	once in 3	once in 6			
Activity	month	month	months	months	annually	Other	Total
Crop Husbandry	18.8	9.9	24.7	20.5	19.5	6.6	100.0
Veterinary	16.9	9.1	21.2	15.8	13.8	23.1	100.0
Fisheries	10.9	21.1	27.2	18.2	17.4	5.4	100.0
Total	17.8	10.1	23.2	18.3	17.2	13.5	100.0

#### Table 7.5: Households Visited by Agricultural Extension Workers by Activity (%)

In the Focus Group Discussions, farmers felt there had been a drastic decline in provision of extension services (20 out of 24 sites). However some farmers in a few sites (4 out of 24) noted that there has been an improvement in access to agricultural extension services by farmers.

## 7.5.3 Source of Extension Services

Government is the main provider of extension services

Households that indicated having been visited by an extension worker in the 12 months that preceded the survey were asked about the source of extension service. The findings indicated that most of the extension services were provided by a government official constituting over 60 percent for each type of agricultural activity as shown in Table 7.6. This finding provides evidence of government efforts to take extension services closer to the people by locating them in every sub county.

Activity	Gov't	Private	NGO/ CBO	*Farmer	Other	Total
	official			group		
Crop Husbandry	66.3	4.5	17.6	9.2	2.5	100.0
Veterinary	60.6	21.9	8.1	7.5	1.8	100.0
Fisheries	56.9	8.1	0.0	35.0	0.0	100.0
Total	63.2	11.9	13.4	9.4	2.2	100.0

 Table 7.6: Distribution of Households by Activity and Source of Extension

 Service (%)

\*Farmer groups as recognized by the NAADS programme

## 7.5.4 Channels through which Extension Services are accessed

Households were asked about the most common and the preferred channels through which they received services from agricultural extension workers. More than one half of the households (50%) reported meetings with the extension worker (individual or joint) as the most common method used to access extension services as shown in Figure 7.8 below. The preference for joint meetings was high with about 61 percent of households preferring this channel. The probable explanation for this could be that in

Group meetings is the most preferred method of receiving extension services joint meetings, households easily learn from one another through sharing experiences. This should be encouraged by extension staff.



Figure 7.8: Distribution of Households by Most Common and Preferred Forms of Accessing Agricultural Extension Services (%)

The survey also indicated that the media was playing a significant role in agricultural extension service delivery. More than one in every five households reported the most common method of accessing agricultural extension services as the mass media. The preferred methods of accessing extension services therefore did not necessarily coincide with the most common methods used and this has implications on access to the services.

#### 7.5.5 Quality of Extension Services

Assessing the quality of extension services is important because it determines the satisfaction households derive from their use. This section discusses the satisfaction households had with agricultural extension services from all sources, the quality of government extension services and how these have changed over time.

Households were asked to rate the quality of agricultural extension services provided by government officials. Most households were satisfied with the services they received from all sources as shown in Table 7.7 below. Over three in every four (78%) households were satisfied with the extension services received.

Services	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Crop husbandry	78.9	16.8	4.3	100.0
Veterinary	77.9	18.3	3.8	100.0
Fisheries	74.5	2.1	23.4	100.0
Total	78.2	16.9	4.8	100.0

 Table 7.7: Distribution of Households by Satisfaction with Extension Services

 by Source and Region (%)

In the Focus Group discussions, the perception most farmers had of the quality of services provided by the various institutions was that NAADS and NGOs provided very good services but the services did not benefit all farmers and were therefore discriminative. With regard to services provided by government extension staff, the views expressed by farmers in most sites visited were that government extension workers were the most ineffective because they did not visit communities regularly to offer help.

The study also found some positive perceptions from farmers and service providers. For example in Dokolo district, the NAADS Coordinator noted that the quality of extension services in the district had improved because the NAADS /Production department were easily reached by farmers. At Kakira village, Kamuli District, farmers perceived extension services to be of good quality because veterinary doctors help to treat their animals and farmers groups were trained on how to look after animals through NAADS.

## 7.5.6 Trends in Provision of Extension Services

Most of the households involved in Crop and Animal Husbandry reported that the services had improved in the two years that preceded the survey as shown in Table 7.8. Whereas about 64 percent of the households involved in Crop Husbandry indicated that the quality of services had improved, only about 6 percent indicated that they had worsened.

64 percent of household engaged in crop husbandry reported an improvement in quality of services in the past two years
Services	Improved	same	Worsened	Total
Crop husbandry	79.73	14.29	5.98	100.00
Veterinary	74.32	20.17	5.51	100.00
Fisheries	70.64	18.74	10.62	100.00
Other, specify	68.48	22.47	9.04	100.00
Total	77.06	16.98	5.96	100.00

 Table 7.8: Distribution of Households by Change in the Quality of Government

 Extension Services (%)

#### 7.5.7 Constraints Faced by Agricultural Extension Workers

In the service provider questionnaire, information was sought on constraints that limit effectiveness of extension workers in delivering services. Respondents were asked to rank the constraints they faced in delivery of their services. Only the most serious constraint faced by every extension worker was considered. Findings show that lack of transport equipment (41%) and inadequate funding (23%) were reported as the most serious constraints facing extension workers as shown in Figure 7.9 below.



Figure 7.9: Challenges faced by extension workers

Other serious constraints included delayed remittance of funds, long distances to farmers and inadequate staff.

Extension workers were asked to compare their working environment now and two years ago as shown in Table 7.9. About 44 percent indicated that the remittance of funds and pay to staff had worsened now compared to 2 years ago. However improvements were also reported in areas of security and attitude of farmers.

Constraints	Improved	same	Worsened	Total
Delayed remittance of funds	13.2	43.0	43.9	100
Lack of transport / equipment	15.7	53.7	30.6	100
Inadequate staff	12.1	58.1	29.8	100
Long distances	2.6	87.2	10.3	100
Negative attitudes	30.0	45.9	24.1	100
Inadequate funding	29.5	35.2	35.2	100
Low pay to staff	1.6	54.1	44.3	100
Insecurity	44.4	48.2	7.4	100
Total	20.8	48.7	30.5	100

Table 7.9: Constraints faced by the Extension workers have changed in the last 2 years

#### 7.6 Marketing Information Services of Agricultural Produce

Within the framework of PMA, it is envisaged that the process of modernizing agriculture will among other ways be achieved through access to information on inputs. The aim of assessing this aspect of the sector's work was to find out if farmers were having access to marketing information in the process of selling their produce and procuring inputs, the institutions involved in providing the services, the channels used and the challenges and opportunities. Findings revealed lack of established system for marketing information and that in most cases farmers found their own solutions to market farm produce and to purchase inputs.

#### 7.6.1 Source of Market information on inputs and produce

Lack of access to market information causes exploitation of farmers by middlemen who purchase produce directly from farmers' homes because farmers do not know of alternative markets for their produce. Service providers were asked the method for delivery of market information.



#### Figure 7.10: Source of Information

16

Others Sources

Figure 7.10 shows the source of market information for each of the inputs and products. About 70 percent of the services provided by extension workers were through address to communities. The same source of information is used to get both products and input market information.

#### 7.7 Credit Facilities

35 30

25 20

SACCO

Agricultural Credit is part of the broader PMA pillar on improving access to rural finance. Currently agricultural credit is supposed to be provided through local Micro Finance Institutions; foreign based MFI such as FINCA, PRIDE, FAULU and VEDCO; and SACCOS being established at sub county level and other local saving and credit schemes. Figure 7.11 shows the sources of credit for the farmers. SACCO was reported to be the main source of credit followed by micro finance institutions.

15

Banks



24

Microfinance

Figure 7.11: Sources of credit for agricultural services

#### 7.8 Availability of credit facilities and challenges accessing credit in the communities

In the qualitative module, a number of institutions were identified by farmers in the various sites as those involved in provision of credit in the communities, including the forms of credit they provide and the mode of access from each source. However, there were a number of challenges identified by farmers that affected their access to credit especially for agricultural purposes. These included conditions set by credit institutions, high cost of assessing credit, lack of knowledge to access credit, inadequacy and unreliable institutions.

#### 7.9 Conclusion

About 75 percent of households were involved in agricultural activities in 2008 compared to 64 percent in 2004.

Close to 14 percent of households reported use of at least one type of input while the other 86 percent did not use any input. More than half of the households attributed non usage to lack of knowledge while sixteen percent indicated high cost of acquiring the inputs.

Most households indicated that access to inputs improved between 2004 and 2008. Access to hybrid seeds and fungicides was reported to have improved by over 70 percent of the households. However, access to herbicides and animal feeds was reported to have worsened by about six percent of the households.

About 30 percent of the households did not require extension services, for crops while 57 percent never required services for animal husbandry. It is not surprising that about 95 percent of the households did not require extension services for fish farming since very few households are engaged in fish farming.

Lack of transport equipment (41%) and inadequate funding (23%) were reported as the most serious constraints facing extension workers

SACCOs were the main source of agricultural credit with 45 percent of the household reporting so while only 24 percent got credit from Microfinance Institutions.

#### 8 CHAPTER EIGHT

#### TRANSPORT

#### 8.1 Introduction

The transport sector contributes immensely to the economic growth and poverty eradication in the country through various ways. An efficient transport infrastructure is vital in supporting economic growth and improvement of the quality of life of the population. The transport sector policy aims at providing strategic support and linkage to the Government Poverty Eradication Action Plan under Pillar II that seeks to enhance production. This explains Government's resolve to put in place a sound road network as a prerequisite for socioeconomic development of the country and to maintain coherence in the socio-economic environment. Easy mobility of goods and people provides the incentive for increased production and market access, and therefore has a positive effect on the improvement of the welfare of households.

The 10 year Road Sector Development Programme was thus set up to sustainably develop and maintain the country's national road network. The programme includes the development of district, urban and community access roads. District Local Governments are responsible for the routine and periodic maintenance of roads under their jurisdiction using funds from PAF and the Road Fund while trunk roads are the responsibility of the Central Government through the Ministry of Works and Transport.

The Survey collected information on road infrastructure. Questions on road infrastructure included those on access, current state and constraints faced in using the roads. The roads were categorized into four categories namely trunk road tarmac, trunk road murram, feeder roads and community roads. The trunk roads are main roads maintained by the central government and usually connect one district to others. The feeder roads are major roads joining trunk roads and are usually maintained by DLGs. The community roads are roads (excluding footpaths) connecting villages and are maintained by the communities themselves sometimes with assistance from the sub-county.

This Survey also collected information on water transport. Respondents were asked whether any of their household members used water transport during the last 2 years and if so, how frequently they used it, where they used the water transport and who provides the water transport services? Other questions were whether the services are

paid for, what were the major constraints faced in utilizing water transport and how government provided transport services changed in the last 2 years.

#### 8.2 Nearest Road to the Household

Overall, 64 percent of households reported Community road as the nearest type of road to their households Respondents were asked to mention the type of road nearest to their households and the results are presented in Table 8.1. Overall, 64 percent of households reported Community road as the nearest type of road to their households compared to 46 percent who reported in 2004. Trunk road (Tarmac) was reported as the nearest by only 5 percent of respondents compared to 10 percent in 2004. In rural areas, two in every three respondents (67 percent) reported Community roads as the nearest while only about 3 percent reported Trunk road (Tarmac) as the nearest. In Urban areas, the biggest proportion of households (51 percent) reported Community roads as the nearest to their households.

	2004			2008		
	Rural	Urban	National	Rural	Urban	National
Trunk road (Tarmac)	3.8	23	10.2	3.3	11.4	4.7
Trunk road (Murram)	12.6	16.1	13.8	8.4	5.7	7.9
Feeder road	29.1	32.3	30.2	21.5	31.8	23.3
Community Road	54.5	28.6	45.9	66.9	51.1	64.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 8.1: Distribution of Households By Type of The Nearest Road By Residence (%)

Table 8.2 shows the percentage distribution of households by nearest road by region. As can be seen, the majority of respondents in all the regions indicated Community road as the nearest type of road followed by Feeder road with the highest proportions reporting community roads in Upper East and Far West regions (81 percent respectively) while for Feeder roads it was Kampala (32 percent) and Mid East (29 percent). In Upper North region a higher proportion reported Trunk road (Murram) (26 percent) compared to Feeder road (22 percent). North East had no households reporting Trunk road (Tarmac) while Upper East had only one percent of respondents reporting Trunk road (Tarmac) as the nearest type of road. This may be an indication of low levels of urbanization in the regions. Upper Central and Near Central had the highest proportions of respondents reporting Trunk road (Tarmac) as the nearest type of road. This may be an indication of low levels of urbanization in the regions. Upper Central and Near Central had the highest proportions of respondents reporting Trunk road (Tarmac) as the nearest type of road (Nine percent each respectively).

		Trunk			
	Trunk road	road	Feeder	Community	
Region	tarmac	Murram	road	road	Total
Kampala	5.8	0.7	32.3	61.2	100.0
Mid Central	4.8	6.0	21.9	67.3	100.0
Upper Central	8.7	12.2	21.7	57.4	100.0
Lower Central	4.3	5.4	26.5	63.8	100.0
Near Central	8.8	6.3	27.5	57.5	100.1
Near East	3.7	5.1	18.7	72.5	100.0
Far East	7.7	7.2	23.4	61.7	100.0
Mid East	6.2	4.4	29.3	60.1	100.0
Upper East	1.0	2.9	14.8	81.3	100.0
Lower North	2.0	5.5	18.6	73.9	100.0
Upper North	4.7	25.7	22.2	47.4	100.0
North East	0.0	18.3	20.7	61.0	100.0
North West	4.2	12.6	28.6	54.6	100.0
Lower West	4.1	10.6	26.1	59.2	100.0
Far West	1.8	1.7	15.3	81.2	100.0
Mid West	4.4	10.9	23.4	61.3	100.0
Upper West	3.6	5.8	19.0	71.6	100.0
Uganda	4.7	7.9	23.3	64.1	100.0

Table 8.2: Distribution Of Households By Type Of The Nearest Road By Sub-Region (%)

#### 8.3 All Year Round Usability of Nearest Road

Overall, 89 percent of households reported usability of the nearest road all year round. The Survey collected information on the all year round usability of the nearest road to the households and the findings are presented in Table 8.3. Overall, 89 percent of households reported usability of the nearest road all year round compared to 77 percent reported in 2004. Ideally, Trunk roads are supposed to be usable all year round. However, of the respondents who reported Trunk road (tarmac) as the nearest road, two (2) percent reported that the road was not usable all year round, a decline from 4 percent in 2004. There was a notable increase in the proportion of households whose nearest road was a Community road reporting all year round usability (89 percent) compared to 67 percent reported in 2004 possibly indicating an improvement in the quality of Community roads.

	All Year Usability							
		2004			2008			
Type of Road	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total		
Trunk road (Tarmac)	96.2	3.8	100.0	97.6	2.4	100.0		
Trunk road (Murram)	86.7	13.3	100.0	90.1	9.9	100.0		
Feeder road	80.5	19.5	100.0	88.0	12.0	100.0		
Community Road	66.8	33.2	100.0	88.7	11.3	100.0		
Total	76.7	23.3	100.0	89.0	11.0	100.0		

Table 8.3: Distribution Of Households Reporting All Year Round Usability Of The Nearest Road (%)

#### 8.4 State of Roads

The Survey also collected information from households on the general state of roads in their areas. This information was supplemented by information from the sub-county chiefs who are supervisors of government programmes in the sub-counties.

#### 8.4.1 Constraints experienced when using Roads

Poor road maintenance was reported as the major constraint faced in using the roads. Respondents were asked to mention the major constraint experienced while using the road nearest to their households. Overall, 85 percent of respondents reported experiencing a major constraint while using the roads. The findings reported in Tables 8.4a and 8.4b show that of those who reported facing constraints while using the roads, overall, 68 percent reported poor maintenance as the major constraint faced compared to 53 percent reported in 2004. Only one percent reported insecurity as the major constraint faced denoting a decline from 10 percent in 2004.

	Major Constraints								
			Poor						
	Bad	Bad	Maintenanc						
Type of Road	Weather	Terrain	е	Insecurity	Other	Total			
Trunk road (Tarmac)	3.0	0.3	66.7	3.9	25.1	100.0			
Trunk road (Murram)	27.2	3.0	64.6	0.8	4.4	100.0			
Feeder road	26.3	3.1	67.4	0.9	2.4	100.0			
Community Road	23.8	3.4	70.9	0.8	1.3	100.0			
Total	24.0	3.0	68.0	1.0	4.0	100.0			

Table 8.4a: Distribution Of Households By Major Constraints Met When Using Roads (%)-2008

## Table 8.5b: Percentage Distribution Of Households By Major Constraints Met When Using Roads (%)-2004

	Major Constraints							
	Bad	Poor						
Type of Road	Weather	Maintenance	Insecurity	Other	Total			
Trunk road (Tarmac)	9.4	49.4	16.9	24.4	100.0			
Trunk road (Murram)	28.3	53.9	11.7	6.1	100.0			
Feeder road	34.2	54.3	8.4	3.1	100.0			
Community Road	38.1	52.3	7.8	1.9	100.0			
Total	31.9	53.0	9.7	5.4	100.0			

Sixty three percent of Sub-County authorities reported that roads/bridges/culverts were in a usable state. Information from households was supplemented with information from sub-county chiefs who were asked about the current state of roads/bridges in their respective sub-counties. The results are shown in Table 8.5. Overall, the majority (63 percent) reported the state of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossing as usable compared to 51 percent in 2004. About 18 percent indicated that they were in poor state compared to 27 percent reported in the previous survey.

	Current Status							
		200	4		2008			
Type of Road	Good	Usable	Poor	Total	Good	Usable	Poor	Total
Trunk road (Tarmac)	71.4	22.3	6.3	100.0	52.6	36.0	11.4	100.0
Trunk road (Murram)	29.6	56.0	14.4	100.0	19.6	53.5	26.9	100.0
Feeder road	16.6	59.9	23.5	100.0	10.3	55.6	34.1	100.0
Community Road	3.2	45.8	51.0	100.0	4.2	49.4	46.4	100.0
Bridges/Culvert								
Crossings	21.8	51.1	27.1	100.0	18.2	63.5	18.3	100.0
Total	22.0	50.0	28.0	100.0	16.2	53.9	29.9	100.0

### Table 8.6: Distribution Of Respondents By Current State of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossing and Type (%)

#### 8.4.2 Reason for Poor State of Roads

Sub-county Chiefs who reported poor state of roads/bridges/culvert crossings were asked the main reason for the poor state. Poor maintenance was cited as the major reason for the poor state of roads/bridges/culvert crossings for all types of roads/bridges/culverts by the highest proportion of respondents. Fifty four percent of the respondents cited it as the reason for the poor state of Trunk roads (tarmac) while 32 percent cited it for Feeder roads. Overall, it was mentioned by 37 percent of the respondents, a considerable decline when compared to 2004 where it was mentioned by 65 percent of the respondents. In both Surveys, lack of engineers was cited by the least proportion of respondents as the main reason for the poor state of roads/bridges/culvert crossings for all types of roads/bridges/culvert crossings for all types of roads/bridges/culvert crossings. A notable proportion of respondents (25 percent) cited bad weather as the reason for poor state of Bridges/Culverts, an increase from 10 percent when compared to 2004. As can be seen from the Tables 8.6a and 8.6b, the proportion that reported "Other" as the main reason increased drastically from eight (8) percent in 2004 to 30 percent.

From the Qualitative Survey, other reasons are that frequent use of roads by heavy trucks was putting pressure on the roads resulting into faster deterioration besides human activities such as sand and stone excavation. Bad farming practices on slopes near roads as well as throwing soil and grass in the roads were also reported to have greatly contributed to the poor condition of the roads. Others were inadequate funding of road maintenance activities and lack of land to expand/widen the roads. In addition, opening up and improvement of roads was reported to be hampered by human settlement activities which call for huge financial resources for compensation.

Poor maintenance was the major reason for the poor state of all types of roads/bridges/culvert crossings.

	Bad	Lack of	Poor	Lack of		
Type of Road	Weather	Equipment	Maintenance	Engineers	Other	Total
Trunk road (Tarmac)	0.0	11.5	53.9	0.0	34.6	100.0
Trunk road (Murram)	13.0	5.5	45.9	0.0	35.6	100.0
Feeder road	17.3	20.8	31.6	0.4	29.9	100.0
Community Road	15.1	17.7	33.8	1.0	32.5	100.0
Bridges/Culverts	25.2	11.3	41.7	3.5	18.3	100.0
Total	16.3	15.3	37.0	1.0	30.4	100.0

Table 8.7a: Distribution of respondents by Main Reason For Poor State of Roads (%)-2008

**Reason for Poor State of Roads** 

### Table 8.8b: Distribution of respondents by Main Reason For Poor State of Roads (%)-2004

	Reason for Poor State of Roads								
	Bad	Lack of	Poor	Lack of					
Type of Road	Weather	Equipment	Maintenance	Engineers	Other	Total			
Trunk road (Tarmac)	0.0	30.3	63.6	0.0	6.1	100.0			
Trunk road (Murram)	7.8	16.4	71.1	3.1	1.6	100.0			
Feeder road	11.8	12.5	69.2	1.5	5.0	100.0			
Community Road	12.2	11.5	65.0	1.0	10.3	100.0			
Bridges/Culverts	10.3	15.7	59.3	5.7	9.0	100.0			
Total	11.1	13.4	65.2	2.3	8.0	100.0			

#### 8.4.3 Change in Road Maintenance in the Last 2 years

Respondents at household level were asked their opinion about the change in maintenance of roads in their communities in the last 2 years. The findings reported in Figures 8.1a and 8.1b show that overall, the proportion of respondents reporting that there was no change in the maintenance of roads in the last 2 years preceding the Survey increased from 43 percent in 2004 to 48 percent while those who reported that it had worsened remained the same between the two surveys (16 and 17 percent respectively.

Forty eight percent of respondents reported there was no change in road maintenance in the 2 years preceding the Survey.



Figure 8.1a: Change in Road Maintenance in Last 2 Years (2008)





# 8.5 Quality of Maintenance and Repair of Roads, Bridges and Culvert Crossings

Countrywide, trunk roads are the responsibility of Ministry of Works and Transport. Feeder roads are under the responsibility of District Local Governments and Community roads are under a lower tier of Local Government – Sub counties/LCIII and the communities themselves.

#### Half of the Sub-County authorities reported that quality of maintenance was average.

The Survey collected information on quality of maintenance from Sub-county Chiefs and the findings are presented in the Table 8.7. Overall, about half of the respondents in both Surveys reported that the quality of maintenance of roads/bridges/culvert crossings was average (50 percent for 2004 and 51 percent respectively). The proportion of respondents who reported that the quality was poor increased overall from 23 percent to 30 percent.

	duality of maintenance							
		2004			2008			
			Poo				Poo	
Type of Road	Good	Average	r	Total	Good	Average	r	Total
Trunk road (Tarmac)	59.3	31.1	9.5	100.0	42.7	39.8	17.5	100
Trunk road (Murram)	35.9	49.0	15.1	100.0	21.1	47.1	31.8	100
Feeder road	22.1	58.7	19.2	100.0	15.6	54.7	29.7	100
Community Road	9.9	49.7	40.4	100.0	8.5	48.6	42.9	100
Bridges/Culvert								
Crossings	28.3	50.2	21.5	100.0	22	56.6	21.4	100
Total	26.6	50.0	23.3	100.0	19.3	50.7	30	100

Table 8.9: Distribution Of Respondents By Quality of Maintenance and Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossing (%)

Quality of maintananaa

#### 8.5.1 Possession of Minimum Road Equipment

Information was solicited from Sub-County authorities on whether their districts had the minimum road maintenance equipment (Grader, Wheel loader and Tipper). The findings reported in Table 8.8 show that nearly 71 percent of respondents reported their districts had Graders, around a half reported their districts had Wheel loaders and 68 percent reported having a Tipper.

	Pos	Possession of Minimum Road Equipment				
Type of Equipment	Yes	No	DK	Total		
Grader	70.9	26.4	2.8	100.0		
Wheel loader	50.3	40.9	8.9	100.0		
Tipper	67.8	27.9	4.2	100.0		

### Table 8.10: Distribution of Respondents by District Possession of Minimum Road Maintenance Equipment (%)-2008

Those Sub-County officials who reported that their districts had the minimum road maintenance equipment were further asked whether their Sub-Counties ever have access to this road equipment. Just over two thirds of the respondents (68 percent) reported that they have access to this equipment while the rest reported that they do not.

Lack of fuel at Sub-County was the major reason why Sub-Counties do not access road equipment. Sub-County officials who reported that they do not have access to road equipment from the district were asked the major reason why. As shown in Figure 8.2, the results show that lack of fuel at Sub-County was the major reason reported by majority of respondents (47 percent) for Sub-Counties not accessing road maintenance equipment. Compared to 2004, this was a decline from 55 percent. Poor relations with District Headquarters was cited as the major reason by the least proportion of respondents in both surveys (4 and 8 percent respectively).



Figure 8.3: Distribution of Respondents by Reason why Sub-County could not access Road Equipment from District (%)

#### 8.5.2 Frequency of Repairs

Information was collected from Sub-County officials on the frequency of repairing roads. The methods of repair that were considered were routine manual, routine mechanized, regular manual and regular mechanized. The findings are presented in Table 8.9a. Overall, routine manual was the most reported mode of repair (approximately 30 percent) followed by regular manual (20 percent) and routine mechanized (19 percent). For Community roads both routine and regular mechanized were the least frequent mode of repairs (6 and 10 percent respectively). Similarly in 2004 it was 4 and 3 percent respectively (see Table 8.9b).

	Routine	Routine	Regular	Regular		
Type of Road	Manual	mechanised	Manual	mechanised	Other	Total
Trunk road (Tarmac)	24.6	24.3	10.0	27.5	13.6	100.0
Trunk road (Murram)	21.4	33.5	7.9	26.8	10.5	100.0
Feeder road	30.3	21.7	16.7	21.5	9.9	100.0
Community Road	38.3	6.1	31.1	10.2	14.4	100.0
Bridges/Culvert Crossings	30.2	14.2	25.3	10.0	20.3	100.0
Total	29.9	18.8	19.7	17.8	13.9	100.0

### Table 8.11a: Distribution Of Respondents By Frequency of Repair by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossing (%)-2008

Table 8.12b: Distribution Of Respondents By Frequency of Repair by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossing (%)-2004

	Frequency of Repairs					
	Routine	Routine	Regular	Regular		
Type of Road	Manual	mechanised	Manual	mechanised	Other	Total
Trunk road (Tarmac)	20.3	41.2	7.3	15.2	15.9	100.0
Trunk road (Murram)	25.2	41.4	8.9	17.7	6.8	100.0
Feeder road	41.1	19.4	19.9	12.5	7.2	100.0
Community Road	43.3	4.0	33.5	3.2	15.9	100.0
Bridges/Culvert Crossings	32.7	11.7	25.9	7.8	22.0	100.0
Total						

#### 8.5.3 Constraints faced in the Maintenance and Repair of Roads

Sub-County officials were asked to rank the three most serious constraints that hindered maintenance and repair of roads. The results are presented in Table 8.10. The constraints were ranked as most serious, serious and least serious. The results show that inadequate funding was the most serious constraint reported (slightly over 66 percent) and it was also the most serious constraint reported in 2004 (49 percent). Low pay to staff and insecurity were generally not considered as serious constraints given the small proportions of respondents that mentioned them in both Surveys.

Inadequate funding was the most serious constraint faced in the repair and maintenance of roads.

	Order of Ranking							
-	2004							
-	Most		Least	Most		Least		
Constraints	serious	Serious	Serious	serious	Serious	Serious		
Delayed remittance of funds	17.1	15.4	15.3	4.9	3.8	5.2		
Inadequate facilities	16.6	31.7	26.6	13.4	22.6	19.4		
Inadequate staff	2.2	7.4	12.6	0.9	9.2	10.5		
Wide road network	3.4	10.0	12.0	0.9	5.1	9.3		
lack of people's interest	4.8	8.6	8.0	4.1	20.8	22.1		
Inadequate funding	48.9	19.5	11.8	66.3	17.8	5.6		
Low pay to staff	0.5	1.7	4.0	0.1	0.3	3.5		
Insecurity	3.2	2.1	3.0	0.0	0.1	2.3		
Other	3.2	3.6	6.7	9.5	20.3	21.9		
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		

Table 8.13: Distribution of Respondents by Constraints to Maintenance andRepair of Roads by Degree of Seriousness (%)

The respondents (Sub-county Chiefs) were further asked whether there had been any changes in the maintenance and repair of roads in the last 2 years preceding the Survey. The findings presented in Figure 8.3 show that generally the maintenance remained the same (55 percent in 2004 compared to 51 percent in 2008) whereas the proportion that reported that the maintenance had worsened increased from 14 to 36 percent).



Figure 8.4: Distribution Of Respondents By Change in Maintenance Repair of Roads (%)

#### 8.5.4 Construction of New Road Infrastructure

Sub-County officials were asked whether any road/bridge/culvert crossings had been constructed in their sub-counties in the last 2 years preceding the Survey. The findings reported in Table 8.11 indicate that overall, only 33 percent of respondents reported that there had been construction of new roads/bridges/culvert crossings. The highest proportion of new constructions was of bridges/culvert crossings (59 percent) and the same was true in 2004 (60 percent). Among road types, the highest proportion of new roads were community roads (45 percent) and the same was true in 2004 (49 percent). The least new constructions were of trunk road (murram) reported by 6 percent of respondents.

### Table 8.14: Distribution of Respondents by Construction of New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings (%)

	Construction of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossing					
		2004		2008		
Type of Road	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Trunk road (Tarmac)	10.9	89.1	100.0	10.5	89.5	100.0
Trunk road (Murram)	15.6	84.4	100.0	5.7	94.3	100.0
Feeder road	38.0	62.0	100.0	26.7	73.3	100.0
Community Road	49.1	50.9	100.0	45.0	55.0	100.0
Bridges/Culvert Crossings	60.3	39.7	100.0	59.3	40.7	100.0
Total	39.3	60.7	100.0	32.9	67.2	100.0

Sub-County officials who reported road construction were further asked the type and length of the road constructed in the last 2 years preceding the Survey. The results shown in Table 8.12a and 10.12b reveal that overall, the majority of respondents (35 percent) reported construction of less than 10 km of new roads in the sub-counties. Only 21 percent reported construction of new roads of 50 km and above. Of the new tarmac roads constructed in the sub-counties, 82 percent were reported to be less than 10 km long.

The highest proportion of new constructions in the 2 years preceding the Survey was of bridges/culvert crossings.

		Length of Road Constructed						
					50 km			
		10 to	20 to		and			
Type of Road	Less than 10km	20km	30km	30 to 50km	more	Total		
Trunk road (Tarmac)	82.5	13.1	4.0	0.0	0.4	100.0		
Trunk road (Murram)	44.4	28.9	11.0	9.3	6.4	100.0		
Feeder road	14.5	20.3	19.0	24.2	22.0	100.0		
Community Road	12.2	11.4	9.5	17.6	49.3	100.0		
Total	35.4	18.7	11.4	13.7	20.8	100.0		

### Table 8.15a: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of Road (%)-2008

Table 8.16b: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Road Constructed by Type of Road (%)-(2004)

	Length of Road Constructed						
					50 km		
	Less	10 to	20 to		and		
Type of Road	than10km	20km	30km	30 to 50km	more	Total	
Trunk road (Tarmac)	67.9	28.3	3.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	
Trunk road (Murram)	59.7	25.6	10.1	3.1	1.6	100.0	
Feeder road	54.2	21.3	12.6	7.0	4.9	100.0	
Community Road	53.8	24.0	7.4	7.8	6.9	100.0	
Total	55.2	23.4	9.5	6.6	5.3	100.0	

#### 8.5.5 Reason for not constructing new road infrastructure

Sub-County officials who reported no new construction of road infrastructure were asked the reason for not constructing. The results are presented in Table 8.13a. Overall, lack of funds was cited by 64 percent of the respondents as the reason for not undertaking any new road infrastructure constructions. This was a slight decline compared to 68 percent reported in 2004. Insecurity was cited as the main reason by the least proportion of respondents in both surveys (less than 1 percent and 2 percent respectively).

Lack of funds was cited as the reason for not undertaking any new road infrastructure constructions.

	Reason					
Type of		Lack of	Lack of			
Road/Bridge/Culvert	No need	funds	Equipment	Insecurity	Other	Total
Trunk road (Tarmac)	37.7	59.2	0.8	0.0	2.3	100.0
Trunk road (Murram)	35.7	55.9	5.6	0.4	2.4	100.0
Feeder road	20.3	68.1	7.3	0.4	3.9	100.0
Community Road	22.2	65.3	5.8	1.1	5.6	100.0
Bridge/Culvert	19.1	73.4	6.0	0.0	1.6	100.0
Total	27.1	63.8	5.5	0.4	3.3	100.0

Table 8.17a: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings (%)-2008

Table 8.18b: Reason for not constructing a New Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings by Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert Crossings (%)-2004

	Reason					
Type of Road/Bridge/Culvert	No need	Lack of funds	Lack of Equipment	Insecurity	Other	Total
Trunk road (Tarmac)	46.3	43.7	2.3	0.0	7.7	100.0
Trunk road (Murram)	24.1	64.1	4.0	2.0	5.7	99.9
Feeder road	11.8	75.9	6.5	1.9	3.9	100.0
Community Road	12.1	74.1	5.8	3.7	4.3	100.0
Bridge/Culvert	12.9	76.6	4.7	2.5	3.3	100.0
Total	19.8	68.3	4.9	2.1	4.9	100.0

#### 8.6 Water Transport

Approximately 18 percent of Uganda's total area is covered by water bodies in the form of lakes, rivers and swamps some of which are navigable. Communities living on islands and along these water bodies use water transport.

#### 8.6.1 Households using Water Transport

Only 11 percent of households used water transport.

The Survey solicited information from households about whether any household member used water transport in the last 2 years preceding the Survey. Only 11 percent of households reported their household members having used water transport in the last 2 years which proportion was almost the same as that reported in 2004 (10%).

#### 8.6.2 Frequency of Using Water Transport

Households that reported using water transport were asked the frequency of using water transport. The results are presented in Figure 8.4. The findings show that use of water transport is not frequent. Only 12 percent of those who reported using water transport use it daily which is consistent with what was reported in 2004 (11 percent). Of the households that reported using water transport, about 6 in 10 households use it once in more than a month.



Figure 8.5: Distribution of Households by Frequency of Using Water Transport (%)

#### 8.6.3 Location of Water Transport

Respondents were asked where the water transport is located. Table 8.14 reports the findings. Forty percent reported that the water transport was intra- district while another 40 percent reported that it was inter-district. This is similar to what was reported in 2004 (41 and 43 percent respectively). Outside District was reported by the least percentage of households in both Surveys.

Table 8.19: Distribution of Households b	y Location of Water Transport	(%)	ļ
--	-------------------------------	-----	---

	2004	2008
Location	Percent	Percent
Within District	41.4	40.2
Between District and Neighbouring District	43.4	40.2
Outside District	15.2	19.6
Total	100.0	100.0

#### 8.6.4 Major Providers of Water Transport

The private sector is still the major provider of water transport services.

Respondents were asked the major providers of boat and ferry services. The findings presented in Table 8.15 show that 93 percent of boat services are provided by private individuals while government only provides 7 percent. This finding is consistent with the 2004 results which showed that government only provided 8 percent of boat services while 92 percent was provided by private individuals. On the other hand, Government was reported as the major provider of ferry services in both Surveys (86 and 81 percent respectively). Overall, private water transport service providers were the major service providers in both Surveys.

	Major Provider						
	2004			2008			
Type of Water Transport	Government	Private	Total	Government	Private	Total	
Boats	8.2	91.8	100.0	7.0	93.0	100.0	
Ferry	85.8	14.2	100.0	81.3	18.7	100.0	
Other	13.5	86.5	100.0	11.8	88.2	100.0	
Group Total	23.6	76.4	100.0	27.7	72.3	100.0	

#### Table 8.20: Type of Water Transport by Major Provider

#### 8.6.5 Payment for Water Transport Provided by the Government

Ferry transport is considered as part of the road infrastructure. Government is the major provider and has six of them under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Works and Transport while others are privately owned. As a government policy, government ferries provide a free service. Respondents were asked whether they made payments for water transport and the findings are presented in Table 8.16 below. Boat services were generally paid for (63 percent) since they are largely operated by private individuals. Compared to 2004, the proportion that paid for boat services declined from 83 percent to 63 percent. The proportion paying for ferry services increased from 18 percent in 2004 to 30 percent.

		Payment for the Water Transport Service							
	2004			2008					
Type of Water Transport	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total			
Boats	83.3	16.7	100.0	62.8	37.2	100.0			
Ferry	18.2	81.8	100.0	30.2	69.8	100.0			
Other	58.4	41.6	100.0	76.2	23.8	100.0			
Group Total	34.5	65.5	100.0	35.2	64.8	100.0			

Table 8.21: Type of Water Transport by payment for the Water Transport Service

Respondents who made payments for water transport services provided by government were further asked the purpose of the payment. The findings are presented in Figure 8.5. The majority of respondents reported that the payments were official fees (87 percent) a slight decline from 91 percent reported in 2004. Only 3 percent reported that the payments were bribes compared to 0 percent in 2004 and only 1 percent reported the payments as tokens of appreciation, a decline from 6 percent in 2004.

Figure 8.6: Distribution of Households by Purpose of Payment for Ferry Transport (%)



#### 8.6.6 Satisfaction with Water Transport provided by Government

The Survey collected information on whether respondents were satisfied with water transport services provided by government. The results are shown in Figure 8.6. Only 38 percent reported that they were satisfied compared to 77 percent reported in 2004 while 62 percent reported that they were not satisfied compared to 32 percent reported in 2004.



### Figure 8.7: Distribution of Households Satisfied By Water Transport Services Provided by Government (%)

#### 8.6.7 Constraints Faced in Using Water Transport

The Survey collected information on constraints faced in using water transport. The findings given in Table 8.17a show that for boats, the major constraint is bad weather (55 percent). This was also the major constraint reported in 2004 reported at 46 percent (Table 8.17b). For ferries, unreliability was the major constraint reported (33 percent). Overall, bad weather was reported as the major constraint faced in utilizing water transport services (34 percent) followed by unreliability (30 percent). In 2004, overall, unreliability was the major constraint cited (44 percent) followed by bad weather (33 percent).

Table	8.22a:	Distribution	of	Households	by	Туре	of	Water	transport	and
Const	raints F	aced (%)-2008	8							

				Major Constrai	ints		
Type of	Water	Bad					
Transport		Weather	Unreliable	High Cost	Insecurity	Other	Total
Boats		55.5	12.3	10.2	1.9	20.0	100.0
Ferry		31.7	33.4	4.1	1.5	29.3	100.0
Other		26.5	9.8	19.3	3.2	41.2	100.0
Total		33.9	30.3	5.4	1.6	28.8	100.0

Bad weather and unreliability were the major constraints reported.

			Major Constrai	nts		
Type of Water	Bad				0.1	
Transport	Weather	Unreliable	High Cost	Insecurity	Other	lotal
Boats	46.1	26.9	17.1	3.8	6.2	100.0
Ferry	28.4	49.7	1.9	5.6	14.4	100.0
Other	84.3	15.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Total	33.4	43.6	5.8	5.1	12.2	100.0

Table 8.23b: Distribution of Households by Type of Water transport and Constraints Faced (%)-2004

#### 8.6.8 Change in Provision of water Transport by Government

The Survey also collected information on respondents' perceptions on change in the provision of water transport services in the last 2 years preceding the Survey. Table 8.18 shows that overall, 45 percent of respondents reported that government provided water transport services have remained the same while 36 percent reported that services had improved. Nineteen percent reported that the services had worsened in the last 2 years. Compared to 2004, there has been a decline in the proportion that reported improvement in the services from 54 percent to 36 percent.

Table 8.24: Change in Provision of Water	Transport by	y Government
--	--------------	--------------

	Change in the Last 2 Years							
		2004						
Type of Water								
Transport	Improved	Same	Worsened	Total	Improved	Same	Worsened	Total
Boats	32.3	59.8	7.8	100.0	19.5	39.0	41.5	100.0
Ferry	60.7	35.4	3.9	100.0	36.5	46.7	16.8	100.0
Other	15.7	84.3	0.0	100.0	68.3	19.3	12.4	100.0
Total	53.8	41.4	4.8	100.0	35.6	45.4	19.0	100.0

#### 8.7 Conclusion

The survey findings indicate that Community roads are the nearest type of road to the majority of households as reported by 64 percent of respondents. Generally, all road types were reported as usable all year round possibly indicating some improvement. Poor maintenance was cited as the major reason for the poor state of roads/bridges/culvert crossings for all types of roads/bridges/culverts. Half of the respondents reported that the quality of maintenance of roads/bridges/culvert crossings was average. Inadequate funding was the most serious constraint reported

(66 percent). It was also the most serious constraint that hindered maintenance and repair of roads.

Only 11 percent of households reported their household members having used water transport in the last 2 years. 93 percent of boat services are provided by private individuals while government only provides 7 percent. Only 38 percent of respondents reported that they were satisfied with government provided water transport services.

### 9 CHAPTER NINE

#### JUSTICE, LAW AND ORDER

#### 9.1 Introduction

The Government of Uganda launched the Justice, Law and Order Sector (JLOS) reform programme in 2000, a sector wide approach (SWAP) to increase coordination and cooperation across key institutions involved in the administration of justice. The purpose of all this was to promote the rule of law, good governance, increase public confidence in the Criminal Justice System, and to enhance the ability of the private sector to make and enforce commercial contracts. This framework has enhanced coherence in policy discussion, decision-making and resource allocation among participating institutions.

Supported by various International development Partners, this sector wide JLOS Reform Programme is coordinated through the Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs (MoJCA). Other member institutions of JLOS include Ministry of Internal Affairs, Ministry of Local Government (specifically Local Council courts), Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (particularly probation services), Directorate of Ethics and Integrity and the Judiciary. Specific departments include amongst others, the Administrator General's Office, the Registrar General's Office, the Immigration and Permits Department, the Community Service Program, The Judiciary Service Commission, the Uganda Law Society, the Supreme Court, Court of Appeal, the High Court, the Commercial Court, Magistrates Courts, Land Tribunal and Legal Aid Services, the Centre for Arbitration and Dispute Resolution, the Uganda Police Force (including CID and Community Policing), the Uganda Prisons Services, the Department of Public Prosecution (DPP), the Tax Appeals Tribunal, the Law Reform Commission and the Uganda Human Rights Commission.

The above statements demonstrate that JLOS is no doubt an important sector with an equally big mandate. It requires, therefore, a lot of quality information to be generated regularly to facilitate correct standards and reforms needed for sustainable quality service delivery.

The 2008 NSDS included a number of questions intended to assess the performance of the JLOS for which this chapter presents key findings. Where appropriate,

information from the NSDS Qualitative Study was included to complement the quantitative findings. Also where possible, comparisons with NSDS 2004 have been made.

# 9.2 Knowledge of Institutions for Arbitration or Conflict Resolution

#### Nine in ten households know about the Police as institution for arbitration

Respondents were asked whether any member of their households knew of any institution as a place where they could go for arbitration or conflict resolution or redress in a case of any problem. The results in Table 9.1 show that knowledge of LC 1 is almost universal (97%) while only three percent knew about the Uganda Law Reform Commission and four percent reported knowledge of the Uganda Law Council. It is worth noting that 92 percent knew the Police as a place where they could go for arbitration or conflict resolution.

 Table 9.1: Distribution of Households which knew Institutions for Arbitration and Conflict Resolution

Institution	% knowing institutions for arbitration and conflict resolution	% not knowing	
Customary courts	31.6	69.4	
LCI	97.4	2.6	
LCII	74.0	26.0	
LCIII	75.3	24.7	
Uganda Police	91.7	8.3	
Prisons	55.1	44.9	
Magistrates court	57.6	42.4	
District Land Tribunal	23.6	76.4	
High court	33.7	66.3	
Administrator General	10.4	89.6	
Directorate of Public Prosecution	8.9	91.1	
Uganda Human Rights Commission	13.4	86.6	
Uganda Law Council	3.9	96.1	
Uganda Law Reform Commission	2.7	97.3	

#### 9.3 Access and Use of Administrative and Legal Services

About one in five Households had an issue or case which required LC I intervention in the last four years preceding the survey

Increasing access to institutions was taken to be a sign of confidence in the administrative and legal system. The survey investigated the extent to which households used the different institutions. Respondents were asked whether they had any issue/case that required institution or court intervention and whether they actually used the institution/court since the last NSDS of 2004. Table 9.2 shows that the proportion of households who had an issue or case which required institution/court

attention increased over the last four years for all the institutions. For customary courts, the proportion increased from three to 14 percent while for Police this increased from six to 10 percent over the two survey periods. The institutions that were mainly required were LC1, Customary courts and the Uganda Police. Only negligible proportions of the households (less than one percent) required interventions from Uganda Human Rights Commission, Uganda Law Council and Uganda Law Reform Commission.

	% issue requiring Institution or Court				
Institution	2004	2008			
Customary courts	3.3	13.8			
LCI	11.2	21.2			
LCII	1.5	4.7			
LCIII	1.6	4.0			
Uganda Police	6.0	10.5			
Prisons	0.7	2.4			
Magistrates court	1.3	3.5			
District Land Tribunal	0.4	2.5			
High court	0.3	1.1			
Administrator General	-	3.7			
Directorate of Public Prosecution	-	2.0			
Uganda Human Rights Commission	-	0.5			
Uganda Law Council	-	0.3			
Uganda Law Reform Commission	-	0.3			

 Table 9.2: Distribution of Households which had an Issue/Case that required Institutions/courts intervention in the last 4 years

**Note:** No information was collected on Uganda Human Rights Commission, Uganda Law Council and Uganda Law Reform Commission in the 2004 Survey

The households that reported having an issue/case requiring institution or court intervention were asked to state the nature of the last issue/case. The survey revealed that majority of the households contacted the various institutions/ courts to resolve complaints. Overall 64 per cent of the cases presented to the institutions were complaints and the trend is almost similar to what was depicted in 2004 as shown in Figure 9.1.



Figure 9.1: Nature of issue or Case Requiring Arbitration

The majority of the Households who required intervention used the services The survey further established whether the institution/court were actually utilized. Results of the survey show that majority of the households that required the services actually used the institutions as Table 9.3 shows. Usage of almost all the institutions/court was higher in the NSDS 2008 as compared to 2004 except for the High Court. This is an indication the people are knowing better the use of the institutions. Over 90 percent of the households that required services of the institutions actually used them except for LC II, District Land Tribunal and the High Court. All the few households which required the services of the Human Rights Commission, Law Council and Law Reform Commission actually used them.

	% Using the Institution or Court			
Institution	2004	2008		
Customary courts	90.1	93.6		
LCI	85.3	93.0		
LCII	79.6	88.2		
LCIII	89.1	93.4		
Uganda Police	87.8	92.0		
Prisons	86.0	93.7		
Magistrates court	91.9	94.1		
District Land Tribunal	83.2	88.1		
High court	92.5	89.1		
Administrator General	-	97.9		
Directorate of Public Prosecution	-	93.0		
Uganda Human Rights Commission	-	100.0		
Uganda Law Council	-	100.0		
Uganda Law Reform Commission	-	100.0		

#### Distribution Households Table 9.3: of which actually used the Institutions/courts

#### 9.4 Quality of and Satisfaction with Administrative and Legal **Services**

The survey solicited information on the time it took to resolve the issue/ case as a proxy for effectiveness. Tables 9.4 and 9.5 show that overall, 77 percent of the cases took less than one month which is an improvement from 66 percent reported in the NSDS 2004. Most of the cases with the District land tribunal (38%) were reported to be still pending which was the same trend in 2004 only that the proportion of households reporting so reduced from 52 percent. Customary courts and LC 1 had most of their cases resolved in less that a month.

ssue/case by institution (2004)						
Institution	less than one month	1 to 6 months	7 to 12 months	More than 12 months	Case pending	
Customary courts	77.6	11.9	2.5	3.4	4.6	
LCI	74.5	12.5	.9	1.9	10.2	
LCII	65.6	20.0	1.6	2.3	10.4	
LCIII	58.5	22.7	3.0	4.3	11.5	
Local administration police	65.0	19.1	2.5	3.4	10.0	
Central police	61.1	13.6	2.9	3.5	18.9	
Prisons	37.7	35.9	7.0	8.7	10.7	
Magistrates court	28.1	26.0	7.6	14.9	23.4	
District Land Tribunal	11.9	15.2	1.2	19.1	52.6	

15.2

21.1

15.5

1.2

13.9

2.3

19.1

19.7

13.6

4.0

52.6

25.9

12.5

12.7

11.9

19.4

73.8

65.5

High court

Other

Total

Table 9.4: Distribution of Households by the Time it Took to Resolve the Issue/Case by Institution (2004)

Institution	less than one month	1 to 6 months	7 to 12 months	More than 12 months	Case pending
Customary courts	83.5	7.9	1.5	1.5	5.6
LCI	85.4	7.7	0.5	0.5	6.0
LCII	75.2	14.0	1.6	1.7	7.5
LCIII	68.2	15.3	3.0	3.0	10.5
Uganda police	75.3	12.0	1.1	1.0	10.7
Prisons	72.2	13.6	4.1	0.7	9.5
Magistrates court	39.2	26.4	8.5	9.0	16.9
District Land Tribunal	17.6	28.1	1.8	14.5	38.0
High court	35.5	27.9	0.0	8.0	28.9
Administrator General	28.3	25.8	7.0	10.2	28.6
Directorate of Public Prosecution	43.7	26.4	0.0	0.0	30.0
Human Rights Commission	58.0	28.7	0.0	0.0	13.3
Uganda Law Council	-	-	-	-	-
Uganda Law Reform Commission	-	-	-	-	-
Total	76.9	11.2	1.5	1.6	8.8

Table 9.5: Distribution of Households by the Time it Took to Resolve the Issue/Case by Institution (2008)

Note: There are few observations for the Uganda Law Council and Uganda Law Reform commission to make meaningful conclusions

Close to three out of four Households that with used the various institutions were sho satisfied with the services received the

The respondents were asked whether the household or person involved was satisfied with the way the case was handled. Results are presented in Table 9.6 and they show a high level of satisfaction with the services. For all institutions, 73 percent of the households were satisfied with the services which is not statistically significant from 75 percent who reported being satisfied with the services in 2004. Households were very satisfied with the Customary courts (84%) and LC courts (78%) and the findings are similar to the 2004 NSDS where it was reported that the work of LC I and LC courts was appreciated.

Table	9.6:	Distribution	of	Households	Satisfied	with	Services	of
Institut	ions/C	ourts						

	% Satisfied with Services of Institutions/Courts				
Institution	2004	2008			
Customary courts	82.4	83.6			
LCI	77.9	77.6			
LCII	78.0	73.1			
LCIII	75.2	74.3			
Uganda Police	66.7	63.6			
Prisons	66.0	59.5			
Magistrates court	70.8	59.6			
District Land Tribunal	66.7	60.0			
High court	66.3	48.7			
Administrator General	91.3	63.4			
Directorate of Public Prosecution	-	60.2			
Uganda Human Rights Commission	-	86.7			
Uganda Law Council	-	-			
Uganda Law Reform Commission	-	-			

72.8

All insttitutions

74.9

Note: There are few observations for the Uganda Law Council and Uganda Law Reform Commission to make meaningful conclusions

#### 9.5 Payment for Administrative and Legal Services

Access to services can be limited if the charges are high and not affordable. Wrongful demand for money from people is also a concern to government and measures have been instituted to curb corruption. Households were asked whether they made any official or unofficial payments for the services they received and the purpose for which the payments were made. The findings in Table 9.7 indicate that 50 per cent of the respondents who accessed services had to make some payments. This is 3 percentage points less the proportion that had to pay in the 2004 NSDS. The highest percentage of respondents reported making payment to Uganda Police (62%). The Uganda Human Rights Commission had the least percentage of respondents who indicated payment for the services (26%).

	% Paying for Services			
Institution	2004	2008		
Customary courts	40.5	37.6		
LCI	53.7	48.8		
LCII	55.4	50.1		
LCIII	51.0	44.8		
Uganda Police	60.4	61.6		
Prisons	45.6	52.3		
Magistrates court	51.8	47.0		
District Land Tribunal	52.3	58.0		
High court	30.7	47.7		
Administrator General	-	57.4		
Directorate of Public Prosecution	-	38.6		
Uganda Human Rights Commission	-	25.8		
Uganda Law Council	-	-		
Uganda Law Reform Commission	-	-		

#### Table 9.7: Distribution of Households that made payments

Respondents who made payments before the cases were resolved were asked the purpose for which the payments were made. It was established that some respondents made official payments before the cases were resolved which included bail, bond and case fee and others made unofficial payments which included bribes and token of thanks. The households that made payment before or after their issue/ case was resolved were asked the purpose of payment. Of concern is the payment of unofficial charges which is an impediment to access and utilization of services.

Tables 9.9 below shows that bribery was highest (29%) in the Prisons; while the magistrates court was reported by 15 percent. It is important to note that much as only

13 percent of households reported giving bribes to police, 41 percent paid facilitation to a Police officer. Bribery was least common to the Customary Courts, LC 1, LC II where only 2 percent of the households paid a bribe. It was also noted that people did not know the legal charges they had to pay. For instance respondents claimed to pay bonds and bails to institutions which are legally not supposed to administer these payments.

Institution	Bribe	Token of thanks	Bail	Bond	Case fee	Other
Customary courts	2.7	41.0	0.2		52.2	3.9
LCI	7.3	7.0	1.9		77.2	5.6
LCII	9.8	3.7			84.2	.2
LCIII	10.1	5.5	3.5		65.3	9.1
Local administration police	26.3	8.3	9.6	14.1	29.8	11.9
Central police	33.0	8.8	10.5	12.3	25.6	9.8
Prisons	9.4		32.6		21.9	36.1
Magistrates court	16.2	2.3	24.7	6.0	44.5	6.2
District Land Tribunal	11.0	15.3	4.5		46.5	22.7
High court	16.3	19.4	5.3		39.2	4.9
All institutions	14.2	9.5	5.8	5.3	57.9	7.3

 Table 9.8: Percentage Distribution of Households by Purpose of Payment for

 Administrative and Legal Services (2004)

 Table 9.9: Percentage Distribution of Households by Purpose of Payment for

 Administrative and Legal Services (2008)

Institution	Bribe	Token of thanks	Facilitation to a police Officer	Bail	Bond	Case fee	Other
Customary courts	2.4	37.4			0.7	46.7	12.8
LCI	4.0	7.1		0.3	0.3	76.3	11.9
LCII	2.3	7.2				77.9	12.5
LCIII	10.1	1.9	3.9	3.9		57.5	18.1
Uganda Police	13.0	2.1	40.9	4.6	8.1	24.4	6.9
Prisons	28.8		8.6	37.8	8.7	9.2	6.9
Magistrates court	15.1	0.7	3.1	15.9	2.6	47.7	14.8
District Land Tribunal	9.8		5.3			54.2	30.6
All institutions	14.2	9.5		5.8	5.3	57.9	7.3

**Note:** There are few observations for the High Court, Uganda Law Council and Uganda Law Reform Commission, Uganda Human Rights Commission and Directorate of Public Prosecutions and hence have not been included in the analysis.

#### 9.6 Membership to Local Council 1 (LC 1)

Only 9 percent of household members were currently on LC 1 committee Respondents were asked whether any member of their households was on an LC 1 Committee. Information in Table 9.10 shows only 9 percent of households reporting having a member on the LC 1 committee. The proportion of household members participating in LC 1 activities was more prominent in the Lower North stratum (15%) while Kampala (Capital) had the least proportion (0.7%). Male headed households reported more participation in LC 1 activities (10%) than female headed households. The proportion of participation was about three times more in rural areas (9.9%) than in urban areas (3.6%).

	With a member currently on LC 1 committee	With a member ever been on LC 1 committee	No member ever on LC 1 committee	Total
Stratum Capital	0.7	47	94.6	100
Mid Control	5.0	4.7	94.0	100
	5.9	4.5	09.0	100
Opper-Central	10.1	10.3	79.6	100
Lower-Central	8.4	14.2	//.4	100
Near-Central	5.9	10.8	83.3	100
Near-East	8.3	7.5	84.2	100
Far-East	14.5	8.5	77.0	100
Mid-East	7.2	8.6	84.2	100
Upper-East	7.4	5.5	87.1	100
Lower-North	14.6	9.5	75.9	100
Upper-North	10.2	8.2	81.6	100
North-East	7.6	2.4	90.0	100
North-West	9.9	7.2	82.9	100
Lower-West	11.1	9.1	79.8	100
Far-West	10.5	8.6	80.9	100
Mid-West	9.5	9.3	81.2	100
Upper West	9.1	5.4	85.5	100
Residence				100
Urban	3.6	5.6	90.8	100
Rural	9.9	8.6	81.5	100
Household Headship				100
Male-headed	4.6	5.7	89.7	100
Female-headed	10.4	9.0	80.6	100
Uganda	8.8	8.1	83.1	100

Table 9.10: Involvement/participation of Household members in LC 1 activities (%)

#### 9.7 Local Council 1 Meetings

Respondents were asked whether they were aware about the frequency of LC 1 meetings. This was regardless of whether any member of their households was a member of the LC 1 committee. Findings from the majority of respondents (44.7%) indicate that there is no common frequency of these meetings. Their opinion was that the meetings are only held "as and when required". About 23 percent of the households reported that meetings were held at least once a month. Figure 9.2 depicts this information.



Figure 9.2: Opinion about Frequency of LC meetings (%)

#### 9.7.1 Household Members Attending Local Council 1 Meetings

Majority of urban dwellers never attend LC 1 meetings In addition to knowledge about the frequency of LC 1 meetings, respondents were further asked whether they (or their household members) actually ever attended LC 1 meetings. Information in Figure 9.3 indicates that the majority of household members (43%) always attended the LC 1 meetings. Nineteen percent of the respondents reported that they sometimes attended while close to one third of the respondents (27%) reported having never attended any LC 1 meetings. Urban dwellers had the highest proportion of household members (43%) who never attended LC 1 meetings.

The above figures are consistent with findings from the NSDS Qualitative Survey, where some focus group discussions attributed the declining attendance of LC meetings to the fact that the lower level LCs are seen as illegal. It has been argued that the LCs formal term of office expired and yet no fresh elections have been held to elect new office bearers. For example, a participant in a Focus Group Discussion held at Makindye Division, Kampala stated that:

"LC I meetings are no longer convened because the tenure of LC Chairpersons expired. LCs now exists on the basis of 'bulungi bwansi' (self help). People no longer see LCs as relevant legal institutions, and do not therefore see the relevance of even reporting their cases to them."



Figure 9.3: Frequency of attending LC meetings by Household Members (%)

# 9.8 Opinion about LC 1 Committee Representing Interests of Households

Slightly more than half of the respondents were of the view that the LC 1 committees in their respective localities were adequately representing their interests. Only 18 percent reported that the LC 1 did not represent the interests of households at all.



Figure 9.4: Opinion about LC Committees representing Household interests (%)

# 9.9 Involvement of Household Members in decision making processes within their villages

Less than half of household members are involved in decision making processes Information was sought about the involvement of household members in decision making processes of their respective villages. This was intended to gauge the level of
participation by households in the planning and implementation of development projects. Table 9.11 shows that more than half of the households (51%) are not involved in decision making processes at all. This situation was more prevalent in the urban areas where 66 percent of respondents reported not being involved at all. Respondents in the Capital (Kampala) reported the highest percentage (77%) of not being involved at all in decision making processes of issues concerning their villages.

	Fully Involved	Involved to some extent	Not involved at all	Total
Stratum				
Capital	3.9	19.6	76.5	100
Mid-Central	13.2	22.2	64.6	100
Upper-Central	23.5	36.5	40.1	100
Lower-Central	18.3	36.2	45.6	100
Near-Central	18.6	33.7	47.7	100
Near-East	20.9	39.7	39.4	100
Far-East	27.3	28.6	44.2	100
Mid-East	7.4	18.2	74.5	100
Upper-East	11.7	23.5	64.8	100
Lower-North	27.6	34.0	38.3	100
Upper-North	23.1	38.6	38.3	100
North-East	11.3	18.2	70.5	100
North-West	17.9	31.2	50.9	100
Lower-West	19.4	25.5	55.0	100
Far-West	11.5	54.7	44.8	100
Mid-West	13.1	42.9	44.0	100
Upper West	12.9	34.6	52.4	100
Residence				100
Urban	9.1	24.6	66.3	100
Rural	18.5	33.8	47.7	100
Uganda	16.8	32.1	51.1	100

Table 9.11: Involvement in decision making processes on issues concerning the village (%)

#### 9.10 Travel documents

Travel documents mostly obtained from concerned offices

Information was sought about respondents' knowledge and perceptions on travel documents especially Passports. The findings from the few household respondents who were knowledgeable about the passport indicated that they would obtain them from the concerned offices. Figure 9.4 depicts this information.

Findings from the qualitative survey indicate that very few community members were knowledgeable about travel documents. Most respondents said they rarely use any travel documents because they seldom leave their villages anyway. The few that had used passports complained that they are expensive to acquire and it takes long to apply for and renew them.

Nevertheless, people living near borders were aware of temporary permits that are needed to cross regional borders like Democratic Republic of Congo, Southern Sudan, Kenya and Rwanda.

Many respondents felt it is necessary to have national identity cards as long as they are made readily accessible and affordable. One respondent recommended thus: "Government should provide citizen identity cards free of charge to every Ugandan," (FGD – Pajobi, Nebbi District).





#### 9.10.1 Ease of access to obtaining Passport

Passport is the very difficult to obtain

Related to the knowledge about travel documents, the respondents were further asked about the ease of access to obtaining a passport. As seen Figure 9.6, over 80 percent of the household respondents were of the view that it is difficult to obtain a passport.

#### Figure 9.6: Ease of access to obtaining Passport (%-National)



Findings from the qualitative study seem to confirm this situation. The communities cited the cost of obtaining a passport as the major hindrance to obtaining it. For example, a key Informant from Kibaale District argued:

"The key challenge with travel documents is that it always takes long to sign and obtain passports," - (KII Kibaale, District).

# 9.11 Local Perceptions on Justice Law and Order Sector (General)

From the qualitative survey, it was established that the commonly known institutions for JLOS included LCs, Elders, Magistrates, Attorneys, Police Surgeons, Prisons and Uganda Registration Services Bureau.

The Local Council 1 (LC 1) was considered the most relevant in terms of local responsibility and lowest levels of corruption.

The Police was considered the most corrupt overall but some few voices mentioned good practices from some police posts. The Department of Community Services in Police emerged as a very important but yet unknown section of Police. The following quotes from Key Informant Interviews illustrate some of these findings about the Police:

"...Many people in communities do not appreciate prisoners being outside prison walls while doing community service. People wrongly assumed that police would have released such prisoners..." (KII, Mbarara District). "....Police Surgeons are completely in short supply and this undermines the investigation function of the police when it comes to handling cases like defilement, rape, victims of accidents, and others.." (KII, Kasese District).

"....lack of proper medical records and administrative identification of people hampers police work since many people do not even have birth certificates. There is need to sensitize communities more about the roles of the community service programme...' (KII, Kamukuzi, Mbarara District).

Generally, the biggest challenges cited were allegations of corruption where people are forced to bribe to obtain services. The respondents felt JLOS services should be free. However, LCs charge arbitrary fees like fines and court charges because they do not earn a salary. The courts of law were also reported to charge high fees for services. Magistrates were said to be corrupt, LCII said to ask for huge amounts of money to arbitrate land disputes and police ask to be facilitated with transport, communication fees and other bribes.

#### 9.12 Conclusion

The Local Council 1 was appreciated as the most relevant in terms of local responsibility and lowest levels of corruption. This is in spite of the fact that less than 10 percent of household members were members of an LC 1 Committee.

Concerning travel documents, the general view was that these documents are mainly obtained from the concerned offices. The passport was reported as a very difficult travel document to obtain.

Close to three out of four Households that used the various institutions/courts for arbitration or conflict resolution or redress in case of a problem were satisfied with the services received although they had to make some payments for the services.

About 77 percent of the cases that were reported to institutions/courts for arbitration took less than one month which is an improvement from 66 percent reported in the NSDS 2004.

### 10 CHAPTER NINE

#### PUBLIC SECTOR MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

#### 10.1 Introduction

The public sector comprises of all Ministries, Departments and Local Governments. It is through the public sector that government implements policies and programmes. Over the last three years, two sectors have been put in place to coordinate issues that cut across the public sector namely the Public Sector Management and the Accountability Sector working groups. The key institutions that are at the forefront of promoting best practices in the public sector and accountability include, Office of the Prime Minister, Office of the President, Ministry of Public Service, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Auditor General, Ministry of Local Government, Directorate of Ethics and Integrity, Inspectorate of Government, Uganda Bureau of Statistics, National Planning Authority, Pubic Service Commission and Local Governments Finance Commission. The objective of the sectors is to promote efficiency, effectiveness, transparency and accountability in public service delivery.

The issues under public sector management and accountability are cross-cutting and are a concern of all Government Institutions. Information was collected on some of the issues and the results are highlighted in this chapter.

#### 10.2 Performance of the Civil Servants in Uganda

Respondents were asked to assess the performance of the civil servants in general and also their attitude towards their clients. Generally, the performance of civil servants was rated highly with only 14 percent reporting that it was poor. Likewise, the attitude of the civil servants towards their clients followed a similar trend. Figure 10.1 below shows this trend.



Figure 10.1: Performance of Civil Servants

#### 10.3 Households with members in Government Employment

A very low proportion of households (6%) reported having a member who was employed in Government service. Figures in Table 10.1 below indicate that out of the few who had members employed by Government, slightly more than a half (52%) reported that their salaries from Government were paid in time. Only 40 percent of the households were of the view that the salary paid by Government is adequate.

	Rating			
Item description	Yes	No	Total	
Household with Government employee	5.9	91.1	100	
Salary Paid on time <sup>3</sup>	52.2	47.8	100	
Is pay adequate?	42.0	58.0	100	
Does level of pay affect service delivery?	42.0	58.0	100	

#### Table 10.1: Rating of Government Employees (%)

#### 10.4 Rating of Government Resource Utilization

The availability of Government resources and the way they are utilized was investigated. Findings indicate that Government buildings were the most common facilities (71%) located within the communities. From Table 10.2 below, it can be observed that only 15 percent of households reported knowledge about Government vehicles available within their communities. On whether the facilities/assets are appropriately utilized, the findings indicate a positive trend. Almost 90 percent of the households were of the view that Government buildings were properly utilized. About

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$  Only for those households with members in government employment

one fifth of the households opined that Government vehicles were not appropriately used.

	Availability of Facility/Asset in the Community			Арр	propriately	utilized?
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Don't Know
Gov't Buildings	71.0	29.0	100	88.0	5.9	6.1
Government Vehicles	15.0	85.0	100	61.6	21.1	13.3
Other Gov't Property	11.0	89.0	100	66.1	18.3	15.6

#### Table 10.2: Rating of Government Resource Utilization

#### 10.5 Rating of Household Involvement in Resource Management

Very minimal involvement by households in Resource Management The level of involvement by household members in public resource management was found out to be very minimal. Less than 30 percent of households reported being involved in identifying development projects. Only 21 percent reported involvement in prioritizing the development projects. The lowest level of involvement reported was in "value for money audit" where only seven percent of the households reported involvement. There was equally very low involvement (11%) in monitoring and evaluation of development projects. Figure 10.2 below shows this picture.



Figure 10.2: Household members' involvement in Resource Management (%)

#### 10.6 Corruption in the Public Sector

Bribery cited as the most common form of corruption Corruption is defined as "use of public office for public gain. "Corruption manifests itself in different forms including bribery, extortion, nepotism, fraud, influence peddling,

theft of public funds or assets, causing financial loss, false accounting in public affairs, etc. Information in Figure 10.3 indicates that bribery - perceived to be the act of offering money to public officials in order to get quicker action or services - was highlighted as the most common form of corruption existing in the public sector. This was consistent across all the strata. Almost 70 percent of the respondents were of the view that bribery exists as the most prominent form of corruption. Use of public assets for personal gain was also cited as a form of corruption where slightly more than half of the respondents (51%) reported that it exists in the public sector.



Figure 10.3: Rating of Corruption in the Public Sector (%)

From the qualitative angle, corruption was generally perceived as bad because it undermines local and national development given that public resources are diverted. Some communities seemed to emphasise the fact that in order to obtain services quickly one needs to bribe the police, judiciary, hospitals, schools, etc. Others have simply resigned to corruption as being inevitable. Below are some quotes to illustrate this point:

"...it is hard to deal with corruption because with your money you get better and faster services," (FGD, Lwankoni-Rakai District).

"...efforts to fight corruption locally are not there; we heard on radio that even the President has failed to fight corruption. What can we lay men do?" (FGD, Kakira-Kamuli district).

Other reported forms of corruption involve diversion of public funds for personal gains or utilization for other purposes other than intended projects. Influencing decisions and nepotism in relation to corruption was also mentioned. However bribery emerged as the most commonly stated form of corruption as demonstrated by the following quote in relation to quickly accessing police services:

"If you take a case to police and you don't have money they won't help you. They tell you that you have to offer money [towa kitu kidogo]," (a male participant, FGD Majengo 'B' Cell, Madera Ward, Soroti District).

Not being accountable to grassroots by politicians was also reported as a form of corruption. The notion held by most communities is that corruption is mainly for the rich who have access to resources. Hence top leadership is perceived to be most corrupt whereas the poor are simply losers.

"...Fish starts rotting from the head downwards. Corruption begins from leaders up and comes down to us and now it is everywhere," (FGD Packwach Town, Nebbi District).

#### **10.6.1 Experience of Corruption Tendencies**

Respondents were asked to report whether any member of their households had ever been a victim of corrupt tendencies since 2004. Only 17 percent of households reported that they had been victims of corrupt tendencies. This could be because of lack of willingness to disclose corruption or the nature of corruption that is limited to a few parties. Figure 10.2 depicts this finding.



Figure 10.4: Experience with corruption tendencies

#### 10.6.2 Awareness about Government's efforts to fight Corruption

Less that one third of the household respondents (28.7%) reported being aware of any Government's efforts to fight corruption. This low percentage may be explained by low level of interaction between individual households and institutions that are meant to fight corruption. Table 10.3 below shows the variations about this awareness at stratum level. The Karamoja area (North-east) reported the lowest rate of awareness.

	Aware	Not Aware	Total
Stratum			
Capital	31.4	68.6	100
Mid-Central	16.4	83.6	100
Upper-Central	18.3	81.7	100
Lower-Central	36.1	63.9	100
Near-Central	23.4	76.6	100
Near-East	29.3	70.7	100
Far-East	16.6	83.4	100
Mid-East	46.0	54.0	100
Upper-East	29.5	70.5	100
Lower-North	30.6	69.4	100
Upper-North	45.0	55.0	100
North-East	10.1	89.9	100
North-West	21.8	78.2	100
Lower-West	42.9	57.1	100
Far-West	29.9	70.1	100
Mid-West	32.4	67.6	100
Upper West	19.1	80.9	100
Uganda	28.7	71.3	100

Table 10.3: Awareness about Government's effort to fight corruption (%)

From the qualitative survey, community members largely reported that there are no locally available efforts to fight corruption. However, the Inspectorate of Government (IG) and police were mentioned as institutions that curb corruption, followed by courts of law. In a few urban districts like Kampala and Mukono districts, communities also mentioned Chieftaincy of Military Intelligence, Resident District Commissioners and judicial courts.

The IG was most appreciated for taking a hard stand on corruption at national level, where 'big' people are concerned. However, it was also noted that IG faces challenges arising from political interferences, corruption amongst some of its staff, and having limited power over legal and policy frameworks. The following quotes from Key Informant Interviews illustrate this situation:

"...Corruption is being tracked, for example, it is good to have the IG but like other institutions even IG is not free of corruption. So police cannot do much either," (KII Nebbi District).

"Corruption is reducing after new tendering and banking procedures came into place but local officials need capacity building in adopting the new approaches," (KII Parombo, Nebbi District).

#### 10.7 Households Retired members/Pensioners

Very few households (only two percent) reported having a member who retired from Government service. Of those households who reported having a member retired from government service, close to a half (47%) had applied for pension and only 45 percent had succeeded in getting their pension payments.

	Rating				
Item description	Yes	No	Total		
HH with retired Government employee	2.4	97.6	100		
Applied for Pension? <sup>4</sup>	47.1	52.9	100		
Receiving Pension? <sup>5</sup>	44.7	55.3	100		

#### Table 10.4: Rating of Pensioners (%)

#### 10.7.1 Use of Pension

Of the few households who reported having a pensioner as member of their household, further information was sought about what the pension was mainly used for. The majority of pensioners (48%) reported using the pension to pay school fees. About 20 percent reported using the pension to run household enterprises.



#### Figure 10.5: Use of Pension

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Only for those households with retired Gov't employees

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Only asked from those who applied for pension

#### 10.8 Conclusion

Generally, the performance of civil servants was rated highly with only 14 percent reporting that it was poor. Likewise, the attitude of the civil servants towards their clients was highly rated.

A very low proportion of households reported having a member who was employed in Government service and of the few who had members in Government; slightly more than a half reported that their salaries from Government were paid in time.

About 60 percent of the households were of the view that the salary paid by Government was not adequate.

Almost 90 percent of the households were of the view that Government buildings were properly utilized. About one fifth of the households opined that Government vehicles were not appropriately used.

From the qualitative survey, the IG was most appreciated for taking a hard stand on corruption at national level, where 'big' people are concerned. However, it was also noted that IG faces challenges arising from political interferences, corruption amongst some of its staff, and having limited power over legal and policy frameworks.

#### **11 CHAPTER ELEVEN**

#### **OTHER SERVICE DELIVERY ISSUES**

#### 11.1 Introduction

Local governments receive funds under various programmes to implement projects. The 2008 NSDS had questions to elicit the perceptions of respondents regarding the projects implemented in the past three years. The respondents who were the household heads gave the nine projects they considered most important (by ranking in the order of importance); whether the projects were implemented in the village/parish, impression of how much the household or household members benefited from the project and the major implementers of the project in the community.

#### 11.2 Projects considered most important

Water provision ranked highest in importance while Agriculturalrelated projects ranked lowest The intention of the question at household level was to generate a spontaneous response without any probing or citation of examples of any project. Therefore, the respondents gave in their opinion what they considered most important. As shown in Table 11.1, water provision continued to be the most important project. This aspect was reported by nearly 34 percent of respondents.

Project	2008 Freq	2008 Percent	2004 Percent
Water provision	2,017,054	33.8	46.3
Electrification	814,524.19	13.6	4.5
New roads or bridges	605,851.76	10.2	3.2
Road or bridge rehabilitation	419,861.88	7.0	6.0
New markets	331,783.99	5.5	-
Markets rehabilitation	293,759.26	4.9	-
Toilet / Latrine construction	286,863.08	4.8	-
New school construction	225,818.23	3.8	6.4
Classroom construction	189,966.57	3.2	-
Construction of teachers houses	168,516.18	2.8	-
Other school improvement	158,208.81	2.6	-
Health unit construction	140,565.87	2.3	11.4
Sensitization / extension services	62,853.09	1.0	-
Demonstration Garden	58,686.08	1.0	-
Introduction of new crop or improved varieties	58,316.63	1.0	2.7
Introduction of improved agriculture techniques	33,919.83	0.5	2.6
Livestock improvement / restocking	26,521.77	0.4	3.7
Poultry / birds related	21,553.51	0.3	-
Forestry related	20,132.28	0.3	-
Environmental conservation	14,258.79	0.2	-
Fish related	8,801.49	0.1	-
Other, specify	8,663.73	0.1	13.2
Total	5,966,481	100	100

Table	11.1:	Distribution	of	households	by	the	projects	considered	most
impor	tant (%	.)			-				

Electrification (13.6%), new roads and bridges construction (10.2%), road rehabilitation (7.0%) and new markets (5.5%) followed in order of importance as perceived by the respondents. A close look at the 2004 NSDS results shows that there is some kind of change in priorities where water provision, health unit construction, new school construction and road/bridge rehabilitation took precedence then.

#### 11.3 Projects implemented

Only a third of the projects were implemented

The survey solicited information about whether there were projects implemented in the village/parish in the past 3 years. The findings revealed that over all, 30 percent of the households indicated that the project was implemented while 70 percent reported that the project was not implemented. Table 11.2 shows the results.

Table Th2: Distribution of nouseholds by	projecta	implemente	Don't	
Project	Yes	No	know	Total
2008				
Water provision	33.06	61.07	5.87	100
Electrification	15.16	78.93	5.9	100
New roads or bridges	18.99	74.76	6.25	100
Road or bridge rehabilitation	55.75	36.28	7.97	100
New markets	7.83	88.08	4.09	100
Markets rehabilitation	28.54	52.32	19.13	100
Toilet / Latrine construction	23.39	69.67	6.94	100
New school construction	27.19	66.84	5.97	100
Classroom construction	56.4	37.91	5.7	100
Construction of teachers houses	46.12	48.38	5.5	100
Other school improvement	25.76	64.58	9.66	100
Health unit construct	13.94	78.72	7.34	100
Sensitization / extension	50.55	42	7.45	100
Demonstration Garden	52.56	37.72	9.72	100
Introduction of new crop varieties	39.74	50.42	9.84	100
Introduction of improvement	17.52	74.13	8.34	100
Livestock improvement	36.22	52.78	11.01	100
Poultry / birds related	24.91	57.39	17.7	100
Forestry related	28.19	60.39	11.42	100
Environmental conservation	22.1	69.37	8.52	100
Fish related	12.75	84.94	2.32	100
Other, specify	9.76	71.69	18.55	100

Table 11.2: Distribution of households by projects implemented (%)

Project	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
2004				
Water provision	51.2	42.5	6.3	100.0
Electrification	19.3	74.5	6.2	100.0
New roads	21.3	72.3	6.4	100.0
Road or bridge rehabilitation	45.4	47.7	6.9	100.0
New markets	8.6	84.5	6.9	100.0
Market rehabilitation	13.2	79.5	7.2	100.0
Toilet/latrine construction	26.8	66.1	7.1	100.0
New school construction	39.2	54.0	6.9	100.0
Classroom construction	53.1	41.6	5.3	100.0
Other school construction	33.7	57.6	8.8	100.0
Health Unit Construction	34.5	58.8	6.7	100.0
Sensitization/extension service	23.4	67.3	9.4	100.0
Demonstration garden	8.2	83.3	8.5	100.0
Introduction of new crop or improved varieties	20.0	71.7	8.3	100.0
Introduction of improved agric technique	13.1	77.4	9.4	100.0
Livestock improvement	20.0	71.1	9.0	100.0
Poultry/birds related	9.1	82.0	9.0	100.0
Forestry related	7.5	83.9	8.6	100.0
Conservation	6.0	84.3	9.7	100.0
Fish related	6.3	85.4	8.3	100.0
Other	10.62	82.8	6.6	100.0
Total	25.6	66.9	7.6	100.0

Classroom construction (56.4%), Roads/Bridges rehabilitation (55.7%), demonstration garden (52.5%), and sensitization/extension (50.5%) were the implemented projects reported with more than half of the cases although they were not ranked as the priority projects by the households, as in Table 11.1.

#### 11.4 Level of Benefits Accruing from the Projects

39% reported that they benefited much from the implemented projects The survey also found out how much the households benefited from the project. The results are presented in Table 11.3. Overall, 39 percent of the households indicated having benefited much from the implemented projects. This is about the same proportion reported in 2004 NSDS. 13 percent said they benefited a little while 16 percent benefited averagely. The households reported that they benefited more from construction of teacher's houses (65%), markets rehabilitation (59%) and new markets (53%).

Proiect	Not at all	A little	Average	Muc h	No benefits	Total
Water provision	21.08	15.47	13.38	42.19	7.88	100
Electrification	47.98	8.79	2.77	14.93	25.53	100
New roads or bridges	5.08	8.37	32.56	50.2	3.79	100
Road or bridge rehabilitation	3.4	13.86	28.26	52.2	2.28	100
New markets	0	4.9	25.43	53.03	16.64	100
Markets rehabilitation	0	30.01	10.88	59.11	0	100
Toilet / Latrine construction	35.64	12.82	23.53	26.38	1.63	100
New school construction	10.78	15.96	16.05	43.02	14.19	100
Classroom construction	8.48	8.91	17.56	53.15	11.9	100
Construction of teachers houses	24.2	10.34	0	65.46	0	100
Other school improvements	42.32	6.66	7.46	43.56	0	100
Health unit construction	15.06	13.71	14.24	41.7	15.29	100
Sensitization / extension	27.6	10.91	15.35	35.63	10.52	100
Demonstration Garden	13.41	5.02	8.8	50.75	22.01	100
Introduction of new crop varieties	36.31	9.8	13.81	33.22	6.87	100
Introduction of improved	30.21	14.24	16.55	26.58	12.42	100
Livestock improvement	55.22	6.23	9.94	15.72	12.88	100
Poultry / birds related	64.17	7.28	3.67	15.7	9.18	100
Forestry related	31.49	12.5	18.49	11.99	25.52	100
Environmental conservation	0	47.09	46.4	6.51	0	100
Fish related	39.72	18.92	0	16.17	25.19	100
Other, specify	27.93	30.23	3.27	23.33	15.23	100
Total	22.59	13.27	16.11	39.39	8.64	100

Table 11.3: Distribution of households by level of benefits from implemented projects by project type (%)

### 11.5 Major Implementer of Projects

The Central government is the major implementer of the projects Information about the major implementers of projects in their communities was also collected. The results are given in Table 11.4. The central government was the major implementer (38%) followed by district (16%), then Sub-County (13%) and lastly NGO/Church (12%).

Implementer	Freq. 2008	Percent 2008	Percent 2004
Central Government	690,738.13	38.02	39.9
District	304,091.69	16.74	27.9
Sub-county	248,088.18	13.66	8.9
Parish	10,576.92	0.58	69
Community members	74,579.43	4.11	2.7
NGO/Church	233,366.71	12.84	9.9
Politicians	24,499.59	1.35	1.0
Private entrepreneurs / traders	87,462.02	4.81	3.7
Traders	13,535.50	0.75	-
Others	18,015.96	0.99	-
Don't know	111,836.34	6.16	-
Total	1,816,790	100	100

#### Table 11.4: Major Project Implementers

#### 11.6 Conclusion

The projects considered most important were water provision, electrification, new roads/bridges, roads rehabilitation and new markets. Agricultural-related projects continued to be rated as least important. These include Livestock improvement / restocking, Poultry / birds and Fish. Project implementation at community level was minimal as the majority of the respondents indicated no project was implemented in the 3 years preceding the survey. The only projects where one-half of respondents reported implementation were classroom construction, Roads/Bridges rehabilitation and demonstration garden.

The Central Government continued to be the major implementer of projects followed by DLGs, sub-county and then NGOs.

The findings of the survey show that a lot more need to be done in the area of agricultural projects. Central Government and Local Governments as well as Civil Society Organization should intensify activities in this sector since it is the backbone of our economy.

## LIST OF REFERENCES

 Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Millennium Development Goals, Country Progress Report, Uganda 2003.
Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Poverty Eradication Action Plan 2004/5 – 2007/08 (PEAP), December 2004
Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Poverty Status Report, 2005.

4. Ministry of Health, Health Sector Strategic Plan I, 2000-2005

5. Ministry of Health, Health Sector Strategic Plan II

6. Ministry of Health, (1999). National Health Policy Uganda 1999. Uganda

7. Uganda Bureau of Statistics & ORC Macro, Uganda Demographic and Health Survey 2006.

8. Uganda Bureau of Statistics, Uganda National Household Survey 2005/06 -

Socio-economic Report, December 2006

United Nations New York, The Millennium Development Goals Report, May 2005

10. United Nations, 55<sup>th</sup> Session, United Nations Millennium Declaration,

September 2000

11. A National Integrated Household Baseline Study on the Demand, Use and Access to

JLOS Service for Uganda, MoJCA, Final Report, 2008

Stratum	Matooke	Maize	Sorghum/ millet	Groundnuts	Beans	Sweet	Irish	Oranges	Cassava	Simsim	Rice
Uganda											
Mid central	22.9	20.5	0.0	28.6	22.1	38.5	0.0	0.0	42.8	0.0	25.0
Upper Central	50.9	67.1	55.1	58.1	67.0	61.3	39.0	52.6	69.3	46.7	7.4
Lower Central	49.5	38.4	28.3	33.5	44.7	23.3	39.5	34.8	49.4	0.0	0.0
Near Central	36.8	46.5	36.2	25.5	47.7	50.6		0.0	44.6	100.0	48.6
Near East	44.7	53.5	43.4	28.6	31.2	25.8	0.0	53.2	42.9	35.7	57.7
Far East	22.5	35.7	38.8	31.1	37.3	51.3	68.1	0.0	8.6		100.0
Mid East	17.9	74.2	70.3	63.4	64.1	46.0		73.6	70.3	76.4	80.1
Upper East	100.0	88.1	56.4	53.8	19.1	70.1		100.0	49.6	87.9	78.3
Lower North	19.8	43.7	37.1	35.5	39.7	29.8		70.5	36.8	56.1	63.0
Upper North	18.3	12.8	18.7	26.7	26.4	31.6		22.4	12.8	21.4	13.0
North East		34.4	18.6	13.1	25.7	0.0					
North West	73.4	65.5	59.2	70.4	78.4	63.0	55.3	92.7	79.5	82.8	77.5
Lower West	77.7	41.8	50.2	51.2	68.4	59.1	43.0	8.2	52.5	11.1	19.4
Far West	83.0	61.2	78.1	79.3	72.0	66.1	88.1	41.3	62.2	0.0	68.4
Mid West	59.8	66.4	56.2	59.0	60.5	56.9	52.4	42.5	55.4	0.0	62.8
Upper West	36.6	61.3	37.7	41.9	54.3	46.4	57.7	31.8	57.9	51.8	62.3

## ANNEX I – Crops grown by Sub-Region

## **ANNEX II – Sampling Errors**

		Std	Relative	[95% Confidence interval]			Number o	of Cases
Characteristic	Value	Err.	(CV)	Lower	Upper	Deft	Un_weighted	Weighted
POPULATION								
National	30,139,000	399,592	0.01	29,500,000	31,100,000	0.00	49,553	30,139,295
By Stratum								
Capital	1,834,000	115,298	0.06	1,608,676	2,061,182	3.55	2,139	1,833,929
Mid central	1,402,000	178,370	0.13	1,052,496	1,752,542	6.24	2,107	1,402,419
Upper Central	2,504,000	104,902	0.04	2,299,297	2,711,004	2.80	3,404	2,504,150
Lower Central	1,780,000	84,054	0.05	1,616,988	1,946,873	2.62	3,072	1,779,931
Near Central	1,341,000	79,682	0.06	1,298,862	1,611,590	2.74	2,527	1,341,226
Near East	3,318,000	146,331	0.04	3,035,690	3,609,992	3.44	4,271	3,317,841
Far East	1,389,000	66,822	0.05	1,257,983	1,520,239	2.35	2,772	1,389,111
Mid East	1,602,000	61,750	0.04	1,485,073	1,727,424	2.02	2,791	1,602,249
Upper East	1,553,000	63,858	0.04	1,428,410	1,679,033	2.13	2,983	1,552,722
Lower North	1,746,000	63,049	0.04	1,622,830	1,870,277	1.99	3,146	1,746,453
Upper North	1,200,000	109,695	0.09	1,016,473	1,446,990	4.08	2,435	1,200,132
North East	882,000	76,838	0.09	731,912	1,033,477	3.36	2,192	882,394
North West	2,023,000	101,050	0.05	1,824,287	2,220,875	2.97	3,180	2,022,581
Lower West	2,492,000	73,464	0.03	2,347,415	2,635,737	1.96	3,745	2,491,576
Far West	1,319,000	36,610	0.03	1,247,515	1,391,196	1.32	2,721	1,319,355
Mid West	2,209,000	95,282	0.04	2,029,575	2,403,525	2.69	3,405	2,208,550
Upper West	1,545,000	91,858	0.06	1,367,319	1,727,833	3.06	2,663	1,544,576

Characteristic			Relative Error	[95% Confidence interval]			Number of	of Cases
	Value	Std. Err.	(CV)	Lower	Upper	Deft	Un_weighted	Weighted
By Residence								
Urban	4,616,000	321,469	0.07	3,984,875	5,246,538	6.57	6,499	4,615,706
Rural	25,695,000	444,598	0.02	24,800,000	26,600,000	9.09	43,054	25,694,588
By Sex								
Male	14,800,000	200,422	0.01	14,500,000	15,300,000	2.95	24,312	14,790,020
Female	15,300,000	221,254	0.01	14,900,000	15,800,000	3.25	25,111	15,338,528
HOUSEHOLD SIZE								
National	5.0	0.0	0.01	5.0	5.1	1.26	9,698	6,010,498
By Stratum								
Capital	4.0	0.1	0.03	3.8	4.3	1.18	525	453,901
Mid central	4.7	0.2	0.04	4.4	5.1	1.51	458	296,388
Upper Central	4.8	0.1	0.03	4.6	5.1	1.35	687	518,960
Lower Central	5.1	0.2	0.03	4.7	5.4	1.34	605	351,532
Near Central	4.6	0.1	0.03	4.4	4.9	1.23	542	313,483
Near East	5.4	0.1	0.03	5.2	5.7	1.50	786	610,345
Far East	5.0	0.1	0.03	4.8	5.3	1.11	540	275,715
Mid East	5.3	0.1	0.02	5.1	5.6	0.99	525	302,746
Upper East	5.7	0.2	0.03	5.4	6.1	1.05	515	270,527
Lower North	5.6	0.1	0.02	5.4	5.7	0.81	569	314,211
Upper North	5.4	0.2	0.03	5.1	5.8	1.33	444	226,185
North East	5.2	0.2	0.04	4.9	5.6	1.33	405	169,061
North West	4.9	0.1	0.02	4.7	5.2	1.15	649	408,823
Lower West	5.0	0.1	0.02	4.8	5.3	1.15	733	493,399
Far West	5.0	0.1	0.02	4.8	5.2	1.05	543	264,039
Mid West	5.2	0.1	0.03	4.9	5.5	1.33	642	427,789
Upper West	4.9	0.2	0.03	4.6	5.3	1.25	530	313,395

-

Characteristic			Polotivo Error	[95% Conf	idence interval]		Number of Cases	
	Value	Std. Err.	(CV)	Lower	Upper	Deft	Un_weighted	Weighted
By residence								
Urban	4.3	0.1	0.02	4.2	4.5	1.32	1,476	1,063,574
Rural	5.2	0.0	0.01	5.1	5.3	1.24	8,222	4,946,923
HEALTH								
Average distance to nearest health facility								
National	4.6	0.1	0.03	4.3	4.8	2.27	9,598	5,948,761
Urban	2.8	0.2	0.06	2.5	3.1	2.29	1,448	1,043,839
Rural	4.9	0.1	0.03	4.7	5.2	2.25	8,150	4,904,922
WATER & SANITATION								
Proportion of households that pay for water	0.38	0.01	0.03	0.36	0.40	2.16	9,698	6,010,497
Average amount spent on water per month	5197.70	305.79	0.06	4597.30	5798.09	1.60	3,485	2,304,800
Proportion of hhs reporting improved water source	0.37	0.01	0.02	0.36	0.39	1.73	9,687	6,002,139
HOUSING								
Occupancy tenure of dwelling								
Owner occupied	0.77	0.01	0.01	0.75	0.79	2.00	9,684	6,000,543
free public	0.01	0.00	0.16	0.01	0.01	1.60	9,684	6,000,543
free private	0.04	0.00	0.06	0.03	0.04	1.30	9,684	6,000,543
Subsidised public	0.00	0.00	0.58	0.00	0.00	1.55	9,684	6,000,543
subsidised private	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.00	1.44	9,684	6,000,543
rented public	0.03	0.00	0.11	0.02	0.03	1.76	9,684	6,000,543
Rented private	0.15	0.01	0.05	0.13	0.16	1.86	9,684	6,000,543
other	0.00	0.00	0.66	0.00	0.00	1.43	9,684	6,000,543

\_

Characteristic			<b>Belative Error</b>	[95% Confidence interval]			Number of Cases	
	Value	Std. Err.	(CV)	Lower	Upper	Deft	Un_weighted	Weighted
Type of roof material								
Thatched	0.36	0.01	0.02	0.35	0.38	1.58	9,675	5,994,078
Iron sheets	0.63	0.01	0.01	0.61	0.64	1.59	9,675	5,994,078
asbestos	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.01	2.07	9,675	5,994,078
Tiles	0.00	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.00	1.33	9,675	5,994,078
Tin	0.00	0.00	0.72	0.00	0.00	0.98	9,675	5,994,078
Cement	0.00	0.00	0.60	0.00	0.00	1.41	9,675	5,994,078
other	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.00	0.01	2.85	9,675	5,994,078
Type of wall material								
Thatched	0.01	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.01	1.05	9,681	5,998,556
mud and poles	0.41	0.01	0.02	0.39	0.43	1.87	9,681	5,998,556
Unburnt bricks	0.17	0.01	0.03	0.16	0.18	1.36	9,681	5,998,556
burnt bricks with mud	0.08	0.00	0.05	0.07	0.09	1.49	9,681	5,998,556
Burnt bricks with cement	0.30	0.01	0.03	0.28	0.32	1.97	9,681	5,998,556
Timber	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.00	0.01	3.01	9,681	5,998,556
cement blocks	0.01	0.00	0.20	0.01	0.01	1.74	9,681	5,998,556
Concrete	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	1.51	9,681	5,998,556
stone	0.00	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	1.69	9,681	5,998,556
other	0.01	0.00	0.15	0.01	0.01	1.37	9,681	5,998,556

				[95% Confide	nce interval]		N	lumber of Cases
Characteristic	Value	Std. Err.	Relative Error (CV)	Lower	Upper	Deft	Un_weighted	Weighted
Type of floor material								
Earth	0.44	0.01	0.02	0.42	0.45	1.58	9,684	6,000,161
earth and cow dung	0.28	0.01	0.02	0.27	0.30	1.40	9,684	6,000,161
cement screed	0.26	0.01	0.03	0.24	0.28	1.98	9,684	6,000,161
mosaic/tiles	0.00	0.00	0.23	0.00	0.01	1.52	9,684	6,000,161
bricks	0.00	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.00	1.01	9,684	6,000,161
stone	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.00	1.31	9,684	6,000,161
Wood	0.00	0.00	0.54	0.00	0.00	1.03	9,684	6,000,161
Concrete	0.01	0.00	0.12	0.01	0.01	1.25	9,684	6,000,161
other	0.00	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	1.04	9,684	6,000,161
ENERGY								
Type of Energy used for lighting								
Electricity	0.10	0.01	0.06	0.09	0.11	1.84	9,685	5,999,985
kerosene(paraffin)	0.84	0.01	0.01	0.82	0.85	1.67	9,685	5,999,985
Gas	0.00	0.00	0.31	0.00	0.00	1.05	9,685	5,999,985
Wood	0.03	0.00	0.09	0.03	0.04	1.61	9,685	5,999,985
Dung/crop residues	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.00	0.00	0.93	9,685	5,999,985
Charcoal	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.00	0.00	1.07	9,685	5,999,985
Solar	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.00	1.09	9,685	5,999,985
None	0.00	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.00	1.14	9,685	5,999,985
other	0.03	0.00	0.09	0.02	0.03	1.41	9,685	5,999,985

=

				[95% Confidence interval]			Number of Case	es
Ok ana shanishin			Deletive Freeze					
	Value	Std. Err.	(CV)	Lower	Upper	Deft	Un_weighted	Weighted
Average monthly electricity bill	23,696	1,120	0.05	21,486	25,907	1.06	685	501,239
Average numver of hours per day that electricity is available	17.14	0.34	0.02	16.48	17.80	1.43	770	567,512
Proportion satisfied with Electricity provision	0.46	0.02	0.05	0.41	0.51	1.36	776	570,611
Proportion of hhs using LPG	0.02	0.00	0.10	0.02	0.03	1.38	9,593	5,946,707
Proportion engaged in mining	0.02	0.00	0.10	0.01	0.02	1.36	9,675	5,994,220
GOVERNANCE								
Proportion of hhs reporting existance of bribery	0.76	0.01	0.01	0.75	0.78	1.22	9,698	6,010,498
Proportion of hhs reporting use of Public assets for personal gain	0.60	0.01	0.01	0.58	0.61	1.26	9,698	6,010,498
Proportion of hhs reporting existance of embezzlement	0.71	0.01	0.01	0.70	0.72	1.22	9,698	6,010,498
Proportion of hhs with atleast one government employee	0.06	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.06	1.32	9,643	5,979,030
Proportion of hhs with atleast one RETIRED government employee	0.02	0.00	0.07	0.02	0.03	1.11	9,673	5,996,047
Proportion of hhs with atleast one member currently receiving pension	0.45	0.05	0.10	0.35	0.54	1.01	118	71,031
Average duration before pension is received(years)	1.80	0.40	0.22	0.99	2.62	1.12	47	28,654

\_

The 2008 National Service Delivery Survey