

# Capacity Building Of County Level Government



## Briefing

Date: 19<sup>th</sup> May 2011

Queries may be directed to: [PolicyFocalPoint.SSudanNGO@gmail.com](mailto:PolicyFocalPoint.SSudanNGO@gmail.com)

### SUMMARY

- **Effective performance by local government at county (and lower) level in South Sudan will be crucial to the sustainable provision of basic services and the establishment of a viable social contract.** Unfortunately, the current capacity of county governments is often weak (although there are some notable geographic variations).
- Current constraints for county authorities, which in turn hinder efforts to develop capacity, include:
  - **Insufficient numbers of staff**, who are often inadequately trained and not receiving a reliable salary;
  - **Inadequate funding**, with many county departments having no budget to control;
  - Inadequate, and sometimes non-existent, offices and equipment;
  - Extremely **limited access to transport**, with many departments relying solely on a poorly maintained motorbike, public transport or lifts from NGOs;
  - **A lack of communications** and IT equipment, with many departments relying solely on personal mobile phones in order to communicate;
  - A lack of clarity regarding **reporting and accountability structures**.
- Many **international NGOs are already heavily involved in building the capacity of county governments**, using a variety of approaches based on the context.
- Lessons learnt from this work indicate that in order to effectively build capacity, in addition to addressing the above challenges it is necessary to:
  - Develop good inter-personal relationships between county officials and agency staff;
  - Find ways to specifically tackle the huge challenges around government staffing;
  - Take a comprehensive approach to capacity building, that brings together issues such as training, provision of hardware and recurrent funding, and ensuring adequate supervision and oversight, rather than viewing each of these aspects in isolation.

***Disclaimer:** This briefing has been prepared based on questionnaires completed by various international NGOs operating in Southern Sudan. However, it should not be taken as necessarily representing the official view of a specific NGO Forum member.*

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 The Importance Of County Government

- In this briefing, 'county government' refers to county-level government institutions, such as County Commissions and other county departments (eg: Health, Education, Agriculture, Rural Water, and so forth). County Commissions are responsible for the overall administration of a county, while the county departments are responsible for the provision of appropriate services (eg: a County Health Department will, at least in theory, manage and support a number of Primary Health Care facilities that provide health care to the population in the county).

- Unfortunately, county government capacity in Southern Sudan has historically been very weak. At the time the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) was signed there were two civil service structures nominally in place: one managed from Khartoum, with a modest presence in government-held garrison towns, which was primarily Arabic-speaking and northern focused; and a rudimentary SPLM civilian administration in the areas under SPLA control. Meanwhile, the civil war had left two generations virtually without education and destroyed much of the small amount of infrastructure that had existed previously.
- Effective performance by such county government will be critical in ensuring sustainable peace and development in Southern Sudan:
  - The principle of subsidiarity states that *“each government function should be performed by the lowest level of government that is capable of performing that function effectively”*<sup>1</sup>.
  - The Local Government Act of 2009 devolves responsibility for provision of basic services to the level of “Local Government Councils” (ie: county level, or below);
  - County governments are the level of government which has the widest geographical spread across Southern Sudan, and which has most contact with communities and citizens.
- Put simply, for an average Southern Sudanese, their impressions of “government” will be defined at least as much, if not more, by the interaction they have with, and the services they receive from, county government, than by pronouncements made by the Government of Southern Sudan in Juba.
- It is therefore vitally important that county governments are supported to function effectively. In the long-term, well-functioning county governments are likely to be the most viable ‘handover partner’ to ensure the sustained provision of basic services, which are currently often provided by NGOs. While it may not be realistic in many cases for county government to take full responsibility for such service delivery in the short-to-medium term, county governments should have an increasing role to play in the coordination and supervision of services, and in ensuring both appropriate links to communities and adherence to relevant government policies.
- In order to provide such support to county governments, it is necessary to understand first their current level of capacity.

### **1.2 Addressing The Information Gap**

- Unfortunately, much recent work on capacity building needs has neglected county level government. For example, the “GoSS Priority Core Government Functions” document<sup>2</sup> only mentions county/counties three times – and each occurrence is in reference simply to receiving information from, or disseminating information to, county authorities<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Why Decentralize Power In A Democracy?”, Larry Diamond, February 2004

<sup>2</sup> “GoSS Priority Core Government Functions”, Ministry Of Finance And Economic Planning, 26 November 2010

<sup>3</sup> The “GoSS Priority Core Government Functions” document drew heavily upon the “GoSS Functional Capacity Prioritization Study” (USAID, December 2009). However, this report does not make substantive reference to county capacity or capacity building requirements – and most references are simply in the context of lack of communications to/from county governments, and hence the need to improve communications infrastructure between counties and higher level of government. While improved communications is definitely necessary, it alone is not sufficient to meet the huge challenges encountered at county level.

While these documents were presumably intentionally focussed at central government level, it must be recognised that without adequately functioning government at lower levels, central government will fail in many of its objectives and, in the worst case, risk recreating the centre-periphery tensions that have been so problematic in Sudan in the past.

- This briefing seeks to provide an initial, albeit very limited, response to the current information gap. It draws upon a desk-based study of a total of 62 different county government institutions, across 42 counties and all 10 states, compiled between December 2010 and March 2011.
- It seeks to highlight both the current level of capacity found amongst county government departments, and the work currently being done by NGOs to build that capacity. It also makes recommendations for how such work could be enhanced.
- However, the limits of such a desk-based study are acknowledged, and more detailed research is still needed.
- It is beyond the scope of this paper to prioritize between the numerous activities that will be needed to build county government capacity. However, it is noted that capacity building should focus on enabling effective government and sustainable service delivery – it is not about creating offices or government structures for their own sake.

## **2. Current Government Capacity At County Level**

### **2.1 Staffing**

- In the majority of county departments, there are insufficient numbers of staff in place to carry out the tasks that the department is intended to fulfill.
- Where staff are in place, they are often inadequately qualified or trained for their roles. In some cases, staff have been appointed for reasons other than aptitude (eg: as a reward for service in the SPLA during the civil war) and are therefore unqualified for their civil service roles, but also unlikely to move on. In other cases, if staff are computer illiterate and do not speak English, it is almost impossible to provide the kind of capacity building that is necessary for them to fulfill their roles (without teaching English and computer skills first).
- Although some county departments have a functioning payroll, in many other cases, staff are not on the payroll, or where they are, salaries are often delayed or perceived to be inadequate (at least in comparison with other employers).
- A combination of the above factors sometimes results in staff dissatisfaction and low morale. If staff are not receiving their salaries, it can be difficult to motivate them to invest the additional personal time and effort that is required to benefit from capacity building.
- Even if salaries are paid, well-qualified or recently trained staff will often move on to better paid (if sometimes lower level) jobs with the UN, in the private sector or sometimes at higher levels of government.
- In some cases, lack of infrastructure (either buildings or transport) within a county means that county officials are actually based in other locations, not inside the county itself. This obviously makes it difficult for officials to communicate with communities and provide services based on real needs.
- In other cases, staff may be theoretically assigned to a county department but not actually be present. It can be difficult to recruit competent staff to work in some of the more remote counties, and challenging even to encourage them to live there once employed. Some may prefer to spend their time in larger towns or state capitals, and there is a perception of urban migration of such staff.
- Overall, many of the above factors contribute to a high level of staff turnover, which is often exacerbated by frequent re-shuffles of staff by government. This further compounds many of the problems, and makes capacity building particularly difficult, as staff may not remain in post long enough to receive and make use of relevant training.
- In some cases, government staff will agree to cooperate with an NGO in a certain endeavour, but not actually understand the responsibility and requirements that come with such a commitment.

## Recommendations

- County Departments need to be resourced with adequate numbers of suitably qualified staff (in accordance with the relevant GoSS line ministry's policy for that sector, where appropriate).
- Appropriate ways of training must be found to equip staff with the skillsets needed for their roles.
- Payroll systems must be established and funded, to ensure that staff receive a 'living wage' in a regular and timely manner.
- Other necessary management systems must be put in place to ensure that staff are appropriately supported in carrying out their roles (including appropriate Human Resources management; training; and provision of the equipment and supplies necessary for their work).
- Ways must be found to ensure that offices for county departments are physically located within the relevant county, and that staff assigned to those offices actually work (and presumably reside, at least some of the time) in the county rather than elsewhere.

## **2.2 Funding And Finances**

- Access to financial resources varies:
  - In the Equatorias, some county departments do appear to receive funding from state authorities. However, in many cases this funding is limited solely to paying salaries.
  - In Greater Upper Nile, while funds are provided by state authorities in some cases, the management of it is often unclear. In such cases, it seems the money is often directly administered by the state (eg: the relevant line ministry) rather than being under the control of the county department. In other cases, no funds are available or they come predominately from the international community.
  - In Greater Bahr El Ghazal, there was little information available on source or control of funds. However, it seems that any funding from states is, at best, limited to paying salaries and in many cases, little or no funding is received at all. In a few cases, UN agencies or NGOs provide modest financial support.

However, overall it seems few county departments actually have direct control over any form of budget.

- It is difficult to expect county authorities to take responsibility for providing services, if they are not also given control over the budget necessary to deliver such services. While it may take time to develop the management and accountability structures necessary to handle large sums, county departments need to be able to start somewhere.
- Without access to at least modest budgets, county departments are unable to undertake even the most basic of activities (such as coordinating the work of NGOs, participating in supervision visits, and covering the running costs necessary to utilize donated equipment). Consequently, it is difficult for such departments to actively engage in capacity building provided by NGOs, and instead they simply become passive recipients of external assistance.

## Recommendations

- County departments must be given access to sufficient resources to carry out their assigned responsibilities.
- Ideally, departments should have control over their own budgets. However, this must be accompanied by adequate training and control mechanisms to limit the risk of mismanagement or corruption.
- A scaled approach may be appropriate, in which counties are progressively given control over increasing budget amounts (and responsibilities commensurate with those amounts) as their capacity to handle such budgets and responsibilities is demonstrated.

- Expanding the provision of banking services (ie: outside of the main state capitals) may help in enabling counties to receive funds while also maintaining accountability.

### **2.3 Offices And Infrastructure**

- Most county departments have access to some kind of office space. However, in some cases this is not their own building, but a temporary location in a hut or an existing structure such as the County Commission or a hospital. Some county departments (especially in parts of Greater Upper Nile and Greater Bahr El-Ghazal) do not seem to have any offices at all. The exception is County Commissions, which generally seem to have large and well-equipped offices.
- Even where county departments do have offices, they are often too small or not adequately maintained or furnished. In some cases, adequate offices are only present because they have been constructed by NGOs.
- In some cases, the lack of transport infrastructure (eg: all-weather roads that are adequately demined) further hinders the ability of county staff to perform their duties, by limiting travel either within their counties, or to the state capital.

#### Recommendations

- County departments must be provided with adequate office space, and office equipment, for their number of staff and assigned tasks.
- County departments should be located in the county for which they are responsible, not elsewhere.

### **2.4 Transport**

- Southern Sudan is known to be a logistically challenging environment. Many county departments are responsible for large, predominately rural, areas but have inadequate means of transport for moving around their county or travelling to the state capital.
- Some County Commissions, and a few county departments in the Equatorias, have their own vehicle.
- Some county departments may have a motorbike or, especially in Upper Nile, a boat. However, these are generally inadequate for the tasks required (boats can only access river side locations, and one motorbike is insufficient for covering the distances involved in many counties, let alone for carrying supplies).
- Even where vehicles, motorbikes or boats are present, there are often problems with supplies of fuel and ensuring maintenance, which means these assets may not actually be available for use.
- In many cases, county departments do not have access to their own means of transport at all.
- Consequently, in order to travel county department staff are forced to rely on lifts from NGOs or public transport. This significantly limits their ability both to perform supervision visits within the county, and visit the state capital for liaison with state authorities. Compounded by the lack of communications (see below) this means that county authorities are often relatively isolated, and not fully aware of what is actually happening within their counties.

#### Recommendations

- County departments should have access to adequate means of transport, to allow routine visiting and travel within their county, transport of supplies, and also staff liaison visits with the state capital and other counties.
- While motorbikes (or boats, in appropriate locations) may be a useful additional transport option, they are unlikely to be adequate on their own. In most cases, county departments will need to have access to vehicles.

- However, simply providing vehicles (which may rapidly break down and become useless) is not sufficient. Adequate fleet management solutions (including fuel, maintenance, garaging, drivers and maintenance staff, and usage prioritization) must be put in place to ensure that an investment in vehicles actually results in improved field access for county officials. Innovative solutions (such as pooling vehicles across several departments, or use of rental contracts rather than owning vehicles outright) could also be considered.

## **2.5 Communications And Information Technology**

- Access to communications and information technology equipment varies:
  - In the Equatorias, many county departments have access to HF radios or failing that, mobile phone networks.
  - In Greater Upper Nile, many county departments have no means of communication at all. However, some have access to mobile networks, and a few have Thurayas or VSAT connections.
  - In Greater Bahr El Ghazal, there seems to be little access to communications, other than where there are mobile phone networks, and a few departments which have Thurayas or VSATs donated by NGOs.
- Overall, many county departments rely on mobile phones for communication (often having to use their own personal handsets). Counties with no, or unreliable, mobile network coverage can be left without communications at all. Where departments have access to other equipment (eg: radios or Thurayas) it has often been donated by a UN agency or NGO.
- Access to IT equipment also varies, but many departments have no access to computers. In some cases, county departments do not have their own equipment, but are able to make use of equipment belonging to NGOs. Even where departments have their own equipment, staff may not be properly trained in how to use it, or they may not have internet access (which limits its benefits).
- Where internet access is available, it is sometimes provided by VSAT, and sometimes via the mobile phone network.
- Without access to adequate communications, county departments are barely able to function. They can neither communicate with the field sites and facilities that they are nominally responsible for, nor report upwards to state level authorities. Similarly, without access to IT equipment (and the necessary skills to use it), staff are left relying on cumbersome and inefficient paper-based processes (which would require even greater numbers of staff in order to be effective).

### Recommendations

- Expansion of the mobile phone network to currently un-served areas should be considered. This has the potential to leverage private sector investment, and provide benefits for the population at large as well as to government authorities.
- Supporting or expanding the provision of 3G internet access through the mobile network should be considered, as a relatively cost effective way of providing basic internet access in many locations. (This may be more cost effective than providing VSAT installation in numerous separate offices, and also enables the population at large to potentially access the internet).
- However, when relying on mobile phone networks for communications, the potential vulnerability of the current networks (3 out of 5 are hosted outside of Southern Sudan, which does not yet have its own international dialing code) must also be considered.
- In locations where mobile phone coverage is not a realistic prospect in the medium-term, alternative communications solutions (such as HF radios and VSATs) should be provided. As a corollary, provision of such equipment should be prioritized on areas which do not currently have mobile phone coverage. However, simply providing equipment to individual offices is not sufficient.

Attention must also be paid to issues of maintenance and (in the case of VSAT) ongoing payment of service provider fees. It may also be appropriate to look at ways of sharing communication resources, so multiple departments can benefit from, say, a single VSAT connection.

- County departments must be provided with the necessary IT resources to fulfill their roles. In addition to simply providing equipment, this must be associated with adequate power, internet connectivity, software, maintenance support and user training.

## **2.6 Management Systems, Oversight And Accountability**

- It seems that few county departments have formalized management systems.
- Management structures between different levels of government also seem to be unclear, and are often weak:
  - In the Equatorias, many county departments have some form of functioning payroll. There is generally good upwards reporting to state authorities, and in some cases there is also supervision of, and reporting from, payam-level activities and facilities.
  - In Greater Upper Nile, management structures are weaker. Some counties manage to report to state authorities, but links with payams and communities often appear to be weak. These challenges are compounded by access problems, and the fact that some departments or commissions are based outside of the county for which they are responsible.
  - In Greater Bahr El-Ghazal, there is some reporting to state authorities but links with payams and communities again seem to be weak.
- In many situations, the actual structure of government is unclear (or is contested). It may not be clear how a county department relates to both the County Commission and the relevant state line ministry, and how disputes or conflicting priorities between the two can be resolved. It is very difficult to provide support to one part of government, if it is not clear what roles and responsibility that entity has and how it is supposed to relate to other parts of government. In the worst cases, there is little concept of the department being accountable to anyone at all.
- In some instances, the role of county government is also unclear – both to citizens and to government officials themselves. In the absence of a clear understanding of public service, with its associated duties and obligations, perceptions of favoritism and discrimination can easily creep in.
- In many cases, decision-making is still very top-down, dictated by state authorities or county commissioners, rather than being devolved to county departments (or lower). Especially if state authorities are rarely able to visit the counties, it is not appropriate for them to be micro-managing what happens at that level.
- The weaknesses in management systems are presumably also linked to many of the other challenges highlighted in this report (such as the lack of staffing, transport and communications).
- It is unrealistic to expect county authorities to ‘govern’ or provide basic services, without adequate management structures being in place to enable them do so.

### Recommendations

- The practical limitations that hinder good management systems (eg: a lack of staffing, transport and communications) need to be addressed, in line with the recommendations elsewhere in this report.
- In addition, clear management structures need to be put in place, clarifying both the responsibilities of county authorities and the way in which they are expected to link to other levels of government. It may be useful for central government to provide a ‘standard blueprint’ of the structure, staff and facilities that a county department is supposed to have, which can then be adjusted according to the context in a specific location (rather than expecting each state ministry or county commission to design such organizational structures themselves).

- Other supporting management systems (eg: payroll; sector-specific reporting mechanisms; staff management systems; accountability mechanisms) also need to be introduced or strengthened.
- Accountability needs to be improved, at multiple levels (between government and citizens, between different levels of government, and for individual staff in their roles).
- Consideration should be given to extending to state and county level the type of capacity building initiatives that have been taken at GoSS level in Juba (such as a focus on personnel and financial management, oversight and accountability, through support such as embedded technical assistance, counter-parting and mentoring and coaching).

### **3. The Experience Of NGOs In Capacity Building At County Level**

#### ***3.1 The Role Of NGOs In Capacity Building***

- NGOs are involved in building the capacity of county departments throughout the ten states of Southern Sudan – and all respondents to the survey indicated they were engaged in such work.
- The nature of this capacity building varies according to the needs of specific departments and the skill-set of individual NGOs, but includes:
  - Staff training through courses, workshops, on-the-job training and coaching (training provided covers a wide ranges of topics, but often includes: technical skills; management; participatory approaches; IT; and English language)
  - Facilitation of county staff to attend state or GoSS-level workshops or conferences
  - Secondment of NGO staff to work in county departments
  - Provision of office and technical equipment
  - Provision of transport (through donation or shared use of vehicles; or specific transport of supplies and materials)
  - Provision of buildings and infrastructure
  - Involvement in planning processes
  - Joint analysis of data and other reports
  - Joint supervision visits to field sites
  - Contributions to running costs (such as salaries or additional cash incentives for staff)
  - Joint implementation of project activities
  - Encouraging external actors to direct relevant queries to county departments, and thereby enhancing their status and role
  - Advocating with other levels of government to properly support and address the needs of county government

#### ***3.2 Lessons Learnt And Recommendations Regarding Capacity Building At County Level***

##### The Importance Of Relationships

- Effective capacity building requires good interpersonal relationships between NGO staff and county officials. Building such relationships takes time, and requires patience and consistent follow-up. It is helpful if NGO staff have skills in the appropriate local language, to facilitate communicate with county staff.
- In addition to relationships with the county department in question, it can also be important to build relationships with the County Commissioner, to engage his<sup>4</sup> support for the capacity building that is taking place.

---

<sup>4</sup> It seems most County Commissioners are male

### Dealing With Staffing Challenges

- Inadequate staffing has been identified as one of the key constraints to capacity building. Ways of tackling this include:
  - Ensuring at least one person in the county department has a high capacity. This person can then be an advocate for more support and resources. Once one good person is in place, it is easier to build things around them, and state authorities are more likely to be willing to delegate responsibility to the county.
  - If senior staff appear to have been appointed for reasons other than aptitude (eg: as a reward for previous service) it can be difficult to seek to have them replaced. However, it is important to get well-qualified subordinates in place, who can then provide the necessary skill-sets.
  - Seconding NGO personnel into the county department can be an effective way of addressing staffing gaps, and also enabling on-the-job coaching and training.
- Specific attention is required to ensure that training provided is effective. Initial barriers (such as illiteracy or lack of English language skills) must be addressed. One-off courses are unlikely to be sufficient, but there is a need for a continuous approach to training, with frequent repetition of key topics, and ongoing supervision to ensure that taught skills are adopted in the workplace. It is also important to ensure proper coordination of training opportunities, so that the right people are trained in the right topics (rather than having some staff trained in the same subject multiple times and others not at all).
- Proper payment of salaries is crucial to ensure staff retention (and reducing the problem of staff moving on as soon as they have received training, which denies the county the benefit of that training).

### Comprehensive Approaches To Capacity Building

- Capacity building is not simply about training, nor about one-off provision of assets. For example, providing training will have little impact if staff do not have the resources (eg: office space; computers, plus electricity; stationery; transport, including fuel and maintenance; finances; etc) in order to make use of that training in their work.
- In order to be effective, multiple aspects of capacity building must come into place, including:
  - Training (of administrative staff, as well as of technical staff)
  - Financial resources (and capacity to manage and account for them)
  - Supervision and technical support (eg: from line ministries)
  - Transport, office space, and IT and communications equipment (and appropriate and support and maintenance for all of these)
  - Management systems, to hold all of these things together

### Integrated Approaches Across Agencies

- There is a clear need for a harmonized approach to capacity building. It would be useful for there to be clearly defined minimum capacity requirements for county departments (ie: in terms of staffing levels and systems to be in place), and a clear process for achieving such capacity. However, such an approach would also need to take into account the significant regional variations in context and current capacity.
- Similarly, agencies providing capacity building support (especially in the same area or to the same department) must ensure their work is harmonized. (Otherwise, some support may be given twice, while other needed support is not provided at all; or practices of one agency may undermine those of another). The roles and responsibilities of different actors should be clearly defined, with regular communication between government departments and assistance agencies.

- There is also a need for coordination between capacity building at county level, and at state and other levels, to again ensure consistency and coherence in approaches used.

### **3.3 Other Recommendations**

#### Good Practice For Donors In Supporting Capacity Building At County Level

- The Basic Services Fund (BSF) and USAID were mentioned by multiple NGOs as being supportive of their county government capacity building efforts.
- Flexibility in funding is particularly important. Specific restrictions on what funds can be spent on (for example, salaries or incentives for county or facility staff) may be felt to be counter-productive, if government mechanisms to cover such costs are not yet in place or functioning.

#### Communities And Lower Levels Of Government

- In addition to strengthening county level government, there is a continued need to strengthen government capacity at lower levels (ie: payam and boma).
- Some communities are willing and interested to hold local authorities to account, and they should be supported in playing such a role.

## Annex: Methodology

- This report is based on a questionnaire circulated to various NGO mailing lists between December 2010 and March 2011. The questionnaire asked questions regarding the current capacity of any county government departments that the respondent NGO was working with, and regarding lessons learnt and insights gained by the NGO as it sought to build such capacity.
- Responses were received from twenty-one NGOs. The number of counties and departments covered by the responses are indicated below. Unfortunately the limited size, and self-selecting nature, of the sample means the results cannot necessarily be considered statistically significant. In particular, possible biases include:
  - Responses were only possible from counties in which NGOs work, and in regard to departments with which they collaborate. County departments which are beyond the reach of NGO support may be those with weakest capacity and hence most in need of assistance, but they are not reflected in this survey.
  - Nine out of the ten counties that host state capitals were captured in survey, composing over 20% of the returns. By contrast, less than 50% of the counties that do not host state capitals were covered. Many comments indicated that counties hosting (or in near vicinity of) state capitals were better resourced and supported than more remote counties. However, it seems that the needs of such remote counties are under-represented in the survey.
- It should also be noted that the actual capacity in any given county is dynamic and may change over time. While it is to be hoped that capacity is generally increasing (eg: as offices are built; equipment supplied; or transport and communications infrastructure improved) there can also be situations where capacity reduces (eg: as equipment or vehicles cease to work due to lack of maintenance or support for recurrent costs; or trained staff move away). Consequently, a report of this nature can only ever be a snapshot of a certain point in time.
- However, despite such limitations it is felt that the results reported in this document are still broadly representative of the current situation of county government departments in Southern Sudan.

State	Number Of Counties In State	Number Of Counties Reporting	State Capital Included
Central Equatoria	6	5	Yes
Eastern Equatoria	8	5	Yes
Western Equatoria	10	5	Yes
Jonglei	11	3	Yes
Unity	9	5	Yes
Upper Nile	12	10	Yes
Lakes	8	2	Yes
Northern Bahr El-Ghazal	5	2	Yes
Warrap	6	3	No
Western Bahr El-Ghazal	3	2	Yes
<b>Total</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>9</b>

County Institution	Number Reporting
County Health Department	41
County Education Department	5
County Agriculture Department	5
County Commission	6
SSRRC	3
Rural Water Department	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>