



Sustainability of WASH services Abomsa, Oromia

2016 Town audit statement

Within the framework of the ONEWASH Plus Programme, sustainability checks are executed to assess WASH service levels and the conditions for sustainable WASH service provision. This town audit statement presents the results of the 2015 and 2016 sustainability checks from Abomsa, Oromia region. It covers the town's water and sanitation services, the water and sanitation services in the rural areas around the town, and institutional WASH services.

Key findings

Town water supply: Service levels remain low. Service provider and service authority scores have not improved yet.

Urban sanitation: While a large proportion of Abomsa residents have a latrine, only about half of the households have an improved facility with washable slab and some households still practise open defecation.

Rural water supply: Lack of human, financial and logistical resources at woreda level for monitoring and support to WASHCOs may present a sustainability problem.

Rural sanitation: Open defecation has been reduced in the rural areas around Abomsa. Also small improvements have been observed at both the service provider and service authority level.

Institutional WASH: All assessed health facilities and schools were reported to have WASH facilities in place. However, only one of the health facilities has private and clean latrines.

Sustainability check overview

The conditions for sustainable WASH have been assessed at two institutional levels:

- Service provider level: The level at which day-to-day management of the WASH services takes place. This is the level of the Town Water Utility, WASHCOs, latrine artisans, septic tank emptiers, solid waste collectors, health facilities and schools;
- Service authority level: The level at which planning, coordination, monitoring and support to service providers takes place. This is the level of the municipality and woreda.

Service providers and authorities were scored on indicators related institutional, technical, financial, environmental, and social sustainability. Scores were assigned based on micro-scenarios. Where multiple service providers were in place (WASHCOs, health facilities, schools), the proportion of service providers meeting the benchmark (BM), which was set as the minimum acceptable level (the 50 score) was determined. In addition to individual indicator scores, the results below present the average score and the % of benchmarks met at each level.

Data collected at the time of the ONEWASH Plus baseline and midline survey informed the 2015 and 2016 sustainability checks respectively. Findings were validated and complemented by town representatives during a sustainability check and planning workshop, which took place in Addis Ababa on 21 and 22 February 2017.

Urban water

Abomsa has a piped water supply system, managed by Abomsa water supply and sewerage utility services. People are served through household connections and 34 public fountains. However, the level of water services provided is low.

Service level

The number of household connections has increased from 1827 to 2068. This could account for the increase in accessibility.

The service level scores related to reliability, quality and quantity have remained the same. Water rotation is still practised, with the town being divided into five blocks, each provided with water every 3 to 4 days for some 2 to 6 hours per day. Although all interviewed households reported to perceive the quality of their water supply to be acceptable in terms of taste, odour and colour, two of the five public taps from which a water quality sample was taken did not provide water of acceptable quality (> 10 MPM/100ml). The total amount of water sold has decreased slightly since the baseline (from 12 litres per capita served per day (lpcd) to 9 lpcd), which is less than half of the GTP-2 norm.

The identification and drilling of suitable water sources for the town is proving a major challenge. So far the results from drilling have been poor, and the project suffered the loss of a drilling rig in a flood. Being located in the rift valley, groundwater development for safe water supply is complicated due to high fluoride levels in groundwater.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

Effective asset management (SP-F-3) has improved, as the TWU now reports to have all utility assets registered.

However, Town Water Utility staffing (SP-I-4) has decreased. Only 31 of the required 46 positions have been filled, which is less than 75% of required staff.

Service authority level

The composition of the Water Board has changed considerably and not all new members have received training yet. This has led to a decrease in score on indicator SA-I-2: Presence of Water Board.

The speed with which the TWU manages to get technical support has decreased. It now generally takes more than a week to get technical support.

Sustainability challenges

The sustainability check revealed the following sustainability challenges to urban water supply in Abomsa:

- Insufficient town Water Utility staffing (SP-I-4), with less of 75% of the required staff in place;
- Inadequate supply of spare parts for minor maintenance (pipes, fittings etc.) (SP-T-3), as it takes longer than 3 days to acquire these parts;
- Ineffective financial management (SP-F-2), with only single entry of financial records;
- Ineffective asset management (SP-F-3), as no accumulated depreciation has been calculated;
- Lack of mechanisms for the urban poor to get affordable water (SP-S-1), as there are insufficient public taps and shared yard connections in the town;
- Presence of Water Board (SA-I-2), but without trained members;
- Ineffective provision of technical support to the TWU (SA-T-1), as it takes more than a week to get technical support.

Urban water sustainability check results

Service levels urban water	2015	2016	Score description
Reliability	0	0	0: Rotation is practised for at least part of the year
Accessibility	25	50	25: 50%-75% of households access the piped scheme within 250m; 50: At least 75% of households access the piped scheme within 250m
Quality	25	25	25: At least half of samples E. coli count of <10
Quantity	0	0	0: Water sales is less than half of GTP-2 norm
Average service level score	13	19	
Number of service level benchmarks met (Max 4)	0	1	-
Service provider level indicators	2015	2016	Score description
SP-I-1: Utility organisation	50	50	50: Utility in place... with three core departments
SP-I-2: Staff Productivity	50	50	50: 10<15 staff per 1000 connections
SP-I-4: Town Water Utility staffing	25	0	25: >= 75% of required staff; 0: < 75% of required staff
SP-T-2: Non-revenue water	75	75	75: <20%, action developed for reducing on NRW
SP-T-3: Adequate supply of spare parts for minor maintenance (pipes, fittings etc.)	25	25	25: Spare parts available, but takes more than 3 days
SP-T-4: Effective maintenance system in place	50	50	50: Utility can execute all repairs (except major electronic mechanical maintenance) within 3 days
SP-T-5: Water quality management and disinfection	0	0	0: No disinfection of reservoir(s)
SP-F-1: Cost Recovery	50	50	50: Operation cost recovery.... and 20% reserve
SP-F-2: Effective financial management	25	25	25: Single entry with complete financial records
SP-F-3: Effective asset management	0	25	0: No (or incomplete/ outdated) asset registry; 25: All utility assets registered
SP-F-4: Effective billing and collection	50	50	50: Manual billing with less than 60 days backlog
SP-S-1: Urban poor get affordable water	25	25	25: Insufficient public taps and shared yard connections in the town
Average service provider score	35	35	
% of service provider BMs met	50%	50%	
Service authority Indicators	2015	2016	
SA-I-1: Sufficient capacity at regional and zonal level to provide support to TWUs	50	50	50: Region has dedicated department / section for supporting TWU, with adequate staff
SA-I-2: Presence of Water Board (WB)	100	25	100: WB established by Regional proclamation..... and trained... and with guidelines... and meeting monthly; 25: WB established by Regional proclamation
SA-T-1: Effective provision of technical support to the TWU	50	25	50: Technical support to the TWU is generally provided within a week; 25: There is some technical support to the TWU, but it generally takes more than a week to get the technical support
SA-T-2: Checks on construction quality	50	50	50: Build quality is checked by zone/region for all schemes
SA-E-1: Catchment management system in place	0	0	0: No catchment management plan
Average service authority score	50	30	
% of service authority BMs met	80%	40%	

Urban sanitation

While a large proportion of Abomsa residents have a latrine, only about half of households have an improved facility with washable slab and a minority of households (7%) still practise open defecation.

The ONEWASH Plus programme has been triggering (CLTSH) the town population to move away from open defecation. Furthermore, the programme has supported the training of artisans to build improved latrines, the training of health extension workers, and the set-up of a solid waste collection association.

Service level

The proportion of households with access to improved latrines has increased. In one of the town's two kebeles, the number of households that own a latrine increased from 1100 to 1538. Nevertheless, the proportion of households with clean and private latrines, although there has been a slight increase, remains low. A small minority of the population still practises open defecation.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

Solid waste management services (SP-I-2) improved with the establishment of the solid waste management collection association.

Service authority level

Performance at service authority level has improved on three indicators, although the benchmark has not been met on these indicators yet:

- Coordination at town level between stakeholders involved in urban sanitation (SA-I-1) improved with the introduction of a task force. However, the task force does not meet on a monthly basis;
- Safe disposal of sludge (SA-E-1) has improved due to current studies and plans for safe disposal;

- Safe disposal of solid waste (Sa-E-2) in an environmentally sound manner has improved with the introduction of designated dumping places. However, less than half of the waste is indeed dumped at these locations.

Sustainability challenges

The sustainability check revealed there are still many sustainability challenges to urban sanitation in Abomsa:

- Lack of liquid waste services (SP-I-1) and inadequate access to septic emptying services (SP-T-2). Septic tank/latrine emptying is available on request from other towns like Adama through the municipality. The vacuum truck of the municipality is not operational (yet);
- Insufficient public latrines (SP-T-3) ;
- Lack of access to financing mechanisms for sanitation service providers (SP-F-3);
- Liquid waste management services not affordable for households (SP-S-1);
- Lack of coordination at town level between stakeholders involved in urban sanitation (SA-I-1);
- Formalisation of pit and septic tank emptiers (SA-I-4);
- Lack of checks on construction quality (SA-T-1);
- Insufficient logistics for town staff to monitor and follow-up on sanitation and hygiene (SA-F-2);
- No safe disposal of sludge (SA-E-1) and solid waste (SA-E-2) in an environmentally sound manner.

Urban Sanitation sustainability check results

Service levels urban sanitation	2015	2016	Score description
Open defecation free	91%	93%	% of households of which none of the members practise open defecation
Improved sanitation coverage	35%	48%	% of households with their own improved latrine
Clean, private, safe improved sanitation coverage (proportion of population)	1%	10%	% of households with their own improved clean latrine which provides privacy
Service provider level	2015	2016	Score description
SP-I-1: Liquid waste services	25	25	25: By municipality
SP-I-2: Solid waste management services	25	50	25: By informal service providers; 50: By formal service providers
SP-I-3: Local private sector with capacity to construct, repair and improve latrines	50	50	50: Artisans in town, but not organised and trained for latrines
SA-T-1: Effective messaging related to sanitation and hygiene	75	75	75: On continuous basis in at least 70% of the town
SP-T-2: Access to septic tank emptying services	25	25	25: Takes longer than 7 days
SP-T-3: Public latrines built and effectively operational	25	25	25: Inadequate number (<half of required) available
SP-F-3: Access to financing mechanisms for sanitation service providers	25	25	25: Access to finance but difficult to access (e.g. high interest, need for collateral)
SP-S-1: Affordability of liquid waste management services for households	25	25	25: Only affordable with subsidy
SP-S-2: Affordability of solid waste management services for households	100	100	100: Affordable without subsidy to all households
SP-S-3: Availability of social inclusive public latrine facilities	50	50	50: Separate facilities for men and women
Average service provider score	43	45	
Number of service provider BMs met	40%	50%	
Service authority level	2015	2016	Score description
SA-I-1: Coordination at town level between stakeholders involved in urban sanitation	0	25	0: No coordination structures; 25: Coordination structure
SA-I-2: Town capacity to facilitate sanitation and hygiene promotion	50	50	50: Sufficient dedicated staff that have received training
SA-I-3: Town sanitation master plan	50	50	50: Sanitation strategic plan and a sanitation annual plan
SA-T-1: Checks on construction quality	25	25	25: Construction quality is checked only for public latrines
SA-F-2: Sufficient logistics for town staff to monitor and follow-up on sanitation and hygiene	25	25	25: Some (minimum) transportation logistics
Sa-E-1: Safe disposal of sludge in an environmentally sound manner	0	25	0: No sludge disposal and treatment site in place, and no study of plan for safe disposal; 25: No sludge disposal and treatment site in place. Study and plan for safe disposal
Sa-E-2: Safe disposal of solid waste in an environmentally sound manner	0	25	0: No designated place for dumping solid waste; 25: Designated place for dumping solid waste, but less than half of solid waste is dumped here
SA-S-1: Town level strategy and interventions for reaching the poorest with sanitation facilities	50	50	50: Policy and strategy for social equity... and awareness on policies and strategies is there
Average service authority score	25	34	
% of service authority BMs met	38%	38%	

Rural water

Although rural water functionality is high in the areas around Abomsa, the lack of human, financial and logistical resources at woreda level for monitoring and support to WASHCOs may present a sustainability problem.

Two rural water points were assessed in both the baseline and the midline survey. Both water points were public fountains connected to a deep borehole and managed by a WASHCO.

Service level

Although both water points were found to be functioning at the time of the baseline and midline surveys, it could not be reported that they were functional for at least 80% of the year.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

The biggest change at service provider level is the fact that now both WASHCOs reported that it takes 3 days or less to acquire spare parts for minor maintenance, while in 2015 both WASHCOs reported it took more than 3 days (SP-T-1).

Service authority level

Because of staff turnover, the woreda WASH team (SA-I-1) no longer has members who have received (re-) training,

In addition, the score on logistics for the woreda water office (SA-F-2) has gone down. Instead of having three motorbikes they now only have one.

Checks on construction quality (SA-T-2) have improved now that build quality is not only checked for all schemes, but action is taken when faults are observed.

Sustainability challenges

The sustainability check revealed the following sustainability challenges to rural water supply in Abomsa:

- New and untrained woreda WASH team (SA-I-1);
- Insufficient staffing of the woreda water office (SA-I-2);
- Insufficient monitoring of O&M and WASHCO performance (SA-T-3);
- Insufficient woreda water office annual recurrent budget (SA-F-1);
- Insufficient woreda water office logistics (SA-F-2), with only one functional motorbike available to the WWO.

Rural water sustainability check results

Service levels rural water	2015	2016	Score description
Improved water supply coverage	98%	55%	% of households with access to improved water services
Functionality	100%	100%	% of functional rural water points
Quality	NA	67%	% of water points with safe water (E. coli <10 mpp)
Reliability	50%	0%	% of water points functioning for at least 80% of the year
Sustainability indicators for rural water service provision	2015	2016	Score description
SP-I-1: Well-composed and trained WASHCO	100%	50%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: WASHCO with pump attendant / caretaker.... and with all 3 of the key positions filled
SP-I-2: By laws and legal status of the WASHCO	50%	100%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: WASHCO has by-laws
SP-T-1: Spare part supply	0%	100%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: It takes 3 days or less to acquire spare parts for minor maintenance, but it takes more than a week to acquire spare parts for major maintenance
SP-T-2: Routine (preventive) maintenance	50%	0%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: Done at least annually
SP-F-1: User payment and tariffs	100%	100%	% of waterpoints meeting the benchmark: Annual fees, Monthly (or weekly) fees, or Tariffs by unit of used water
SP-F-2: Financial management of WASHCO	0%	50%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: The WASHCO has up-to-date financial records and a dedicated account in a financial institution
SP-F-3: Revenue/standard annual expenditure balance	50%	50%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: at least 1
SP-E-1: WASHCO Water safety plan	100%	50%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: There is a water safety plan
SP-S-1: Election of WASHCO by entire community	100%	100%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark:
SP-S-2: Women representation in WASHCOs	0%	0%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: At least 50% of the WASHCO members is female
Average proportion of WASHCOs meeting the BM	55%	60%	
Service authority level	2015	2016	Score description
SA-I-1: Woreda WASH Team	75	25	75: There is a WWT, supported by woreda programme staff...and WWT has been trained. ... and retrained periodically; 25: There is a WWT, supported by woreda programme staff
SA-I-2: Woreda Water Office	0	0	0: Woreda water office has less than 75% of required staff
SA-I-3: Woreda level plan	50	50	50: There is a woreda WASH strategic plan and a WASH annual plan
SA-I-4: Regional standard WASHCO by-laws	50	50	50: Regional WASHCO by-law...and disseminated to all woredas for implementation
SA-T-1: Presence of WASH artisans in the woreda	25	50	25: WASH artisans in the woreda, but less than half of the number of kebeles; 50: At least half of the number of the kebeles
SA-T-2: Checks on construction quality	50	75	100: Build quality is checked for all schemes..., using standard checklists... and action is taken when faults are observed
SA-T-3: Monitoring of O&M and WASHCO performance	25	25	25: The woreda water office monitors some WASHCOs and provides technical support
SA-T-4: Scheme inventory and maintenance plan	100	100	100: Woreda conducts annual scheme inventory and identifies non-functional schemes... and develops maintenance plan...and ensures that all are maintained
SA-F-1: Woreda water office annual recurrent budget	25	25	25: Operational budget 50,000-100.000 birr
SA-F-2: Woreda water office logistics	75	25	75: Three motor bikes available to WWO; 25: One motor bike available to WWO
Average service authority score	48	42.5	
% of service authority BMs met	60%	50%	

Rural sanitation

Open defecation has been reduced in the rural areas around Abomsa. Also small improvements have been observed at both service provider and service authority level.

Service level

Open defecation has decreased significantly in the rural areas around Abomsa. However, households do not have access to their own latrines that are safe, private and clean.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

Effective messaging related to sanitation and hygiene (SP-T-1) has improved, it is now taking place on continuous basis in the entire woreda.

However, access to financing mechanisms for latrine artisans was reported to have decreased (SP-F-2), as it has become more difficult (e.g. high interest, need for collateral).

Service authority level

Coordination at woreda level between stakeholders involved in rural sanitation (SA-I-1) improved with the introduction of a task force, which meets on monthly basis.

Woreda capacity to facilitate sanitation and hygiene promotion (SA-I-2) was reported to have improved, with sufficient dedicated staff in place that have received training.

Sustainability challenges

The sustainability check revealed the following sustainability challenges to rural sanitation in the area around Abomsa:

- Lack of access to financing mechanisms for latrine artisans (SP-F-2), as financing mechanisms are difficult to access;
- Insufficient woreda health / education office annual operational budget (SP-F-1);
- Insufficient logistics for woreda staff responsible for rural sanitation and hygiene promotion to monitor and follow-up on rural S&H (SA-F-2).

Rural sanitation sustainability check results

Service levels rural sanitation	2015	2016	Score description
Open Defecation Free	51%	100%	% of households of which none of the household members practises open defecation
Improved sanitation coverage:	2%	0%	% of households with their own improved latrine
Clean and private improved sanitation coverage (proportion of population):	0%	0%	% of households with their own improved clean latrine which provides privacy
Service provider level	2015	2016	Score description
SP-I-1: Local private sector with capacity to construct, repair and improve latrines	50	50	50: Latrine artisans only in town
SP-T-1: Effective messaging related to sanitation and hygiene	25	50	25: Messaging on sanitation and hygiene takes place on continuous basis in at least half the woreda; 50: Messaging on sanitation and hygiene takes place on continuous basis in the entire woreda
SP-F-2: Access to financing mechanisms for latrine artisans	75	25	75: Access to finance, with reasonable conditions... and at least half of latrine artisans access the financing mechanism; 25: Access to finance but difficult to access (e.g. high interest, need for collateral)
SP-S-1: Affordability of latrines for households	75	75	75: Affordable without subsidy for most households
Average service provider score	56	50	
% of service provider BMs met	75%	75%	
Service authority level	2015		
SA-I-1: Coordination at woreda level between stakeholder involved in rural sanitation	0	50	0: No coordination structures; 50: Coordination structure....meeting on monthly basis
SA-I-2: Woreda capacity to facilitate sanitation and hygiene promotion	25	50	25: Dedicated staff at woreda level but insufficient in terms of quantity (number of staff) and/or quality (training of staff); 50: Sufficient dedicated staff that have received training
SA-I-3: S&H in woreda WASH plan	50	50	50: Woreda annual sanitation plan....and S&H included in woreda WASH plan
SP-F-1: Woreda Health Office annual operational budget		25	0: Operational budget < 50,000 birr; 25: Operational budget 50,000-100.000 birr
SA-F-2: Sufficient logistics for woreda staff responsible for rural sanitation and hygiene promotion to monitor and follow-up on rural S&H	25	25	25: Some (minimum) transportation logistics needed
SA-S-1: Woreda level strategy and interventions for reaching the poorest with sanitation facilities	100	75	100: Policy and strategy for social equity... and awareness on policies and strategies is there...and interventions for vulnerable included in woreda annual planand woreda undertakes comprehensive actions to address social equity; 75: Policy and strategy for social equity... and awareness on policies and strategies is there...and interventions for vulnerable included in woreda annual plan
Average service authority score	40	46	
% of service authority BMs met	40%	67%	

Institutional WASH

All assessed health facilities and schools were reported to have WASH facilities in place. However, only one of the health facilities has private and clean latrines.

Project activities related to institutional WASH have included training of health staff, the set-up of WASH committees in schools, and support to new menstrual hygiene management (MHM) facilities at schools.

Service level

WASH facilities at schools have not shown any change since the baseline survey. Latrine cleanliness, the availability of handwashing facilities and the high number of students per latrine are still major issues. Only one school had a student / latrine ratio of less than 50. The average number of students per latrine amounted to 117.

All four of the health facilities have improved latrines that are used and provide privacy (against three in the baseline). Latrine cleanliness is still one of the issues as only one of the surveyed latrines was found to be clean. Access to water in the health facility is still a challenge as well.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

The % of health facilities with clear roles for cleaning and minor maintenance of institutional latrines (SP-I-1) has increased, as has the proportion of schools with an active school health club or administrative body that manages latrines.

The % of health facilities and schools with a latrine cleaning programme and at least weekly cleaning (SP-T-1) has increased as well.

Service authority level

Performance at service authority level related to institutional sanitation has improved on:

- Coordination at town level between stakeholders involved in institutional WASH (SA-I-1) improved with the introduction of a task force, which meets on monthly basis;
- Safe disposal of sludge (Sa-E-1) and solid waste (Sa-E-2) in an environmentally sound manner has improved with the introduction of designated dumping places. However, less than half of the waste is actually dumped there.

Sustainability challenges

The sustainability check revealed the following sustainability challenges related to institutional WASH in and around Abomsa:

- Lack of handwashing facilities with soap and water (SP-T-2);
- Lack of septic tank emptying practices (SP-T-4);
- Inadequate local government capacity to provide support to institutional sanitation (SA-I-2);
- Ineffective support to institutional WASH (SA-T-2), as it takes more than a week to respond to a request;
- Insufficient financing at woreda and town level to monitor and follow-up support to institutional WASH (SA-F-1);
- Insufficient logistics at woreda and town level to monitor and follow-up on institutional WASH (SA-F-2);
- Lack of safe disposal and / or reuse of sludge in an environmentally sound manner (SA-E-1);
- Lack of safe disposal and / or recycling of solid waste in an environmentally sound manner (SA-E-2).

Institutional WASH sustainability check results

Service levels Institutional WASH	Health facilities		Schools		Score description
	2015	2016	2015	2016	
Institutional water supply coverage	100%	100%	100%	100%	% of institutions with access to improved water supply
Improved functioning water supply of acceptable quality in compound of institution	50%	50%	60%	100%	% of institutions with functional improved water supply within the compound
Institutional sanitation coverage	75%	100%	100%	100%	% of institutions with improved sanitation
Institutions with clean and private sanitation	25%	25%	0%	0%	% of institutions with clean, safe and private sanitation facilities
Service provider indicators	2015	2016	2015	2016	Score description
SP-I-1: Roles for cleaning and minor maintenance of institutional latrines	50%	100%	80%	100%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: Clear roles School: active school health club or administrative body that manages latrines
SP-T-1: Latrine cleaning programme	50%	75%	60%	80%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: Regular cleaning programme, cleaning at least once a week
SP-T-2: Availability of sufficient and appropriately equipped sanitation facilities including hand washing	50%	0%	0%	0%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: Availability of handwashing facility with water and soap (or ash)
SP-T-4: Septic tank emptying practices	25%	0%	0%	20%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: Septic tank emptying
SP-F-2: Financing of capital maintenance of sanitation facilities	75%	75%	100%	100%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: By the institution and / or the users
SP-E-1: Distance between latrines and water source (hand dug well / borehole / spring)	75%	100%	100%	100%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: between 10 and 30 m
SP-E-2: Open defecation free environment	75%	100%	100%	100%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: ODF
SP-S-1: Social inclusion of latrine facilities	25%	25%	80%	80%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: Separate latrines for males and females
Average % of institutions meeting BM	53%	59%	65%	73%	
Service authority indicators	2015	2016	2015	2016	Score description
SA-I-1: Coordination at woreda level between stakeholders involved in institutional WASH	0	50	0	50	0: No coordination structures; 50: Coordination structure....meeting on monthly basis
SA-I-2: Local government capacity to provide support to institutional sanitation	25	25	25	25	25: Dedicated staff at woreda and/ or regional level, but insufficient in terms of quantity (number of staff) and/or quality (training of staff)
SA-T-1: Monitoring of latrine use and maintenance and follow-up support provided by woreda or other support institution from zonal/regional level	100	75	100	75	75: Monitoring at least every 6 months and support is provided accordingly; 100: Monitoring at least every 6 months and support is provided accordingly...and monitoring results inform future planning
SA-T-2: Effective support to institutional WASH	25	25	25	25	25: Support on request of institutions, but it takes more than a week to respond to a request
SA-T-3: Availability of septic tank emptiers	50	50	50	50	50: In all urban areas
SA-F-1: Sufficient financing at woreda and town level to monitor and follow-up support to institutional WASH	25	25	25	25	25: Some financial resources
SA-F-2: Sufficient logistics at woreda and town level to monitor and follow-up on institutional WASH service provision	25	25	25	25	25: Some (minimum) transportation logistics needed
SA-E-1: Safe disposal and / or reuse of sludge in an environmentally sound manner	0	25	0	25	0: No sludge disposal and treatment site in place, and no study of plan for safe disposal; 25: No sludge disposal and treatment site in place. Study and plan for safe disposal
SA-E-2: Safe disposal and / or recycling of solid waste in an environmentally sound manner	0	25	0	25	0: No designated place for dumping solid waste; 25: Designated place for dumping solid waste, but less than half of solid waste is dumped here
Average service authority score	28	36	28	36	
% of service authority BMs met	22%	33%	22%	33%	

Conclusions and recommendations

Overall, little change has been observed in water and sanitation service levels and the conditions for sustainable WASH service provision in the town and its surrounding areas. Improvements (in terms of increase in proportion of benchmarks met) have mainly been observed for rural sanitation at service authority level; for school WASH at service provider and service authority level.

Sustainability challenges were found to be mainly prevailing in urban water services at service authority level, urban sanitation at service provider and service authority level, and institutional WASH at service authority level. These areas present serious sustainability challenges and require more attention.

Highlights of proposed actions

The town utility should strengthen institutional capacity. There is a need for training of utility staff and for the introduction of performance management to improve efficiency. Asset management and financial planning also need to be strengthened. The provision of shared yard connections in low-income household compounds could improve social sustainability. In order to ensure environmental sustainability catchment management should be introduced.

In urban sanitation, solid waste management services and waste management technologies need to be introduced. Furthermore, pro-poor strategies are needed in order to ensure that vulnerable groups get access to sanitation facilities.

Public latrine management could be improved through performance agreements with operators.

In rural water supply, the spare part supply chain could be improved through involvement of the private sector. Furthermore, there is a need for allocation of adequate budget at woreda level to improve monitoring and support to WASHCOs.

In rural sanitation, the logistics at woreda level should be improved.

Institutions should develop a financing plan for operation and maintenance of WASH facilities and should strengthen their WASH management capacity.

This factsheet was produced by the IRC/ Hoarec consortium providing independent monitoring and knowledge management services to the ONEWASH Plus programme. The ONEWASH Plus Programme is jointly implemented by the Government of Ethiopia and UNICEF to support the ONEWASH National Programme. Funding is provided by UKaid.