



Sustainability of WASH services Adishihu, Tigray

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 Adishihu, Tigray 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: Water quality, maintenance capacity and low cost recovery remain critical sustainability challenges. Utility has improved in the areas on non-revenue water and effective asset management.

Rural water supply: Organisation and capacity of woreda WASH teams improved. Inadequate number of WASH artisans, limited budget, and logistics at woreda level remain critical challenges.

Urban sanitation: Access to emptying services has improved. More coordination structures have been established and are functioning. Logistics and access to finance for service providers remain challenges.

Rural sanitation: The formation and training of Hygiene and Sanitation Community Groups are an improvement while woreda budget and logistics remain sustainability challenges.

Institutional WASH: Roles of actors become clearer but budget and logistics remain challenges.

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, and 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 to 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

In general, there had not been any significant change in the sustainability situation. There is no urban water supply intervention in the town. Any improvements over the last year have been achieved as a result of interventions by the water utility and regional support.

Service level

The town water supply system was built in 1978 when the town population was only about 2000. Now the town population has grown to about 12,000 people but the water supply system has not expanded or improved. The motor pump is very old and the reservoir too small. At the time of the midline survey, the scheme had 752 household connections. However, households with piped connections only get water one to four days a week. Water shortage is the worst during the dry season.

Only 7 of the 11 public fountains were found to be functional at the time of the midline survey (a decrease from the baseline, when 9 public fountains were found to be functional). Public fountains are only supplied with water a couple of times per week and only receive water for 2 to 6 hours.

The problems with accessing the piped water supply account for the low consumption levels. The amount of piped water sold was some 25 litres per inhabitant per day, which is only 63% of the GTP-2 norm.

Water was only found to be safe (E. coli count of <10 MPM / 100 ml) for one of the 10 samples taken from the piped scheme during the midline survey.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

In 2016 the organisation of the utility (SP-I-1) has improved due to management signing the performance agreement with the board. The utility also reported to have made considerable improvements related to the availability of information on the scheme (SP-T-1), non-revenue water status (SP-T-2), and their asset management practices (SP-F-3) for registering

and monitoring all assets. The financial management has also improved with the utility producing all relevant financial reports and being audited. However, the cost recovery situation has worsened as the utility is no longer meeting the cost recovery benchmark.

Service authority level

The effectiveness of the water board has improved with members being trained and provided with guidelines. The support from the region has also improved as there is now a dedicated department for supporting the TWU. The department has adequate staff, logistics, budget and systems in place. The construction quality check has also improved as the utility is doing regular quality checks of all the construction works in accordance with the guideline.

Sustainability challenges

The town is struggling with a limited water supply. However, this can only be addressed when an additional source would be developed.

Challenges at service provider level include:

- Insufficient staff: As in 2015, only half of the required staff is in place in 2016 (SP-I-4);
- Limited maintenance capacity of the utility (SP-T-4);
- Limited water quality and disinfection practices (SP-T-5);
- The utility's financial viability is uncertain because of a low cost recovery level (SP-F-1);
- Social sustainability is questionable (SP-S-1) because of absence of a strategy plan to provide services to urban poor.

At service authority level, the main challenge is the lack of a catchment management plan (SA-E-1).

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	50	25	50: At least 75% of households access the piped scheme within 250m; 25: 50%-75% of households access the piped scheme within 250m
Quality	25	0	25: At least half of samples E. coli count of <10; 0: Less than half of water quality samples taken from the piped scheme have an E. coli count of <10
Quantity	25	25	25: Water sales is at least half of GTP-2 norm
Average service level score	25	13	
Number of service level benchmarks met (Max 4)	1	0	-
Service provider level indicators	2015	2016	Score description
SP-I-1: Utility organisation	25	75	25: Utility in place; 75: Utility in place... with three core department ... and signed performance agreement
SP-I-2: Staff Productivity	50	50	50: 10<15 staff per 1000 connections
SP-I-4: Town Water Utility staffing	0	0	0: < 75% of required staff
SP-T-2: Non-revenue water	50	100	50: <20%; 100: <10%, and action developed for reducing on NRW
SP-T-3: Adequate supply of spare parts for minor maintenance (pipes, fittings etc.)	75	50	75: Spare parts available within day; 50: Spare parts available within 3 days
SP-T-4: Effective maintenance system in place	25	25	25: Utility has capacity to execute simple repairs, but does not do so within 3 days
SP-T-5: Water quality management and disinfection	75	50	75: Monthly disinfection of reservoir(s) by qualified operator... and intermittent quality check (chemical, bacteriological, physical) on network; 50: Monthly disinfection of reservoir(s) by qualified operator
SP-F-1: Cost Recovery	50	0	50: Operation cost recovery.... and 20% reserve; 0: Operational cost recovery not met
SP-F-2: Effective financial management	75	100	75: Double-entry accounting system with annual income statement.... and balance sheet; 100: Double entry accounting system with annual income statement.... and balance sheet... and audited
SP-F-3: Effective asset management	0	75	0: No (or incomplete/ outdated) asset registry; 75: All utility assets registered and accumulated depreciation calculated...and condition identified
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	42	50	
% of service provider BMs met	58%	67%	
Service authority Indicators	2015	2016	Score description
SA-I-1: Sufficient capacity at regional and zonal level to provide support to TWUs	75	100	75: Region has dedicated department / section for supporting TWU, with adequate staff... and logistics and budget; 100: Region has dedicated department / section for supporting TWU, with adequate staff and logistics and budget..... and systems (guidelines etc.)
SA-I-2: Presence of Water Board (WB)	50	75	50: WB established by Regional proclamation... and trained; 75: WB established by Regional proclamation..... and trained... and with guidelines
SA-T-1: Effective provision of technical support to the TWU	50	50	50: Technical support to the TWU is generally provided within a week
SA-T-2: Checks on construction quality	75	100	75: Build quality is checked by zone/region for all scheme. according to general guidelines; 100: Build quality is checked and TWU for all schemes according to general guidelines
SA-E-1: Catchment management system in place	0	0	0: No catchment management plan
Average service authority score	50	65	
% of service authority BMs met	80%	80%	

Urban sanitation

Scores on sustainability indicators at service provider and service authority level have improved. However, this has not translated yet into significant improvements in sanitation service levels in the town.

Service level

The sanitation situation in the town has improved slightly since the baseline. However, open defecation is still being practised by about a fifth of the urban population and less than a quarter of the population has access to their own latrine which is safe, clean and private.

Achieving ODF in the town was not possible as several households have been unable to construct latrines. These include poor households, households without enough space in the compound and tenant households living in houses rented by absentee home owners. The idea of constructing a communal latrine in such poor neighbourhoods couldn't be realised because of poor coordination between municipality and health authorities.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

The proportion of indicators on which the benchmark has been met has increased considerably, from 45% to 92%.

Scores have especially improved on the following indicators:

- Access to septic tank emptying services (SP-T-2), with households now access to a service within 7 days;
- In 2016, the number of public latrines increased even though its management still needs to improve (SP-T-3);
- Affordability of liquid waste management services for households (SP-S-1) has also reached an acceptable level for some of the households.

Service authority level

Also at service authority level, the proportion of indicators on which the benchmark has

been met has increased considerably (from 56% to 78%).

There are improvements in safe disposal of sludge in an environmentally sound manner (SA-E-1) with the commencement of sanitary landfill construction. Similar improvements have also been observed for safe disposal of solid waste (SA-E-2).

The town has developed a strategy and interventions plan for reaching the poorest with sanitation facilities (SA-S-1).

Sustainability challenges

At service provider level, a critical challenge is getting access to financing for service providers.

Challenges at service authority level include:

- The limited logistics available to the municipality;
- The lack of safe disposal of sludge in an environmentally sound manner.

Urban Sanitation sustainability check results

Service levels urban sanitation	2015	2016	Score description
Open defecation free	77%	79%	% of households of which none of the members practise open defecation
Improved sanitation coverage	44%	48%	% of households with their own improved latrine
Clean, private, safe improved sanitation coverage (proportion of population)	20%	23%	% of households with their own improved clean latrine which provides privacy
Service provider level	2015	2016	Score description
SP-I-1: Liquid waste services	50	50	50: By municipality.....and / or private service provider engaged in extraction and transportation of liquid waste
SP-I-2: Solid waste management services	50	50	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	100	100	100: On continuous basis in the entire town
SP-T-2: Access to septic emptying services	25	50	25: Takes longer than 7 days; 50: Available within 7 days
SP-T-3: Public latrines built and effectively operational	25	50	25: Inadequate number (<half of required) available; 50: Sufficient public latrines available but poorly managed
SP-F-3: Access to financing mechanisms for sanitation service providers	0	25	0: No Access to finance; 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	50	25: Only affordable with subsidy; 50: Affordable without subsidy to some households
SP-S-2: Affordability of solid waste management services for households	NA	50	NA; 50: Affordable without subsidy to some households
SP-S-3: Availability of social inclusive public latrine facilities	50	50	50: Separate facilities for men and women
Average service provider score	42	53	
Number of service provider BMs met	56%	90%	
Service authority level	2015	2016	Score description
SA-I-1: Coordination at town level between stakeholders involved in urban sanitation	50	50	50: Coordination structure.....meeting on monthly basis
SA-I-2: Town capacity to facilitate sanitation and hygiene promotion	75	75	75: Sufficient dedicated staff that have received training and irregular retraining
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	50	50	50: Construction quality is checked for public and private 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	25	50	25: Designated place for dumping solid waste, but less than half of solid waste is dumped here; 50: Designated place for dumping solid waste, and at least half of solid waste dumped here
SA-S-1: Town level strategy and interventions for reaching the poorest with sanitation facilities	25	75	25: Policy and strategy for social equity; 75: Policy and strategy for social equity... and awareness on policies and strategies is there...and interventions for vulnerable included in town annual plan
Average service authority score	38	50	
% of service authority BMs met	50%	75%	

Rural water

In general, there has been some improvement in the sustainability situation. However, as there are no rural water supply interventions under the ONEWASH Plus programme, these improvements cannot be attributed to the project.

Service level

In 2016 functional rural water points reached 100%. Access to water supply on GTP-I and II has also significantly increased.

Water quality described in % of water points with safe water (E. coli <10 mpp) has decreased in 2016. The reliability of water supply has also deteriorated in 2016 in the rural villages.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

In 2016, all surveyed WASHCOs in the rural areas around Adishihu had by-laws in place (SP-I-2).

The spare part supply situation has improved (SP-T-1), with more WASHCOs reporting that it takes 3 days or less to acquire spare parts for minor maintenance.

More WASHCOs collect user payments (SP-F-1) and as a result have an improved cost recovery level (SP-F-3). The accounting system and financial management of WASHCOs (SP-F-2) have also improved.

In 2016 all assessed WASHCOs reported to have a water safety plan.

WASHCO governance in terms of women inclusion (SP-S-2) has also improved.

Service authority level

The woreda WASH team reported to have received retraining and was provided with the One WASH National Programme POM (Programme Operational Manual). (SP-I-1)

The woreda water office no longer has guidelines in place (SP-I-2).

The presence of WASH artisans in the woreda has also dropped (SA-T-1). Scheme inventory and maintenance plans have been improved (SA-T-4).

The woreda water office budget (SA-F-1) and allocated logistics (SA-F-2) have improved.

Sustainability challenges

In 2016 the critical sustainability challenges at service provider level were:

- Limited preventative maintenance capacity (SP-T-2);
- Weak WASHCO governance (election) (SP-S-1).

In 2016 the critical sustainability challenges at service authority level are:

- Weak woreda planning process (SA-I-3);
- Limited presence of WASH artisans (SA-T-1).

Rural water sustainability check results

Service levels rural water	2015	2016	Score description
Reliability	79%	43%	% of water points functioning for at least 85% of the year
Accessibility	81%	91%	% of households within acceptable distance of main source of water supply
Quality	100%	80%	% of water points with safe water (E. coli <10 mpp)
Service provider level	2015	2016	Score description
SP-I-1: Well-composed and trained WASHCO	100%	100%	% 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	83%	100%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: WASHCO has by-laws
SP-T-1: Spare part supply	50%	80%	% 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	17%	20%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: Done at least annually
SP-F-1: User payment and tariffs	67%	83%	% 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	67%	80%	% 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%	60%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: at least 1
SP-E-1: WASHCO Water safety plan	50%	100%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: There is a water safety plan
SP-S-1: Election of WASHCO by entire community	33%	40%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark
SP-S-2: Women representation in WASHCOs	33%	60%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: At least 50% of the WASHCO members is female
Average proportion of WASHCOs meeting the BM	55%	72%	
Service authority level	2015	2016	Score description
SA-I-1: Woreda WASH Team	50	100	50: There is a WWT, supported by woreda programme staff...and WWT has been trained; 100: There is a WWT, supported by woreda programme staff...and WWT has been trained... and retrained periodically... and WWT has copy of POM
SA-I-2: Woreda Water Office	100	50	100: Woreda water office staffed with required staff trained in WASH planning, management and monitoring ... and equipped with required guidelines ; 50: Woreda water office has more than 75% of required staff... and are trained in WASH planning, management and monitoring
SA-I-3: Woreda level plan	75	0	75: There is a consolidated annual plan including NGO intervention; 0: There is no WASH strategic plan, nor a woreda annual plan
SA-I-4: Regional standard WASHCO by laws	75	100	75: Regional WASHCO by-law...and disseminated to all woredas for implementation ...and woredas provide regional by-laws to all WASHCOs; 100: Regional WASHCO by-law...and disseminated to all woredas for implementation ...and woredas provide regional by-laws to all WASHCOs. and monitor enactment of by-laws by WASHCOs
SA-T-1: Presence of WASH artisans in the woreda	50	25	50: At least half of the number of the kebeles; 25: WASH artisans in the woreda, but less than half of the number of kebeles
SA-T-2: Checks on construction quality	50	100	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	50	25: The woreda water office monitors some WASHCOs and provides technical support; 50: The woreda water office monitors all WASHCOs at least once a year
SA-T-4: Scheme inventory and maintenance plan	50	75	50: Woreda conducts annual scheme inventory, identifies non-functional schemes; 75: Woreda conductst annual scheme inventory, identifies non-functional schemes... and develops maintenance plan
SA-F-1: Woreda water office annual recurrent budget	0	50	0: Operational budget < 50,000 birr; 50: Operational budget 100.000-150.000 birr
SA-F-2: Woreda water office logistics	25	50	25: One motor bike available to WWO; 50: Two motor bikes available to WWO
Average service authority score	50	60	
% of service authority BMs met	70%	80%	

Rural sanitation

Scores on sustainability indicators at service provider and service authority level have improved. However, this has not translated yet into significant improvements in sanitation service levels in rural areas.

Service level

Great progress has been made in the woreda in promoting sanitation practices. The proportion of households practising open defecation has decreased significantly and more kebeles have become open defecation free areas.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

In 2016 in a number of areas sustainability factors have improved. These include the formation and training of Hygiene and Sanitation Community Groups. During the same period latrine construction became more affordable to households (SP-S-1).

Sustainability factors that have worsened in 2016 include the limited financial viability of latrine artisans (SP-F-1) and ever challenging access to financing for service providers (SP-F-2).

Service authority level

In 2016, the woreda was able to establish a coordination structure (SA-I-1). The woreda capacity to facilitate sanitation and hygiene promotion has also improved (SA-I-2). The woreda improved local level strategy and interventions for reaching the poorest with sanitation facilities (SA-S-1).

On the other hand, in 2016 the inclusion of Sanitation & Hygiene (S&H) interventions in the woreda WASH plan has not been successful (SA-I-3).

Sustainability challenges

The critical sustainability challenges at service provider level are limited and access to financing mechanisms for latrine artisans is difficult (SP-F-2).

A critical sustainability challenges at service authority level is that limited logistics are available for the woreda offices (SA-F-2). Another critical challenge is the low operating budget allocated at woreda level (SA-F-1).

Rural sanitation sustainability check results

Service levels rural sanitation	2015	2016	Score description
Open defecation free	33%	73%	% of households of which none of the household members practices open defecation
Improved sanitation coverage:	0%	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	100	100	100: Latrine artisans also in rural areas
SP-T-1: Effective messaging related to sanitation and hygiene	50	50	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	100	25	100: Access to finance, with reasonable conditions... and all 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	25	75	25: Only affordable with subsidy; 75: Affordable without subsidy for most households
Average service provider score	69	63	
% of service provider BMs met	75%	75%	
Service authority level	2015	2016	
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	50	75	50: Sufficient dedicated staff that have received training; 75: Sufficient dedicated staff that have received training and irregular retraining.
SA-I-3: S&H in woreda WASH plan	75	50	75: Consolidated annual plan including NGO intervention; 50: Woreda annual sanitation plan....and S&H included in woreda WASH plan
SP-F-1: Woreda Health Office annual operational budget	25	25	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	25	75	25: Policy and strategy for 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	33	50	
% of service authority BMs met	33%	67%	

Institutional WASH

At service provider level, the sustainability scores for schools have improved, however, for health they decreased. At service authority level the sustainability scores have improved.

Service level

In one of the two health facilities, which were visited in the baseline as well as the end-line, the main source of water shifted from piped supply on premises to a hand pump within 500 m of the health facilities. Both health facilities had latrines in place.

All schools were found to have latrines. Latrines were found to be clean and provided privacy in 3 of the 5 schools, which was a considerable improvement from the baseline, when none of the schools had private and clean latrines. The water supply situation improved as well in 2 of the 5 schools. All but one school now have access to a functional water supply within the compound.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

While the score for the health facilities did not improve, some improvements were observed related to school WASH at this level:

- All schools now have health clubs in place, which are responsible for managing the latrines (SP-I-1);
- Most schools (4 out of 5) now clean facilities at least once a week (SP-T-1).

Service authority level

The changes at service authority level were the following:

- Coordination structures have been put in place (SA-I-1), meetings take place on a monthly basis;
- Effective support to WASH in health facilities improved (SA-T-2);
- Sufficient financing at woreda and town level to monitor and follow-up support to WASH in health facilities improved (SA-F-1);
- Access to septic tank emptiers improved (SA-T-3).

Sustainability challenges

Challenges at service provider level

The sustainability challenges at institutional level are mainly related to technical issues:

- None of the schools or health facilities have a handwashing facility with water and soap (or ash) (SP-T-2);
- Only a few institutions have septic tank emptying services (SP-T-4).

The critical sustainability challenges at service authority level are mainly related to technical and environmental issues:

- Absence of sufficient financing at woreda and town level to monitor and follow-up support to institutional WASH (SA-F-1);
- Limited logistics at woreda and town level to monitor and follow-up on institutional WASH service provision (SA-F-2);
- Absence of safe disposal and / or reuse of sludge in an environmentally sound manner (SA-E-1);
- Absence of safe disposal and / or reuse 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%	80%	80%	% of institutions with access to improved water supply
Improved functioning water supply of acceptable quality in compound of institution	100%	50%	40%	80%	% of institutions with functional improved water supply within the compound
Institutional sanitation coverage	100%	100%	80%	100%	% of institutions with improved sanitation
Institutions with clean and private sanitation	50%	100%	0%	60%	% 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	100%	100%	20%	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%	50%	40%	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	0%	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	50%	50%	20%	20%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: Septic tank emptying
SP-F-2: Financing of capital maintenance of sanitation facilities	100%	50%	100%	40%	% 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)	100%	100%	100%	100%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: between 10 and 30 m
SP-E-2: Open defecation free environment	50%	50%	80%	80%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: ODF
SP-S-1: Social inclusion of latrine facilities	100%	100%	80%	100%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: Separate latrines for males and females
Average % of institutions meeting BM	69%	63%	55%	65%	
Service authority indicators	2015	2016	2015	2016	Score description
SA-I-1: Coordination at woreda level between stakeholder 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	75	75	75	75	75: Sufficient dedicated staff that have received training ... and irregular retraining
SA-T-1: Monitoring of latrine use and maintenance and follow-up support provided by woreda or other support institution from zonal/regional level	50	50	100	100	50: Monitoring at least every year and support 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	50	75	75	25: Support on request of institutions, but it takes more than a week to respond to a request; 50: Support on request of institutions. It takes a week or less to respond to a request; 75: Support on request of institutions. It takes three days or less to respond to a request
SA-T-3: Availability of septic tank emptiers	50	75	50	75	50: In all urban areas; 75: In all urban areas....and some in rural
SA-F-1: Sufficient financing at woreda and town level to monitor and follow-up support to institutional WASH	0	50	25	25	0: No financial resources; 25: Some financial resources; 50: Acceptable level of 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 or 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	25	25	25	25	25: Designated place for dumping solid waste, but less than half of solid waste is dumped here
Average service authority score	28	47	42	53	
% of service authority BMs met	33%	67%	44%	56%	

Conclusions and recommendations

While limited water supply remains the most critical challenge in the town, the financial viability of the utility is also limited. The project intervention in the last two years has led towards improving the sanitation situation. A major development is the formation of coordination structures. Woreda level

organisations are limited in their effectiveness because of low operational budget allocation and absence of adequate logistics. Environmental issues will remain critical sustainability challenges both in water supply and sanitation.

Highlights of proposed actions

The town utility should improve water quality management. It should build maintenance capacity. Asset management and cost recovery 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, the municipal capacity for logistics shall be increased and access to financing for service providers should also be improved. Public latrine management could be improved through a performance agreement with operators.

In rural water supply, the number of WASH artisans should increase. 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 and operational budget at woreda level should be improved.

Institutions should develop a financing plan for operation and maintenance of WASH facilities and woreda offices should get more operational budget and logistics.

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.