



Sustainability of WASH services Maksegnit

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 Maksegnit, Amhara 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: The town water utility is understaffed. Furthermore, there are challenges with the social and environmental sustainability of the service.

Rural water supply: Technical sustainability challenges include the limited maintenance capacities and ineffective spare part supply chain. Furthermore, financial sustainability challenges have been identified.

Urban sanitation: Town capacity in waste management is limited and there are environmental and social challenges particularly when addressing the demand of the poor.

Rural sanitation: Inadequate latrine artisans, inadequate staff at woreda level to promote and support sanitation, and insufficient operational budget and logistics at woreda level present considerable sustainability challenges.

Institutional WASH: There is insufficient human and financial capacity at woreda level to support institutional WASH. Furthermore, safe disposal and treatment of human waste presents an environmental sustainability challenge.

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 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

Interventions in urban water supply are ongoing. These have not yet resulted in improved service levels, nor in considerable improvements in service provider and service authority performance.

Service level

The number of household connections has increased from some 800 to 1100. In 2016, 90% of households use piped schemes as their main source of dry season water supply compared to 64% in 2015. The number of public taps which are functional and in use has decreased from 8 in the baseline to 6 in the midline. The proportion of households with access to a piped scheme within 250 m has increased from 50% to 60%, but it is still less than 75% of the population. Water rotation is no longer practised, but there are no reliable water services for at least 16 hours a day. The total amount of water sold last year amounted to only 12 litres per person per day, which is less than half of the GTP-2 norm. Water quality improved slightly.

In general the water supply situation has not significantly improved because there is no additional supply to the town yet. This is being addressed with the construction of four new boreholes, providing a yield of 34 l/s. In addition, 7 km of main pipes and a further 8 km of distribution network are being laid.

Changes in sustainability conditions

Service provider level

Overall, the performance of the service provider has improved slightly with 50% of the benchmarks met in 2016, against 42% in 2015. Main improvements included increase in number of staff from 20 to 27 (SP-I-4), decrease in non-revenue water from 24% to 14% (SP-T-2) and improvements in water quality management (SP-T-5).

However, the score on the indicator related to billing and collection (SP-F-4) has decreased because of the backlog of uncollected bills, which has increased to over 60 days.

Service authority level

Like in 2015, 80% of the service authority benchmarks have been met in 2016. The average score at this level has increased slightly. The performance of the Water Board was reported to have improved, with the Board meeting on a monthly basis. Furthermore, a main change at service authority level has been that the town prepared a catchment management plan. The support from region and zone remained at the same satisfactory level.

Sustainability challenges

A critical challenge for the town is the limited amount of water supplied. This can only be addressed when additional sources are developed. On top of that, there are a number of constraints affecting the sustainability of services.

Challenges at service provider level:

- Unskilled staff (SP-1-4) remains a critical sustainability challenge;
- Furthermore, staff productivity (SP-I2) is low;
- Although assets have been registered, no asset management plan has been developed yet (SP-F-3);
- The supply chain is poorly organised (SP-T-3);
- The billing and collection efficiency (SP-F-4) is very low;
- Social sustainability (SP-S-1) is questionable because of absence of a strategy and plan to provide services to the urban poor.

Challenges at service authority level:

- The service authorities have not developed and implemented a catchment management (SA-E-1).

Urban water sustainability check results

| Service levels urban water | 2015 | 2016 | Score description |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reliability | 0 | 25 | 0: Rotation is practised for at least part of the year; 25: No rotation is practised |
| Accessibility | 25 | 25 | 25: 50%-75% of households access the piped scheme within 250 m |
| Quality | 0 | 25 | 0: Less than half of water quality samples taken from the piped scheme have an E. coli count of <10; 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 | 6 | 19 | |
| Number of service level benchmarks met (Max 4) | 0 | 0 | - |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0: >20 staff per 1000 connections |
| SP-I-4: Town Water Utility staffing | 0 | 25 | 0: < 75% of required staff; 25: >= 75% of required staff |
| SP-T-2: Non revenue water | 25 | 50 | 25: >20%; 50: <20% |
| 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 disinfestation | 25 | 50 | 25: Disinfection of reservoir(s) but less often than monthly; 50: Monthly disinfection of reservoir(s) by qualified operator |
| SP-F-1: Cost Recovery | 50 | 50 | 50: Operation cost recovery.... and 20% reserve |
| SP-F-2: Effective financial management | 50 | 50 | 50: Double entry accounting system with annual income statement |
| SP-F-3: Effective asset management | 25 | 25 | 25: All utility assets registered |
| SP-F-4: Effective billing and collection | 50 | 25 | 50: Manual billing with less than 60 days backlog; 25: Manual billing with 60 days or more 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 | 31 | 35 | |
| % of service provider BMs met | 42% | 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) | 50 | 100 | 50: WB established by Regional proclamation.....and trained; 100: WB established by Regional proclamation.....and trained... and with guidelines... and meeting monthly |
| 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 | 50 | 50 | 50: Build quality is checked by zone/region for all schemes |
| SA-E-1: Catchment management system in place | 0 | 25 | 0: No catchment management plan; 25: Catchment management plan in place |
| Average service authority score | 40 | 55 | |
| % of service authority BMs met | 80% | 80% | |

Urban sanitation

Conditions at service provider level for sustainable sanitation service provision have improved slightly. However, this has not yet resulted in increased sanitation coverage and service levels.

Service level

Over the last year, the sanitation and hygiene committee in the town has recorded construction of over 500 new latrines. However, as there are still households without latrines, the town is not declared open defecation free. Especially poorer households, households without space and households in informal settlements have not managed to build private latrines. A shortage of public latrines also makes it difficult to maintain ODF status, when there is a huge inflow of people from rural areas during public holidays and market days.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

The solid waste collection association has improved their service (SP-I-2), dividing the town into seven zones and making sure each zone is reached once a week. Scores on indicators related to solid waste management have increased.

Solid waste services are considered affordable (SP-S-2). Households pay 5 – 10 birr per service, while hotels and cafes are charged more. Solid waste service provision is considered economically viable (SP-F-2).

The waste collectors had to overcome challenges such as shortage of waste collection sacks and the carts supplied that were too heavy to move manually. The temporary solid waste dumping sites that were prepared by the town are also full and the new solid waste disposal site is not yet completed.

Service authority level

The benchmark is still met on only a fifth (20%) of the indicators at this level. Nevertheless, the average score has increased slightly, as there was some improvement in the level of coordination in the town (SA-I-1) and as a designated place was assigned for dumping of solid waste (SA-E-2).

Sustainability challenges

Challenges at service provider level include:

- The private sector is not involved in liquid waste management (SP-I-1);
- Access to septic tank emptiers (SP-T-1) remains a problem. The pits are not emptied on time as the town aggregates demand for latrine emptying and brings in a vacuum truck from out of town only once a year;
- Public latrines are inadequate (SP-T-2);
- Sanitation service providers do not have access to financing mechanisms (SA-F-3).

Challenges at service authority level include:

- Town capacity to facilitate sanitation and hygiene promotion (SA-I-2) is insufficient;
- Checks on construction quality are only done on public latrines;
- Insufficient logistics for town staff to monitor and follow-up on sanitation and hygiene
- Lack of safe disposal and /or reuse of sludge and solid waste in an environmentally sound manner;
- Lack of implemented strategy and service delivery models for reaching the poorest with sanitation facilities.

Urban Sanitation sustainability check results

| Service levels urban sanitation | 2015 | 2016 | Score description |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Open defecation free | 82% | 81% | % of households of which none of the members practise open defecation |
| Improved sanitation coverage | 37% | 32% | % of households with their own improved latrine |
| Clean, private, safe improved sanitation coverage (proportion of population) | 8% | 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 | 0 | 50 | 0: No solid waste management services; 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 | 50 | 50 | 50: On continuous basis in at least half the town |
| SP-T-2: Access to septic 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 | 0 | 0 | 0: No access to finance. |
| SP-S-1: Affordability of liquid waste management services for households | 50 | 50 | 50: Affordable without subsidy to some households |
| SP-S-2: Affordability of solid waste management services for households | 0 | 50 | 0: Not affordable to households; 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 | 28 | 38 | |
| Number of service provider BMs met | 40% | 60% | |
| Service authority level | 2015 | 2016 | Score description |
| SA-I-1: Coordination at town level between stakeholder involved in urban sanitation | 0 | 25 | 0: No coordination structures; 25: Coordination structure |
| SA-I-2: Town capacity to facilitate sanitation and hygiene promotion | 25 | 25 | 25: Dedicated staff at town level but insufficient in terms of quantity (number of staff) and/or quality (training of staff) |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0: No access to logistics (transport etc.) |
| Sa-E-1: Safe disposal of sludge in an environmentally sound manner | 0 | 0 | 0: No sludge disposal and treatment site in place, and no study of 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 | 25 | 25 | 25: Policy and strategy for social equity |
| Average service authority score | 16 | 22 | |
| % of service authority BMs met | 13% | 13% | |

Rural water

Interventions in rural water supply are ongoing. These have not yet resulted in improved service levels, nor in considerable improvements in service provider and service authority performance.

Service level

As shown in the table, there were no major changes in rural service levels in the areas around Maksegnit town. Although coverage and functionality remain relatively high, coverage in line with the GTP standards remains low. Water quality remains an issue as well.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

The proportion of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark has increased on the following indicators:

- By-laws and legal status of the WASHCO (SP-I-2);
- User payment and tariffs (SP-F-1);
- Revenue / expenditure balance (SP-F-3);
- Election of WASHCO by entire community (SP-S-1).

On the other hand, the proportion of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark decreased considerably on the following indicators:

- Presence of WASHCO water safety plan (SP-E-1);
- Financial management system (SP-F-2);
- Female representation in WASHCOs (SP-S-2).

Service authority level

The scores at service authority level have not changed considerably. Both in 2015 and in 2016, 60% of the benchmarks were met. Slightly higher scores were obtained in 2016 than in 2015 on the following indicators:

- Woreda WASH team organisation and capacity improved (SA-I-1);

- Presence of WASH artisans in the woreda improved (SA-T-1).

Sustainability challenge

The critical sustainability challenges at service provider level are:

- Inadequate spare part supply (SP-T-1);
- Preventive maintenance not carried out periodically (SP-T-2);
- Financial management got worse (0% meeting benchmark) (SP-F-2);
- WASHCOs do not have a water safety plan (SP-E-1);
- Although women are mainly responsible for collecting water, few WASHCOs have sufficient female representation (SP-S-2).

The critical sustainability challenges at service authority level are:

- Limited woreda water office staff;
- Absence of regional WASHCO by-law and no dissemination to woredas for implementation;
- Inadequate monitoring of O&M and WASHCO performance;
- Limited woreda water office logistics.

Rural water sustainability check results

| Service levels rural water | 2015 | 2016 | Score description |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reliability | 60% | 70% | % of water points functioning for at least 85% of the year |
| Accessibility | 96% | 100% | |
| Quality | 25% | 0% | % 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 | 83% | 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 | 56% | 100% | % of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: WASHCO has by-laws |
| SP-T-1: Spare part supply | 28% | 25% | % 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% | 25% | % of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: Done at least annually |
| SP-F-1: User payment and tariffs | 86% | 100% | % of water points meeting the benchmark: Annual fees, Monthly (or weekly) fees, or Tariffs by unit of used water |
| SP-F-2: Financial management of WASHCO | 33% | 0% | % 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 | 6% | 50% | % of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: at least 1 |
| SP-E-1: WASHCO Water safety plan | 56% | 38% | % of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: There is a water safety plan |
| SP-S-1: Election of WASHCO by entire community | 67% | 100% | % of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: |
| SP-S-2: Women representation in WASHCOs | 17% | 13% | % of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: At least 50% of the WASHCO members is female |
| Average proportion of WASHCOs meeting the BM | 45% | 55% | |
| Service authority level | 2015 | 2016 | Score description |
| SA-I-1: Woreda WASH Team | 75 | 100 | 75: There is a WWT, supported by woreda programme staff...and WWT has been trained. ...and retrained periodically; 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 | 25 | 25 | 25: Woreda water office has more 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 | 0 | 0 | 0: No standard regional WASHCO by-laws |
| SA-T-1: Presence of WASH artisans in the woreda | 50 | 75 | 50: At least half of the number of the kebeles; 75: All kebeles have at least 1 trained artisan |
| SA-T-2: Checks on construction quality | 75 | 75 | 50: Build quality is checked for all schemes; 75: Build quality is checked for all schemes..., using standard checklists |
| 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 | 75 | 75 | 75: Woreda conducts annual scheme inventory, identifies non-functional schemes... and develops maintenance plan |
| SA-F-1: Woreda water office annual recurrent budget | 50 | 50 | 50: Operational budget 100.000-150.000 birr |
| SA-F-2: Woreda water office logistics | 0 | 0 | 0: No motorcycles available to WWO |
| Average service authority score | 43 | 48 | |
| % of service authority BMs met | 60% | 60% | |

Rural sanitation

Sanitation in the rural areas around Maksegnit remains a challenge, with low improved service coverage and low performance of service providers and service authorities.

Service level

As shown in the table, there has not been a considerable change in the level of sanitation services provided in the rural areas around Maksegnit. Open defecation is still being practised by almost half of the population, while improved sanitation coverage remains very low.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

No change has been observed.

Service authority level

The number of benchmarks met at service authority level has remained very low, at 17%. Small improvements have been observed in coordination at woreda level (SA-I-1), with the introduction of a task force under the ONEWASH Plus Project, and in the budget of the woreda health office (SA-F-1), but the benchmarks were not met on these indicators.

Sustainability challenges

The critical sustainability challenges at service provide level are:

- A lack of latrine artisans (SP-I-2) with capacity to construct and repair latrines;
- Lack of access to financing mechanisms for latrine artisans (SP-F-2).

The critical sustainability challenges at service authority level are:

- Lack of regular coordination at woreda level (SA-I-1);
- Insufficient dedicated staff at woreda level to do sanitation and hygiene promotion (SA-I-2);
- Inadequate woreda operational budget (SA-F-1);
- Insufficient logistics available at woreda level (SA-F-2);
- No interventions for reaching the poorest with sanitation facilities (SA-S-1).

Rural sanitation sustainability check results

| Service levels rural sanitation | 2015 | 2016 | Score description |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Open defecation free | 54% | 55% | % 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 | 0 | 0 | 0: No latrine artisans |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0: No access to finance |
| SP-S-1: Affordability of latrines for households | 75 | 75 | 75: Affordable without subsidy for most households |
| Average service provider score | 31 | 31 | |
| % of service provider BMs met | 50% | 50% | |
| Service authority level | 2015 | 2015 | Score description |
| SA-I-1: Coordination at woreda level between stakeholder involved in rural sanitation | 0 | 25 | 0: No coordination structures; 25: Coordination structure |
| SA-I-2: Woreda capacity to facilitate sanitation and hygiene promotion | 25 | 25 | 25: Dedicated staff at woreda level but insufficient in terms of quantity (number of staff) and/or quality (training of staff) |
| 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 | 0 | 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 | 25 | 25 | 25: Policy and strategy for social equity |
| Average service authority score | 21 | 29 | |
| % of service authority BMs met | 17% | 17% | |

Institutional WASH

Although some changes have been observed in clarity of roles and responsibilities related to cleaning and maintenance of institutional latrines, this has not yet resulted in considerably improved services in schools and health facilities.

Service level

The level of water and sanitation services provided in health facilities has not improved. Although most of the visited health facilities and schools had access to water, only few had access to improved water sources within the compound. Most institutions had improved latrines, but few had latrines that were clean and private.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

The changes that took place at service provider level are:

- Understanding of the roles for cleaning and minor maintenance of institutional latrines (SP-I-1) has been internalised and has improved substantially. This has been the case in both the health centres and the schools. The majority of schools now have health clubs in place;
- The proportion of health facilities that practise cleaning at least once a week (SP-T-1) has increased;
- The proportion of institutions that budget for capital maintenance of sanitation facilities decreased (SP-F-2)

Service authority level

- Coordination in the woreda and town (SA-I-1) has improved with the introduction of the task force, set up under the ONEWASH Plus project;
- Effective support to institutional WASH (SA-T-2) improved in schools and deteriorated in health facilities. Monitoring support to health facilities (SA-T-1) also decreased;
- Safe disposal and / or recycling of solid waste in an environmentally sound manner have improved.

Sustainability challenges

The main sustainability challenges at service provider level are:

- Availability of sufficient and appropriately equipped sanitation facilities including handwashing stations (SP-T-2);
- Septic tank emptying practices (SP-T-3).

The critical sustainability challenges at service authority level are:

- Weak coordination structures among WASH actors (SA-I-1);
- Limited local government capacity to provide support to institutional sanitation in health centres (SA-I-2);
- Insufficient 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 (SA-E-1) and solid waste (SA-E-2) in an environmentally sound manner.

Institutional WASH sustainability check results

| Service levels Institutional WASH | Health facilities | | Schools | | Score description |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | 2015 | 2016 | 2015 | 2016 | |
| Institutional water supply coverage | 100% | 100% | 67% | 67% | % of institutions with access to improved water supply |
| Improved functioning water supply of acceptable quality in compound of institution | 25% | 25% | 50% | 33% | % of institutions with functional improved water supply within the compound |
| Institutional sanitation coverage | 75% | 75% | 100% | 100% | % of institutions with improved sanitation |
| Institutions with clean and private sanitation | 25% | 25% | 0% | 17% | % 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 | 25% | 75% | 50% | 83% | % of institutions meeting the benchmark: Clear roles School: active school health club or administrative body that manages latrines |
| SP-T-1: Latrine cleaning programme | 25% | 75% | 50% | 50% | % 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% | 25% | 0% | 0% | % of institutions meeting the benchmark: Availability of handwashing facility with water and soap (or ash) |
| SP-T-4: Septic tank emptying practices | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | % of institutions meeting the benchmark: Septic tank emptying |
| SP-F-2: Financing of capital maintenance of sanitation facilities | 100% | 50% | 83% | 67% | % 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% | 83% | 83% | % of institutions meeting the benchmark: between 10 and 30 m |
| SP-E-2: Open defecation free environment | 50% | 100% | 33% | 67% | % of institutions meeting the benchmark: ODF |
| SP-S-1: Social inclusion of latrine facilities | 25% | 50% | 67% | 83% | % of institutions meeting the benchmark: Separate latrines for males and females |
| Average % of institutions meeting BM | 41% | 59% | 46% | 54% | |
| Service authority indicators | 2015 | 2016 | 2015 | 2016 | Score description |
| SA-I-1: Coordination at woreda level between stakeholder involved in institutional WASH | 0 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 0: No coordination structures; 25: Coordination structure |
| SA-I-2: Local government capacity to provide support to institutional sanitation | 25 | 25 | 75 | 75 | 25: Dedicated staff at woreda and/ or regional level, but insufficient in terms of quantity (number of staff) and/or quality (training of staff); 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 | 75 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 50: Monitoring at least every year and support provided accordingly; 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 | 50 | 25 | 25 | 50 | 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 |
| 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 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0: No access to logics; 25: Some (minimum) transportation logistics needed |
| SA-E-1: Safe disposal and / or reuse of sludge in an environmentally sound manner | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0: No sludge disposal and treatment site in place, and no study of 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 | 31 | 31 | 42 | |
| % of service authority BMs met | 33% | 22% | 33% | 44% | |

Conclusions and recommendations

Overall, limited 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 urban water at service provider level; for urban sanitation at service provider level; and school WASH at service authority level.

Sustainability challenges were found to be prevailing especially in urban water services at service provider level, urban sanitation at service authority level, rural sanitation at both service provider and service authority level; and health facility WASH at service authority level. These areas present serious sustainability challenges and require more attention.

Highlights of proposed actions

In order to make optimal use of the extra water capacity that will soon become available to Maksegnit, the Town Water Utility should be strengthened with skilled and trained staff. The utility should develop shared connection arrangements to address the demand of the urban poor. It also has to develop and implement catchment management for sustainability of the water source.

In urban sanitation, the municipality should strengthen its capacity to manage waste effectively. Furthermore, pro-poor strategies need to be introduced in order to give vulnerable groups 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 to support the WASHCOs in enhancing their capacity and financial management.

In rural sanitation, the logistics at woreda level should be improved. Also more latrine artisans have to be trained and certified.

In institutional WASH, woreda offices should enhance capacity to provide support to schools and health facilities. WASH coordination should be improved by establishing effective structures.

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.