



# Sustainability of WASH services Sheno, 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 Sheno, 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:** Little change was observed in the level of service and the sustainability scores. Service levels remain low and especially at service provider level, sustainability challenges prevail, particularly related to financial sustainability.

**Rural water supply:** Limited change has been observed related to water service provision in the rural areas around Sheno.

**Urban sanitation:** Small improvements have been observed in going towards an open defecation free town.

**Rural sanitation:** Open defecation practice has reduced significantly in the rural areas around Sheno. Also improvements were observed in the conditions for sustainable sanitation at service provider level.

**Institutional WASH:** Good progress has been made in improving institutional WASH. Service levels have increased and conditions for sustainable institutional WASH have improved at both service provider level and service authority level.

### 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

**Little change was observed in the level of service and the sustainability scores. Service levels remain low and especially at service provider level, sustainability challenges prevail, particularly related to financial sustainability.**

## Service level

Since 2015, the number of private connections has increased slightly from 2232 to 2406. This contributes to improvement in the accessibility of the town water scheme. However, ongoing construction activities were reported to be interrupting and sometimes even contaminating the existing water supply.

Functionality of public taps has gone down since the baseline. At the time of the midline survey, only five of the 13 public fountains in Sheno and none in Humus Gabaya were found to be functional, while at the time of the baseline survey, 10 public taps were functional.

Reliability of water services is a big issue. Water rationing with rotation of water to certain parts of the system is practised throughout the year. Public fountains are supplied with water every 3 to 4 days for 3 to 8 hours.

Water quality was acceptable for only one out of six samples taken from the piped scheme (E. coli concentrations up to 10 MPN/100ml).

The average amount of water sold per household connection was 139 litre per connection per day. The total amount of water sold amounted to about 30 litre per served person per day, which is 74.7% of the GTP-2 norm.

## Changes in sustainability indicator scores

### Service provider level

The average score on the service provider indicators has increased slightly.

- Water quality management and disinfection (SP-T-5) have improved, with disinfection of reservoir(s) now taking place, but less often than monthly;

- Effective financial management (SP-F-2): from single entry with complete financial records, to double entry accounting system with annual income statement;
- Effective asset management (SP-F-3) has improved, as now all utility assets have been registered.

### Service authority level

No change was observed in the scores on the service authority indicators.

## Sustainability challenges

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

- Insufficient Town Water Utility staffing (SP-I-4). Only 24 of the 41 required staff positions have been filled;
- Water quality management and disinfection (SP-T-5) do not take place on monthly basis (as mentioned above);
- Insufficient cost recovery (SP-F-1). Operational costs are recovered, but revenues are not sufficient to build up reserves (revenue expenditure ratio of 1);
- Lack of effective asset management (SP-F-3). All assets have been registered, but no depreciation has been calculated;
- Lack of effective billing and collection (SP-F-4). Manual billing is practised with a backlog of at least 60 days;
- Insufficient mechanisms for ensuring affordable water to the urban poor (SP-S-1);
- A Water Board has been established by regional proclamation, but its members have not been trained (SA-I-2);
- No catchment management system in place (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	75	50: At least 75% of households access the piped scheme within 250 m; 75: At least 85% of households access the piped scheme within 250 m
Quality	50	0	50: All 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
<b>Average service level score</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>25</b>	
<b>Number of service level benchmarks met (Max 4)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	-
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	75	75	75: 7<10 staff per 1000 connections
SP-I-4: Town Water Utility staffing	0	0	0: < 75% of required staff
SP-T-2: Non-revenue water	100	100	100: <10%, and action developed for reducing on NRW
SP-T-3: Adequate supply of spare parts for minor maintenance (pipes, fittings etc.)	50	75	50: Spare parts available within 3 days; 75: Spare parts available within day
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	25	0: No disinfection of reservoir(s); 25: Disinfection of reservoir(s) but less often than monthly
SP-F-1: Cost Recovery	50	25	50: Operation cost recovery.... and 20% reserve; 25: Operation cost recovery
SP-F-2: Effective financial management	25	50	25: Single entry with complete financial records; 50: Double entry accounting system with annual income statement
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	25	25	25: Manual billing more backlog of 60 days or more
SP-S-1: Urban poor get affordable water	25	25	25: Insufficient public taps and shared yard connections in the town
<b>Average service provider score</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>44</b>	
<b>% of service provider BMs met</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>	
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)	25	25	25: WB established by Regional proclamation
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	0	0: No catchment management plan
<b>Average service authority score</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>35</b>	
<b>% of service authority BMs met</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>60%</b>	

# Urban sanitation

**Small improvements have been observed in going towards an open defecation free town.**

## Service level

There has been a slight reduction in the proportion of households practising open defecation since the baseline. However, there are still many households that do not have their own improved sanitation facilities. Although private latrines seem to have improved slightly since the baseline in terms of privacy and cleanliness, still only a minority of households (17%) own private, safe and clean latrines.

## Changes in sustainability indicator scores

### Service provider level

On two of the service provider indicators, the score has increased:

- Access to septic emptying services (SP-T-2) improved, with septic tank emptiers now being available within 7 days. Households with a full latrine are supposed to report this to the municipality, who provides the households with a cost estimate and facilitates the actual latrine emptying. This used to be done by a private latrine emptier from Addis Ababa, some 80 km away. However, recently a local private septic tank emptier started operating in Sheno as well;
- Access to financing mechanisms for sanitation service providers (SP-F-3) was reported to have improved slightly. However, it remains difficult to get access to financing (e.g. high interest, need for collateral).

### Service authority level

The situation at service authority level seems to have improved as well.

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 solid waste (Sa-E-2) in an environmentally sound manner has improved with the introduction of designated dumping places and at least half of the solid waste is actually dumped there. In May 2016, the Mekuanint & Awel Cleaning and Beautification Association was established in Sheno to provide solid waste collection services in the town. It consists of unemployed day labourers, mobilised by the municipality, with support from World Vision (under the ONEWASH Plus Project). The Association started operations in August 2016. In addition, there are informal day labourers who collect solid waste on an ad hoc basis.

The town reported to have developed a strategic sanitation plan, in addition to the annual plan (SA-I-3).

Furthermore, the town reported to check the construction quality of both public and private latrines in the town (SA-T-1).

## Sustainability challenges

Sustainability challenges related to urban sanitation in Sheno include:

- Access to financing mechanisms for sanitation service providers (SP-F-3);
- Availability of social inclusive public latrine facilities (SP-S-3);
- Coordination at town level between stakeholder involved in urban sanitation (SA-I-1);
- Sufficient logistics for town staff to monitor and follow up on sanitation and hygiene (SA-F-2);
- Safe disposal of sludge in an environmentally sound manner (Sa-E-1).

## Urban Sanitation sustainability check results

Service levels urban sanitation	2015	2016	Score description
Open defecation free	88%	93%	% of households of which none of the members practise open defecation
Improved sanitation coverage	53%	48%	% of households with their own improved latrine
Clean, private, safe improved sanitation coverage (proportion of population)	10%	20%	% 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	50	50	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 obtain (e.g. high interest, need for collateral)
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	100	100	100: Affordable without subsidy to all households
SP-S-3: Availability of social inclusive public latrine facilities	0	0	0: No separate facilities for men and women
<b>Average service provider score</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>53</b>	
<b>Number of service provider BMs met</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>80%</b>	
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	75	75	75: Sufficient dedicated staff that have received training and irregular retraining
SA-I-3: Town sanitation master plan	25	50	25: Sanitation annual plan but no strategic plan; 50: Sanitation strategic plan and a sanitation annual plan
SA-T-1: Checks on construction quality	25	50	25: Construction quality is checked only for public latrines; 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	25	25	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	50	0: No designated place for dumping solid waste; 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	75	75	75: Policy and strategy for social equity... and awareness on policies and strategies is there...and interventions for vulnerable included in town annual plan
<b>Average service authority score</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>47</b>	
<b>% of service authority BMs met</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>63%</b>	

# Rural water

**Limited change has been observed related to water service provision in the rural areas around Sheno.**

## Service level

The proportion of functional and reliable point sources in the areas around Sheno has decreased since the baseline. The proportion of water points with safe water has increased.

- Monitoring of O&M and WASHCO performance is only done by some WAHSCOs (SA-T-3);
- Woreda water office annual recurrent budget is lower than 100,000 birr (SA-F-1);
- Woreda water office logistics (SA-F-2): there is only one motorbike available to the WWO.

## Changes in sustainability indicator scores

### Service provider level

While at the time of the baseline data collection, data was collected from 32 WASHCOs, only two WASHCOs were visited at the time of the midline survey.

### Service authority level

The number of WASH artisans in the woreda (SA-T-1) was reported to have increased, from WASH artisans in less than half of the kebeles, to all kebeles having at least one trained artisan.

However, the woreda water office annual recurrent budget (SA-F-1) was reported to have decreased to less than 100,000 birr per year.

## Sustainability challenges

The sustainability check revealed the following sustainability challenges to rural water in the areas around Sheno:

- Lack of well-composed and trained WASHCOs (SP-I-1);
- Lack of user payment and tariffs (SP-F-1);
- Lack of female representation in WASHCOs (SP-S-2);
- Woreda WASH Team is in place, but staff have not been trained;
- Woreda water office (SA-I-2) is in place, but has less than 75% of the required staff (SA-I-1);

## Rural water sustainability check results

Service levels rural water	2015	2016	Score description
Reliability	71%	73%	% of water points functioning for at least 85% of the year
Accessibility	89%	100%	
Quality	25%	60%	% 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	50%	0%	% 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	78%	50%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: WASHCO has by-laws
SP-T-1: Spare part supply	44%	50%	% 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	38%	100%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: Done at least annually
SP-F-1: User payment and tariffs	43%	0%	% of waterpoints meeting the benchmark: Annual fees, Monthly (or weekly) fees, or Tariffs per unit of used water
SP-F-2: Financial management of WASHCO	3%	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	3%	50%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: at least 1
SP-E-1: WASHCO Water safety plan	28%	50%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: There is a water safety plan
SP-S-1: Election of WASHCO by entire community	63%	100%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark:
SP-S-2: Women representation in WASHCOs	6%	0%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: At least 50% of the WASHCO members is female
<b>Average proportion of WASHCOs meeting the BM</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>45%</b>	
Service authority level	2015	2016	Score description
SA-I-1: Woreda WASH Team	25	25	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	75	75	75: There is a consolidated annual plan including NGO intervention
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	75	25: WASH artisans in the woreda, but less than half of the number of kebeles; 75: All kebeles have at least 1 trained artisan
SA-T-2: Checks on construction quality	100	100	25: Build quality is checked irregularly / not for all schemes; 50: Build quality is checked for all schemes
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, identifies non-functional schemes... and develops maintenance plan...and ensures that all are maintained
SA-F-1: Woreda water office annual recurrent budget	50	25	50: Operational budget 100.000-150.000 birr; 25: Operational budget 50,000-100.000 birr
SA-F-2: Woreda water office logistics	25	25	25: One motor bike available to WWO
<b>Average service authority score</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>50</b>	
<b>% of service authority BMs met</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>	

# Rural sanitation

**Open defecation practice has reduced significantly in the rural areas around Sheno. Also improvements were observed in the conditions for sustainable sanitation at service provider level.**

## Service level

The proportion of households with members practising open defecation has gone down. However, although the proportion of households with access to private, clean, safe latrines has increased, it is still tiny.

- does not meet on monthly basis (SA-I-1);
- There are still insufficient logistics for woreda staff responsible for rural sanitation and hygiene promotion to monitor and follow up on rural S&H (SA-F-2).

## Changes in sustainability indicator scores

### Service provider level

Effective messaging related to sanitation and hygiene (SP-T-1) has improved. Over the last year, it was reported to have been done on a continuous basis in the entire woreda. This has resulted in some ODF kebeles.

### Service authority level

Coordination at woreda level between stakeholders involved in rural sanitation (SA-I-1) improved with the introduction of a task force. However, the task force does not meet on monthly basis.

Woreda capacity to facilitate sanitation and hygiene promotion (SA-I-2) improved. In addition to having sufficient staff and having received initial training, staff members have now also received irregular retraining.

## Sustainability challenges

The sustainability check revealed the following sustainability challenges to rural sanitation in the areas around Sheno:

- Access to financing mechanisms for latrine artisans (SP-F-2) remains a challenge, as financial mechanisms are difficult to access for latrine artisans (e.g. high interest, need for collateral);
- As mentioned above, there is a coordination structure in place, but it

## Rural sanitation sustainability check results

Service levels rural sanitation	2015	2016	Score description
Open defecation free	43%	80%	% of households of which none of the household members practises open defecation
Improved sanitation coverage:	4%	10%	% of households with their own improved latrine
Clean and private improved sanitation coverage (proportion of population):	0%	10%	% 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	25	75	25: Messaging on sanitation and hygiene takes place on continuous basis in at least half the woreda; 75: Messaging on sanitation and hygiene takes place on continuous basis in the entire woreda... and some ODF kebeles
SP-F-2: Access to financing mechanisms for latrine artisans	25	25	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
<b>Average service provider score</b>	56	69	
<b>% of service provider BMs met</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>75%</b>	
Service authority level	2015	2016	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	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	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: Operational budget < 50,000 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	75	75	75: Policy and strategy for social equity... and awareness on policies and strategies is there...and interventions for vulnerable included in woreda annual plan
<b>Average service authority score</b>	40	50	
<b>% of service authority BMs met</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>60%</b>	

# Institutional WASH

**Good progress has been made in improving institutional WASH. Service levels have increased and conditions for sustainable institutional WASH have improved at both service provider level and service authority level.**

## Service level

Both in health facilities and in schools access to WASH services has improved. The proportion of schools and health facilities with access to functional water facilities of acceptable quality within the compound has increased. Although the proportion of health facilities and schools with clean and private latrines has increased, about two-thirds of schools and latrines still do not have clean and private sanitation facilities.

The availability of septic tank emptiers has improved (SA-T-3). In addition to having septic tank emptiers in urban areas, they are now also available in some rural areas around the town.

As mentioned in the urban sanitation section, safe disposal of solid waste (SA-E-2) in an environmentally sound manner has improved with the introduction of designated dumping places and at least half of the solid waste is actually being dumped at these locations.

## Changes in sustainability indicator scores

### Service provider level

Improvements have been observed in the performance of health facilities and schools related to provision of WASH services. These have mainly included:

- Increased % of schools with active school health club or administrative body that manages latrines;
- Increased % of institutions with regular cleaning programme, cleaning at least once a week;
- Increased % of schools with menstrual hygiene disposal facilities;
- Increased % of institutions which are open defecation free;
- Increased proportion of schools with separate latrines for boys and girls.

### Service authority level

Coordination at town level between stakeholders involved in school WASH (SA-I-1) improved with the introduction of a task force. However, this task force does not meet on a monthly basis. No such structure has been put in place for WASH in the health facility.

## Sustainability challenges

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

- Lack of sanitation facilities with handwashing facilities with water and soap (or ash) (SP-T-2);
- Presence of menstrual hygiene management facilities (SP-T-3) has improved in schools, but not in health facilities;
- Septic tank emptying practices (SP-T-4) remain a challenge, especially in schools;
- Lack of a coordination structure for WASH in health facilities. The task force on school WASH does not meet on a regular basis (SA-I-1);
- Lack of effective support to WASH in health facilities (SA-T-2), as it takes more than a week to provide support after health facility put in a request;
- Insufficient financing at woreda and town level to monitor and follow up support to school WASH (SA-F-1);
- Insufficient logistics at woreda and town level to monitor and follow up on institutional WASH service provision (SA-F-2);
- Safe disposal and / or reuse of sludge in an environmentally sound manner (SA-E-1) remains a challenge, with no sludge disposal and treatment site in place.

## 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	0%	50%	17%	67%	% of institutions with functional improved water supply within the compound
Institutional sanitation coverage	100%	100%	67%	100%	% of institutions with improved sanitation
Institutions with clean and private sanitation	0%	25%	17%	33%	% of institutions with clean, safe and private sanitation facilities
<b>Service provider indicators</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>Score description</b>
SP-I-1: Roles for cleaning and minor maintenance of institutional latrines	100%	100%	33%	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	100%	75%	50%	100%	% 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	100%	0%	33%	33%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: Septic tank emptying
SP-F-2: Financing of capital maintenance of sanitation facilities	100%	75%	67%	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)	100%	100%	67%	100%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: between 10 and 30 m
SP-E-2: Open defecation free environment	0%	100%	50%	83%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: ODF
SP-S-1: Social inclusion of latrine facilities	100%	25%	33%	100%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: Separate latrines for males and females
<b>Average % of institutions meeting BM</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>75%</b>	
<b>Service authority indicators</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>Score description</b>
SA-I-1: Coordination at woreda level between stakeholder involved in institutional WASH	0	50	0	25	0: No coordination structures; 25: Coordination structure
SA-I-2: Local government capacity to provide support to institutional sanitation	75	25	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	100	75	100	100	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	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	50	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	50	25	25	25	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	25	25	25	25	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	50	50	0: No designated place for dumping solid waste; 50: Designated place for dumping solid waste, and at least half of solid waste dumped here
<b>Average service authority score</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>50</b>	
<b>% of service authority BMs met</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>56%</b>	

## Conclusions and recommendations

So far, the ONEWASH Plus project seems to have been most successful in improving institutional WASH in Sheno. The proportion of schools with improved functional water provision within the compound has increased, as has the proportion of schools with latrine facilities. Service provider level sustainability scores related to school WASH have also increased considerably.

In addition, activities related to sanitation seems to have resulted in a decrease in open

defecation, especially in the rural areas. Service authority level sustainability scores related to urban sanitation have increased considerably.

However, water service levels have gone down rather than up, due to construction activities. Sustainability scores at service provider level are low for both urban and rural water services.

## Highlights of proposed actions

In urban water, proposed plans include hiring additional skilled staff, procure disinfection equipment, train staff, regularly conduct quality monitoring and disinfection, train water board members and provide guidelines to improve the effectiveness of the overview.

In urban sanitation, improvement of stakeholder coordination through integration of planning and monitoring, to build social inclusive public latrine facilities and provide the municipality with logistics have been proposed to improve sustainability.

In rural water proposed plans include allocating adequate operational budget and logistics, hire additional staff and training of WASH artisans.

In rural sanitation, procurement of adequate logistics, support of the woreda administration to ensure that coordination structures meet regularly and facilitate funding with micro finance have been proposed to improve sustainability.

In institutional WASH, supply of handwashing facilities with water and soap, construction of menstrual hygiene disposal facilities and provision of appropriate emptying services for rural schools and health facilities have been proposed to improve sustainability.

This factsheet was produced by IRC 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.