



Sustainability of WASH services Welenchiti, 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 check from Welenchiti, 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: Some improvement in performance at service provider and service authority level. However, the level of services has not yet improved.

Urban sanitation: Reduction of open defecation. However, access to clean, private, safe latrines is still an issue for the majority of households. Performance at service authority level has improved slightly. Safe disposal of liquid waste remains a challenge.

Rural water supply: High rural water coverage and functionality. Lack of human and financial resources at woreda level for providing support to WASHCOs may present a sustainability problem.

Rural sanitation: Reduction of open defecation. Increase in service authority performance.

Institutional WASH: Although health facilities and schools have access to water and sanitation services, the quality of these services needs to be further improved.

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

Small improvements have been observed in performance at service provider and service authority level. However, the level of services provided has not yet improved.

Service level

Accessibility of the piped scheme has increased. The number of household connections has been increasing steadily, from 1,683 in 2015 to 1,795 in 2016.

Reliability of water supply remains a big issue. Water rationing is practised year round. When water is available, it can generally only be accessed during the night (dry season) or early morning. An important reason for this is the fact that the (borehole) pumps can only function at night due to electric power shortages in the town. In addition, some pumps are under-designed with an abstraction rate largely below the safe yield of the aquifer (AYJEF water works, 2013).

Water quality was also still found to be an issue.

The amount of water sold per household connection is relatively high, at 252 litres per connection per day (or 63 lpcd, assuming an average household size of 4 people). However, the total amount of water sold comes down to only about 29 litres per capita per day.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

The score on the utility organisation indicator (SP-I-1) improved, as a performance agreement has been signed between the utility and the Water Board. However, this agreement is not comprehensive and needs improving.

Availability of spare parts supply for minor maintenance (pipes, fittings etc.) (SP-T-3) has improved as spare parts are now available within one day.

Water quality management and disinfection has improved, as reservoir(s) have been

disinfected. However, this still happens less than once a month.

Asset management (SP-F-3) has improved, as now all utility assets are registered. However, accumulated depreciation is not calculated.

Billing and collection (SP-F-4) has improved. There is a computerised billing system with no backlog, > 95 collection rate and < 10% zero reading.

Service authority level

The score on the Water Board (WB) indicator (SA-I-2) increased, as Water Board members have been trained.

Checks on construction quality (SA-T-2) improved as general guidelines were implemented and used to check build quality for all urban water schemes.

Sustainability challenges

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

- Inadequate Town Water Utility staffing (SP-I-4), with only 65% of the required staff in place.
- Inadequate water quality management and disinfection (SP-T-5) as disinfection of reservoir(s) is not done on a monthly basis.
- Ineffective asset management (SP-F-3), as accumulated depreciation is not calculated.
- Lack of mechanisms for urban poor to get affordable water (SP-S-1), as there are insufficient public taps and shared yard connections in the town.
- 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	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 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	13	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	75	50: Utility in place... with three core departments; 75: Utility in place... with three core departments 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	NA	0	NA; 0: < 75% of required staff
SP-T-2: Non revenue water	75	75	75: <20%, action developed for reducing on NRW
SP-T-3: Adequate supply of spare parts for minor maintenance (pipes, fittings etc.)	50	75	50: Spare parts available within 3 days; 75: Spare parts available within day
SP-T-4: Effective maintenance system in place	75	75	75: Utility can execute all repairs (except major electronic mechanical maintenance) within 3 days... and executes periodic (preventive) maintenance
SP-T-5: Water quality management and disinfestation	0	25	0: No disinfection of reservoir(s); 25: Disinfection of reservoir(s) but less often than monthly
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	0	25	0: No (or incomplete/ outdated) asset registry; 25: All utility assets registered
SP-F-4: Effective billing and collection	75	100	75: Computerised billing with no backlog and >80 collection rate; 100: Computerised billing with no backlog and >95 collection rate and < 10% zero reading
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	45	52	
% of service provider BMs met	73%	67%	
Service authority indicators	2015	2016	Score description
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	50	25: WB established by Regional proclamation; 50: WB established by Regional proclamation..... and trained
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	75	50: Build quality is checked by zone/region for all schemes; 75: Build quality is checked by zone/region 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	35	45	
% of service authority BMs met	60%	80%	

Urban sanitation

Open defecation has been successfully reduced in the town. However, access to clean, private, safe latrines is still an issue for the majority of households. Performance at service authority level has improved slightly, especially related to coordination and planning. Safe disposal of liquid waste remains a challenge.

Service level

Open defecation has decreased. This was confirmed by the participants of the focus group discussion, who have observed that the sanitation situation has improved since the start of the project. So far, two of the 16 ketenas have been declared ODF.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

No change has been observed in service provider scores.

Service authority level

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

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

Safe disposal of sludge in an environmentally sound manner (SA-E-1) has improved as there is now a designated place for dumping liquid waste some 12 km from the town. However, less than half of the liquid waste is dumped here.

Sustainability challenges

The sustainability check revealed the following sustainability challenges to urban sanitation in Welenchiti:

- Access to septic emptying services (SP-T-2) is still an issue. Adama is the closest town from where privately operated vacuum truck services for septic emptying are obtained. The municipality facilitates the service.
- Insufficient public latrines built and effectively operational (SP-T-3). Welenchiti is a town located on the highway and sees many truck drivers passing through and taking a break in the town. In addition the town sees an inflow of some 500-600 daily labourers per day. Town visitors like these still have insufficient access to sanitation facilities.
- Construction quality (SA-T-1) is checked only for public latrines, not for household latrines.
- Lack of access to logistics for town staff to monitor and follow-up on sanitation and hygiene (SA-F-2).
- Lack of safe disposal of sludge in an environmentally sound manner (Sa-E-1), as less than half of the liquid waste is dumped at the designated site.

Urban Sanitation sustainability check results

Service levels urban sanitation	2015	2016	Score description
Open defecation free	90%	100%	% of households of which none of the members practise open defecation
Improved sanitation coverage	32%	40%	% of households with their own improved latrine
Clean, private, safe improved sanitation coverage (proportion of population)	7%	3%	% 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	75	75	75: On continuous basis in at least 70% of 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	75	75	75: Access to finance, with reasonable conditions... and at least 50% of sanitation service providers access the financing mechanisms
SP-S-1: Affordability of liquid waste management services for households		50	0: Not affordable to households; 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	50	50	
Number of service provider BMs met	75%	80%	
Service authority level	2015	2016	Score description
SA-I-1: Coordination at town level between stakeholders involved in urban sanitation	0	50	0: No coordination structures; 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	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	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	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	NA	50	NA; 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	100	100	100: Policy and strategy for social equity... and awareness on policies and strategies is there...and interventions for vulnerable included in town annual plan... and town undertakes comprehensive actions to address social equity
Average service authority score	32	47	
% of service authority BMs met	29%	63%	

Rural water

Rural water coverage and functionality are high in the areas around Welenchiti. However, the lack of human and financial resources at woreda level for providing support to WASHCOs may present a sustainability problem.

The four rural water points which were assessed both in the baseline and in the midline data collection round, in the rural areas around Welenchiti town, were all public taps connected to the town piped scheme or to deep wells with limited distribution. Four WASHCOs have been assessed in the baseline and two in the midline.

Service level

Functionality of the rural point sources around Welenchiti has remained at 100%.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

Because only a few WASHCOs have been assessed in the midline, the results presented in the table below have to be viewed with caution.

The biggest change seems to have been observed in indicator SP-F-2: Financial management of WASHCO. In the baseline only one of the four WASHCOs had up-to-date financial records and a dedicated account in a financial institution, in the midline both WASHCOs assessed met this benchmark.

Service authority level

The score on three service authority indicators has improved:

- Presence of WASH artisans in the woreda (SA-T-1), as there are now WASH artisans in at least half of the kebeles.
- Checks on construction quality (SA-T-2) as now build quality is checked for all schemes.

- Woreda water office logistics (SA-F-2), as the WWO now has access to three motor bikes.

Sustainability challenges

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

- Many WASHCOs do not practise routine (preventive) maintenance (SP-T-2) on at least annual basis;
- Lack of WASHCo water safety plans (SP-E-1);
- Lack of staffing of woreda water office (SA-I-2), with less than 75% of required staff in place;
- Lack on monitoring of O&M and WASHCO performance (SA-T-3), as the woreda water office only monitors some WASHCOs and provides technical support.
- Insufficient woreda water office annual recurrent budget (SA-F-1), with an annual operational budget of less than 50,000 birr.

Rural water sustainability check results

Service levels rural water	2015	2016	Score description
Reliability	25%	57%	% of water points functioning for at least 85% of the year
Accessibility	51%	100%	% of households within acceptable distance of main source of water supply
Quality	100%	100%	% 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%	50%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: WASHCO with pump attendant / caretaker.... and with all 3 of the key positions filled
SP-I-2: By-laws and legal status of the WASHCO	100%	100%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: WASHCO has by-laws
SP-T-1: Spare part supply	0%	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	25%	0%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: Done at least annually
SP-F-1: User payment and tariffs	100%	100%	% of waterpoints meeting the benchmark: Annual fees, Monthly (or weekly) fees, or Tariffs by unit of used water
SP-F-2: Financial management of WASHCO	25%	100%	% 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	25%	100%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: at least 1
SP-E-1: WASHCO water safety plan	25%	0%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: There is a water safety plan
SP-S-1: Election of WASHCO by entire community	100%	100%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark:
SP-S-2: Women representation in WASHCOs	0%	50%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: At least 50% of the WASHCO members is female
Average proportion of WASHCOs meeting the BM	45%	65%	
Service authority level	2015	2016	Score description
SA-I-1: Woreda WASH Team	75	75	75: There is a WWT, supported by woreda programme staff...and WWT has been trained... and retrained periodically
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	0	50	0: No trained artisans in the woreda; 50: At least half of the number of the kebeles
SA-T-2: Checks on construction quality	25	50	50: Build quality is checked for all schemes; 100: Build quality is checked for all schemes..., using standard checklists... and action is taken when faults are observed
SA-T-3: Monitoring of O&M and WASHCO performance	25	25	25: The woreda water office monitors some WASHCOs and provides technical support
SA-T-4: Scheme inventory and maintenance plan	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	0	0	0: Operational budget < 50,000 birr
SA-F-2: Woreda water office logistics	25	75	25: One motor bike available to WWO; 75: Three motor bikes available to WWO
Average service authority score	35	47.5	
% of service authority BMs met	40%	70%	

Rural sanitation

Open defecation has been reduced in the rural areas around Welenchiti. Service authority scores have increased. However, the lack of logistical resources needed to support and sustain good sanitation and hygiene behaviour in the woreda could pose a serious sustainability challenge.

Service level

The rural sanitation situation seems to have improved. The proportion of open defecation free households has increased, as has the proportion of households with clean, safe and private latrines.

Changes in sustainability indicator scores

Service provider level

No scores were available from 2015 on the service provision level. Therefore, it was not possible to do analyse the changes in sustainability conditions at this level.

Service authority level

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

Woreda capacity to facilitate sanitation and hygiene promotion (SA-I-2) has improved, as staff were reported to have received irregular retraining.

Woreda level strategy and interventions for reaching the poorest with sanitation facilities (SA-S-1) have improved, as a policy and strategy for social equity is in place and interventions for the vulnerable have been included in the woreda annual plan.

Sustainability challenges

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

- Lack of (or difficult) access to financing mechanisms for latrine artisans (SP-F-2);
- Insufficient logistics for woreda staff responsible for rural sanitation and hygiene promotion to monitor and follow-up on rural S&H (SA-F-2).

Rural sanitation sustainability check results

Service levels rural sanitation	2015	2016	Score description
Open defecation free	70%	80%	% of households of which none of the household members practises open defecation
Improved sanitation coverage:	18%	30%	% 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	0: No latrine artisans; 100: Latrine artisans also in rural areas
SP-T-1: Effective messaging related to sanitation and hygiene	25	50	25: Messaging on sanitation and hygiene takes place on continuous basis in at least half the woreda; 50: Messaging on sanitation and hygiene takes place on continuous basis in the entire woreda
SP-F-2: Access to financing mechanisms for latrine artisans		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 latrines for households	NA	50	NA; 50: Affordable without subsidy for some households
Average service provider score	25	56	
% of service provider BMs met	0%	75%	
Service authority level	2015	2016	Score description
SA-I-1: Coordination at woreda level between stakeholders 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			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	0	75	0: No 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	30	55	
% of service authority BMs met	40%	80%	

Institutional WASH

Although health facilities and schools have access to water and sanitation services, the quality of these services needs to be further improved.

Service level

Both in health facilities and in schools access to WASH services, especially sanitation has improved. However, not all institutions have a functional water supply of acceptable quality within their compound. Only one of the eight schools assessed has clean and private latrines.

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 (SP-I-1);
- Increased % of institutions with a regular cleaning programme, cleaning at least once a week (SP-T-1);
- Increased % of institutions which are open defecation free (SP-E-2);
- Increased % of schools with separate latrines for boys and girls (SP-S-1).

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 health facilities.

Effective support to institutional WASH (SA-T-3) was reported to have improved, with support now being provided to institutions on request within one week.

As mentioned in the urban sanitation section, safe disposal of liquid (SA-E-1) and solid (SA-

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

Sustainability challenges

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

- Lack of sufficient and appropriately equipped sanitation facilities including for hand washing (SP-T-2), as none of the health facilities and schools were found to have handwashing facilities with water and soap (or ash).
- Septic tank emptying practices (SP-T-4) remain a challenge, especially in schools.
- Lack of separate toilets for men and women in the majority of the health facilities.
- Lack of access to septic tank emptiers (SA-T-3), especially in rural areas.
- Insufficient financing (SA-F-1) and logistics (SA-F-2) at woreda and town level to monitor and follow-up support to institutional WASH.
- Safe disposal of sludge and solid waste in an environmentally sound manner (SA-E-1) remains a challenge. There is no sludge disposal and treatment site in place, although studies and plans have been developed to improve this.
- There is a designated dumping site for solid waste, but less than half the solid waste is dumped here. As the initial site named “Goro Gube” is now forbidden, waste is currently dumped at temporary sites. A new site is currently under construction.

Institutional WASH sustainability check results

Service levels Institutional WASH	Health facilities		Schools		Score description
	2015	2016	2015	2016	
Institutional water supply coverage	67%	100%	100%	100%	% of institutions with access to improved water supply
Improved functioning water supply of acceptable quality in compound of institution	0%	33%	38%	50%	% of institutions with functional improved water supply within the compound
Institutional sanitation coverage	67%	100%	63%	100%	% of institutions with improved sanitation
Institutions with clean and private sanitation	33%	0%	13%	13%	% 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	33%	100%	88%	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	33%	67%	63%	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	0%	33%	13%	13%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: Septic tank emptying
SP-F-2: Financing of capital maintenance of sanitation facilities	67%	67%	75%	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)	67%	100%	75%	100%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: between 10 and 30 m
SP-E-2: Open defecation free environment	67%	100%	50%	100%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: ODF
SP-S-1: Social inclusion of latrine facilities	33%	33%	50%	100%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: Separate latrines for males and females
Average % of institutions meeting BM	38%	63%	52%	77%	
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	na	50	NA	75	50: Sufficient dedicated staff that have received training; 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	100	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	0	50	25	50	0: No support; 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	25	25	25	25	25: Only in some urban areas
SA-F-1: Sufficient financing at woreda and town level to monitor and follow-up support to institutional WASH	50	50	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	0	25	0	25	0: No sludge disposal and treatment site in place, and no study of plan for safe disposal; 25: No sludge disposal and treatment site in place. Study and plan for safe disposal
SA-E-2: Safe disposal and / or recycling of solid waste in an environmentally sound manner	0	25	0	25	0: No designated place for dumping solid waste; 25: Designated place for dumping solid waste, but less than half of solid waste is dumped here
Average service authority score	25	44	25	44	
% of service authority BMs met	25%	56%	13%	44%	

Conclusions and recommendations

The progress made so far in improving the water supply situation in the town, had not yet resulted in improved water services.

Changes in sanitation services have been observed. These include a decrease in open defecation and improved solid waste management. Challenges are, however, remaining, especially related to the level of

sanitation services and the safe disposal of liquid and solid waste.

Some progress has also been made in the area of institutional WASH. However, the cleanliness of institutional latrines and the presence of handwashing facilities remain an issue in more than half of the visited institutions.

Highlights of proposed actions

Regarding urban water, the town utility should strengthen institutional capacity by hiring additional employees to ensure there is adequate staff to manage it effectively. Asset management needs 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.

To improve urban sanitation, the town should build additional public latrines (both municipal and private) and commercialise management. Furthermore, the municipality should invest in acquiring adequate logistics.

In rural water supply, woreda should develop water safety plans. WASHCOs should be

strengthened by training members.

Furthermore, there is a need for allocation of adequate budget at woreda level to improve monitoring and support to WASHCOs.

In rural sanitation, the logistics at woreda level should be improved and access to funding for latrine artisans should improve as well.

Woredas should build more WASH facilities with menstrual hygiene disposal facilities and dedicated room with water. Furthermore, woredas should develop a financing plan for operation and maintenance of WASH facilities and should strengthen their WASH management capacity.

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