



# Sustainability of WASH services Wukro, Tigray

## 2016 Town audit statement

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

### Key findings

**Town water supply:** Limited number of skilled staff remains a critical challenge. The utility did not have asset management in place. There are also low cost recovery and environmental challenges.

**Rural water supply:** Limited maintenance capacity of WASHCOs, and inadequate operational budget of the WWO remain critical sustainability challenges.

**Urban sanitation:** The difficulty to access financing for sanitation service providers remains critical challenge. Insufficient logistics and environmental issues are other challenges.

**Rural Sanitation:** Limited access to financing mechanisms for latrine artisans and insufficient logistics for woreda staff were the main sustainability challenges.

**Institutional WASH:** Inadequate WASH facilities, insufficient woreda capacity, and limited availability of logistics are listed as challenges.

### Sustainability check overview

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

- Service provider level: The level at which day-to-day management of the WASH services takes place. This is the level of the Town Water Utility, WASHCOs, latrine artisans, septic tank emptiers, solid waste collectors, 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. Besides the improvement in asset management procedures, no considerable improvements have been observed in service provider and service authority performance.**

## Service level

The majority of the people in Wukro town continue to depend on the town's piped water scheme for their main source of water supply. However, the services provided by this scheme seem to have deteriorated since the last sustainability check in 2015.

The Wukro piped scheme only has four public fountains, two of which are actually in use and supplied with water on a daily basis. The number of household connections has increased from 5,691 during the baseline to 6,216 in the midline survey. This has not led to changes in the accessibility score.

The water quality score has increased slightly. At the time of the midline survey, both of the public fountains and 7 of the 8 checked household connections provided safe water (E. coli count < 10 MPN/100 ml).

However, reliability of the water supply remains a big challenge. During the dry season water is supplied to household connections once every two weeks. The coping system used by households is to collect and store water when it is available. This is probably the main reason for the low water consumption. The amount of water sold through household connections and public taps only amounted to about 30 litres per person served per day, which is an increase from the 24 lpcd sold in 2015.

## Changes in sustainability indicator scores

### Service provider level

The Town Water Utility has taken good steps in improving non-revenue water mitigation (SP-T-2), asset management (SP-F-3), and strategies for reaching the urban poor (SP-S-1).

However, on the downside, cost recovery (SP-F-1) has decreased. In 2015, the revenues exceeded the expenditure with a factor 1.9, while in 2016 the revenues were not sufficient to cover the expenditure (revenue/expenditure ratio of 0.81).

### Service authority level

There has been no change in sustainability indicator scores at service authority level.

## Sustainability challenges

The sustainability check has identified the following challenges related to the provision of water supply in Wukro Town:

- A lack of well-trained staff (SP-I-4). Although the Town Water Utility is reasonably staffed in terms of number of people (with 79 of the 91 positions filled), not all staff have received training in WASH planning, management and monitoring;
- The above mentioned low cost recovery level (SP-F-1);
- The lack of a catchment management plan (SA-E-1).

## Urban water sustainability check results

Service levels urban water	2015	2016	Score description
Reliability	0	0	0: Rotation is practised for at least part of the year
Accessibility	75	75	75: At least 85% of households access the piped scheme within 250m
Quality	50	25	50: All samples E. coli count of <10; 25: At least half of samples E. coli count of <10
Quantity	0	25	0: Water sales is less than half of GTP-2 norm; 25: Water sales is at least half of GTP-2 norm
<b>Average service level score</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>31</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 department
SP-I-2: Staff Productivity	50	50	50: 10<15 staff per 1000 connections.
SP-I-4: Town Water Utility staffing	25	25	25: >= 75% of required staff
SP-T-2: Non-revenue water	0	75	0: NRW is not known; 75: <20%, action developed for reducing NRW
SP-T-3: Adequate supply of spare parts for minor maintenance (pipes, fittings etc.)	75	75	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	100	75	100: Monthly disinfection of reservoir(s) by qualified operator... and periodic (at least monthly) quality check (chemical, bacteriological, physical) on network; 75: Monthly disinfection of reservoir(s) by qualified operator... and intermittent quality check (chemical, bacteriological, physical) on network
SP-F-1: Cost Recovery	50	0	50: Operation cost recovery.... and 20% reserve; 0: Operational cost recovery not met
SP-F-2: Effective financial management	100	100	100: Double entry accounting system with annual income statement.... and balance sheet... and audited
SP-F-3: Effective asset management	0	100	0: No (or incomplete/ outdated) asset registry; 100: All utility assets registered... and accumulated depreciation calculated...and condition identified... and replacement plan developed
SP-F-4: Effective billing and collection	100	75	100: Computerised billing with no backlog and >95 collection rate and < 10% zero reading; 75: Computerised billing with no backlog and >80 collection rate
SP-S-1: Urban poor get affordable water	25	100	25: Insufficient public taps and shared yard connections in the town; 100: Sufficient public taps in the town and shared yard taps for urban poor.... and provision of credit facility for urban poor for private connections...., which are all repaid within 1 year
<b>Average service provider score</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>65</b>	
<b>% of service provider BMs met</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>83%</b>	
Service authority Indicators	2015	2016	
SA-I-1: Sufficient capacity at regional and zonal level to provide support to TWUs	75	75	75: Region has dedicated department / section for supporting TWU, with adequate staff... and logistics and budget
SA-I-2: Presence of Water Board (WB)	75	75	75: WB established by Regional proclamation... and trained... and with guidelines
SA-T-1: Effective provision of technical support to the TWU	50	50	50: Technical support to the TWU is generally provided within a week
SA-T-2: Checks on construction quality	75	75	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
<b>Average service authority score</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>55</b>	
<b>% of service authority BMs met</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>80%</b>	

# Urban sanitation

**Although efforts have been put in place to improve the sanitation situation in Wukro, there are still challenges to be addressed, especially related to ensuring improved sanitation services to all and ensuring collection and treatment of human waste.**

## Service level

In 2016, 100% of households have become open defecation free. During the same period, the proportion of households with their own improved latrine decreased. Proportion of households with their own improved clean latrine which provides privacy also decreased.

## Changes in sustainability indicator scores

### Service provider level

The scores on the sustainability indicators at service provider level have improved considerably. Benchmarks have been met on all but one indicator. Improvements have been observed related to:

- The presence of public latrines (SP-T-3);
- Access to financing mechanisms for sanitation service providers (SP-F-3);
- Affordability of solid waste management services for households (SP-S-2).

### Service authority level

At service authority level, the following improvements have been observed:

- Checks on construction quality have improved (SA-T-1);
- Town level strategies and interventions have been implemented for reaching the poorest with sanitation facilities (SA-S-1).

## Sustainability challenges

Sustainability challenges at service provider level include:

- Inadequate liquid waste services (SP-I-1) and access to septic emptying services (SP-T-2). The town only has one old vacuum truck that often breaks down. At the time of the midline survey, the truck had not provided services over the last three months. Under the ONEWASH Plus project, a new truck has been purchased. However, this truck was not yet operational at the time of data collection.
- Difficulty to access financing for sanitation service providers (SP-F-3).

Challenges at service authority level include:

- Insufficient logistics for town staff to monitor and follow-up on sanitation and hygiene (SA-F-1);
- Unsafe disposal of sludge (SA-E-1) in an environmentally sound manner.

## Urban Sanitation sustainability check results

Service levels urban sanitation	2015	2016	Score description
Open defecation free	96%	100%	% of households of which none of the members practice open defecation
Improved sanitation coverage	72%	65%	% of households with their own improved latrine
Clean, private, safe improved sanitation coverage (proportion of population)	43%	31%	% of households with their own improved clean latrine which provides privacy
<b>Service provider level</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>Score description</b>
SP-I-1: Liquid waste services	25	25	25: By municipality
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	25	25: Takes longer than 7 days
SP-T-3: Public latrines built and effectively operational	25	50	25: Inadequate number (<half of required) available; 50: Sufficient public latrines available but poorly managed
SP-F-3: Access to financing mechanisms for sanitation service providers	0	25	0: No Access to finance; 25: Access to finance but difficult to access (e.g. high interest, need for collateral)
SP-S-1: Affordability of liquid waste management services for households	100	100	100: Affordable without subsidy to all households
SP-S-2: Affordability of solid waste management services for households	25	100	25: Only affordable with subsidy; 100: Affordable without subsidy to all households
SP-S-3: Availability of social inclusive public latrine facilities	50	50	50: Separate facilities for men and women
<b>Average service provider score</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>58</b>	
<b>Number of service provider BMs met</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>70%</b>	
<b>Service authority level</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>Score description</b>
SA-I-1: Coordination at town level between stakeholder involved in urban sanitation	100	100	100: Coordination structure....meeting on monthly basis... with agreed actions based on meeting....and a joint annual plan
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	75	75	75: Consolidated annual plan including NGO intervention
SA-T-1: Checks on construction quality	50	75	50: Construction quality is checked for public and private latrines; 75: Construction quality is checked for public and private latrines....using standard checklists
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	50	50	50: Sludge disposal and treatment site in place
Sa-E-2: Safe disposal of solid waste in an environmentally sound manner	50	50	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	50	75	50: Policy and strategy for social equity... and awareness on policies and strategies is there; 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>59</b>	<b>66</b>	
<b>% of service authority BMs met</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>88%</b>	

# Rural water

The trainings provided to WASHCO members as part of the ONEWASH Plus project seem to have had a positive effect on the performance of WASHCOs.

## Service level

In 2016, the water supply coverage improved. However, the water quality was found to be worse than at the time of the baseline data collection. This change in water quality could be due to the fact that midline data was collected in Wukro during the rainy season, while baseline data had been collected in the dry season.

## Changes in sustainability indicator scores

### Service provider level

All WASHCOs reported to have received training since the baseline. This may have contributed to the improvements in service provider level, which have included the following:

- % of WASHCOs with by-laws (SP-I-2) increased;
- Spare part supply (SP-T-1) improved;
- The proportion of water points with tariffs (SP-F-1) increased;
- % of WASHCOs with up-to-date financial records and a dedicated account in a financial institution (SP-F-2) increased;
- % of WASHCOs with a positive annual revenue / expenditure balance (SP-F-3) increased;
- % of WASHCOs with water safety plan reached 100%.

However, the % of WASHCOs that reported the WASHCO had been elected by the entire community (SP-S-1) decreased.

### Service authority level

The main changes at service authority level are the following:

- Presence of trained WASH artisans in the woreda (SA-T-1) improved;
- Woreda water office annual recurrent budget (SA-F-1) improved slightly.

## Sustainability challenges

Sustainability challenges at service provider level include:

- Lack of routine (preventive) maintenance practices. Only a quarter of WASHCOs reported to practise this on at least an annual basis;
- Election of WASHCO members (SP-S-1), which was reported to be done by a small group within the community, or by the men only for the majority of the WASHCOs.

Sustainability challenges at service provider level include:

- Inadequate monitoring of O&M and WASHCO performance (SA-T-3);
- Limited woreda water office annual recurrent budget (SA-F-1), which could be a cause of the aforementioned inadequate monitoring.

## Rural water sustainability check results

Service levels rural water	2015	2016	Score description
Reliability	54%	92%	% of water points functioning for at least 85% of the year
Accessibility	78%	100%	% of households within acceptable distance of main source of water supply
Quality	80%	25%	% 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	95%	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	58%	88%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: WASHCO has by-laws
SP-T-1: Spare part supply	37%	75%	% 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	5%	25%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: Done at least annually
SP-F-1: User payment and tariffs	73%	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	53%	88%	% 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	21%	100%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: at least 1
SP-E-1: WASHCO Water safety plan	63%	100%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: There is a water safety plan
SP-S-1: Election of WASHCO by entire community	89%	25%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark
SP-S-2: Women representation in WASHCOs	63%	88%	% of WASHCOs meeting the benchmark: At least 50% of the WASHCO members is female
<b>Average proportion of WASHCOs meeting the BM</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>79%</b>	
Service authority level	2015	2016	Score description
SA-I-1: Woreda WASH Team	50	50	50: There is a WWT, supported by woreda programme staff...and WWT has been trained
SA-I-2: Woreda Water Office	50	50	50: Woreda water office has more than 75% of required staff... and are trained in WASH planning, management and monitoring
SA-I-3: Woreda level plan	75	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	100	100	NA
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	25	0: Operational budget < 50,000 birr; 25: Operational budget 50,000-100.000 birr
SA-F-2: Woreda water office logistics	50	50	50: Two motor bikes available to WWO
<b>Average service authority score</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>55</b>	
<b>% of service authority BMs met</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>80%</b>	

# Rural sanitation

Open defecation practices have decreased in the rural areas around Wukro, where the ONEWASH Plus project has been promoting good sanitation and hygiene practices.

## Service level

The proportion of households reporting to practice open defecation has decreased considerably. The proportion of households with their own improved latrine has increased substantially as well.

## Changes in sustainability indicator scores

### Service provider level

In 2016, in a number of areas sustainability factors have improved. One area of improvement was that local private sector with capacity to construct, repair and improve latrines increased.

Areas where services have become worse are:

- Effective messaging related to sanitation and hygiene;
- Access to financing for artisans.

### Service authority level

At service authority level improvements were made in the integration of S&H in the woreda WASH plan (SA-I-3), and in developing a woreda level strategy and interventions for reaching the poorest with sanitation facilities (SA-S-1).

## Sustainability challenges

Limited access to financing mechanisms for latrine artisans (SP-F-2) was the main critical sustainability challenge at service provider level.

Insufficient logistics for woreda staff responsible for rural sanitation and hygiene promotion to monitor and follow-up on rural S&H (SA-F-1) was the main sustainability challenge at service authority level.

## Rural sanitation sustainability check results

Service levels rural sanitation	2015	2016	Score description
	Wukro	Wukro	Wukro
Open defecation free	48%	70%	% of households of which none of the household members practise open defecation
Improved sanitation coverage:	12%	70%	% 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
<b>Service provider level</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>Score description</b>
SP-I-1: Local private sector with capacity to construct, repair and improve latrines	50	100	50: Latrine artisans only in town; 100: Latrine artisans also in rural areas
SP-T-1: Effective messaging related to sanitation and hygiene	50	50	50: Messaging on sanitation and hygiene takes place on continuous basis in the entire woreda
SP-F-2: Access to financing mechanisms for latrine artisans	100	25	100: Access to finance, with reasonable conditions... and all latrine artisans access the financing mechanism; 25: Access to finance but difficult to access (e.g. high interest, need for collateral)
SP-S-1: Affordability of latrines for households	75	75	75: Affordable without subsidy for most households
<b>Average service provider score</b>	69	63	
<b>% of service provider BMs met</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75%</b>	
<b>Service authority level</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	
SA-I-1: Coordination at woreda level between stakeholder involved in rural sanitation	0	0	0: No coordination structures
SA-I-2: Woreda capacity to facilitate sanitation and hygiene promotion	100	100	100: Sufficient dedicated staff that have received training and annual retraining
SA-I-3: S&H in woreda WASH plan	75	100	75: Consolidated annual plan including NGO intervention; 100: Consolidated annual sanitation plan prepared involving all stakeholders
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
<b>Average service authority score</b>	40	60	
<b>% of service authority BMs met</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>60%</b>	

# Institutional WASH

The proportion of institutions (health facilities and schools) with sanitation facilities which are clean and private has increased in and around Wukro. Also improvements have been observed in the conditions for sustainable institutional WASH at school and health facility level.

## Service level

The proportion of institutions (health facilities and schools) with sanitation facilities which are clean and private has increased in and around Wukro.

## Changes in sustainability indicator scores

### Service provider level

Changes at service provider level were the following:

- All health facilities reported to have clear understanding of roles for cleaning and minor maintenance, and all schools reported to have School Health Clubs in place to take on these roles (SP-I-1);
- All schools and health facilities reported to practise cleaning of latrines at least once a week (SP-T-1);
- All health facilities now have separate latrines for males and females (SP-S-1).

### Service authority level

Changes at service authority level were the following:

- Local government capacity for providing support to institutional sanitation (SA-I-1) improved;
- Provision of effective support to institutional WASH (SA-T-2) improved;
- As mentioned in the urban sanitation section of this note, the situation related to safe disposal of liquid waste (SA-E-1) deteriorated.

## Sustainability challenges

Sustainability challenges at service provider level mostly related to technical sustainability challenges. These include:

- Limited availability of sufficient and appropriately equipped sanitation facilities including hand washing in schools and health facilities (SP-T-1);
- Lack of handwashing facility with water and soap (or ash) in health facilities and schools (SP-T-2);
- Lack of septic tank emptying practices in schools and health facilities (SP-T-4).

Challenges at service authority level are mainly related to financial sustainability:

- Insufficient financing at woreda and town level to monitor and follow-up support to schools (SA-F-1);
- Limited availability of logistics at woreda level to support WASH facilities in schools and health institutions (SA-F-2).

In addition, the lack of a site for safe disposal of sludge in an environmentally sound manner (SA-E-1) poses an environmental sustainability challenge.

## Institutional WASH sustainability check results

Service levels Institutional WASH	Health facilities		Schools		Score description
	2015	2016	2015	2016	
Institutional water supply coverage	100%	100%	88%	88%	% of institutions with access to improved water supply
Improved functioning water supply of acceptable quality in compound of institution	67%	67%	75%	75%	% of institutions with functional improved water supply within the compound
Institutional sanitation coverage	100%	100%	100%	100%	% of institutions with improved sanitation
Institutions with clean and private sanitation	33%	67%	25%	75%	% 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	67%	100%	50%	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	67%	100%	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%	13%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: Availability of handwashing facility .... with water and soap (or ash)
SP-T-4: Septic tank emptying practices	0%	0%	13%	0%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: Septic tank emptying
SP-F-2: Financing of capital maintenance of sanitation facilities	100%	67%	100%	88%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: By the institution and / or the users
SP-E-1: Distance between latrines and water source (hand dug well / borehole / spring)	100%	100%	100%	88%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: between 10 and 30 m
SP-E-2: Open defecation free environment	100%	100%	100%	100%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: ODF
SP-S-1: Social inclusion of latrine facilities	33%	100%	75%	100%	% of institutions meeting the benchmark: Separate latrines for males and females
<b>Average % of institutions meeting BM</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>73%</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 stakeholders involved in institutional WASH					0: No coordination structures
SA-I-2: Local government capacity to provide support to institutional sanitation	75	75	25	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	75	100	100	75: Monitoring at least every 6 months and support is provided accordingly; 100: Monitoring at least every 6 months and support is provided accordingly...and monitoring results inform future planning
SA-T-2: Effective support to institutional WASH	25	75	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; 75: Support on request of institutions. It takes three days or less to respond to a request
SA-T-3: Availability of septic tank emptiers	50	75	50	75	50: In all urban areas; 75: In all urban areas....and some in rural
SA-F-1: Sufficient financing at woreda and town level to monitor and follow-up support to institutional WASH	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	50	50	50	50	50: Sludge disposal and treatment site in place
SA-E-2: Safe disposal and / or recycling of solid waste in an environmentally sound manner	50	50	50	50	50: Designated place for dumping solid waste, and at least half of solid waste dumped here
<b>Average service authority score</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>56</b>	
<b>% of service authority BMs met</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>75%</b>	

## Conclusions and recommendations

In general, many of the conditions for sustainable WASH service provision are in place in and around Wukro. Over the last two years, service provider level conditions for sustainable WASH service have improved, especially for rural water and urban sanitation. Service authority level conditions for sustainable WASH

service provision have also generally improved slightly. However, service levels need to be further improved. Water service levels are still far removed from the standards set under GTP-2 and more people need access to latrines which are clean, and provide privacy and safety.

## Highlights of proposed actions

Town utility should strengthen institutional capacity through hiring and training of additional staff. Asset management and financial planning also need to be strengthened. In order to ensure environmental sustainability, catchment management should be introduced.

In urban sanitation, the town should improve funding arrangements for artisans so that they can access financing more easily. Furthermore, the municipality should increase its logistics and work towards addressing environmental safe disposal. Public latrines management could be improved through performance agreement with operators.

In rural water supply, the woreda water office should enhance the maintenance capacity of WASHCOs through training and support. Furthermore there is a need for increased

allocation of operational budget at woreda level to improve monitoring and support to WASHCOs.

In rural sanitation, the logistics at woreda level should be improved. In addition, woredas should improve funding arrangements for artisans so that they can access financing more easily.

Woreda level institutions should strengthen their WASH management capacity including getting more logistics in order to support schools and health facilities more effectively.

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.