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# 1.0 Introduction

## 1.1 WASH Performance and Context

Inadequate water, sanitation and hygiene services constitute a global challenge. The latest GLAAS report (UN Water and WHO 2014[[1]](#footnote-2)) observes that 748 million women, men and children are without ready access to an improved drinking water source while more than a third of the world population (2.5 billion) lack basic sanitation. The report notes that the sector faces strategic challenges of monitoring of WASH, country-level capacity to implement plans and receipt of insufficient funding (Ibid). The GLAAS report advocates for four interconnected priorities that relate to:

* Securing, absorbing and targeting sustained international and national financing;
* Renewing the focus on health facilities to strengthen hygiene promotion and WASH in schools;
* Supporting the operation and maintenance of existing infrastructure and services; and
* Expanding efforts in neglected areas in need of improved services provided by formal institutions.

Zimbabwe faces serious challenges despite early progress when water coverage increased from 32 percent to 56 percent and overall sanitation access rose from 28 percent to 55 percent (World Bank 2013[[2]](#footnote-3)). In general urban WASH services achieved well over 90 percent coverage by the late 1990s. However, since the 1990s there has been a decline whose extent is not fully known with sanitation having stagnated since the 1990s (World Bank et al 2013). Case-study based analyses show a desperate situation in most towns (Mapfumo and Madesha 2014[[3]](#footnote-4); Government of Zimbabwe 2012[[4]](#footnote-5); Human Rights Watch 2013[[5]](#footnote-6); World Bank 2013; Chinyama and Toma 2013[[6]](#footnote-7); Hove and Tirimboi 2011[[7]](#footnote-8); Municipality of Chinhoyi et al 2014[[8]](#footnote-9); Makwara and Tavuyanago 2012[[9]](#footnote-10); Economic Consulting Associates 2011[[10]](#footnote-11)). The situation is characterized by water scarcity, increasing frequency of reported sewerage system blockages, declining overall service quality, affordability challenges, high non-revenue water (NRW), a significant gap between general and active coverage and Councils being unable to extend or upgrade their WASH systems against a background of rising urban populations. Residents in some urban neighbourhoods go without Council or ZINWA provided water over periods ranging from hours to years.

Variable reasons are given for the service decline with Mapfumo and Madesha (2014) citing population growth, poor and ageing infrastructure, economic challenges and climate change. Human Rights Watch (2013) cites lack of institutional capacity (government failure to provide access to potable water, adequate health information and to address poor sanitation) and public sector corruption compounded by a lack of political will at all levels of government to address these problems. Based on their analysis of a Chinhoyi Suburb Chinyama and Toma (2013) concur on population growth (over-crowdedness) and also noted that WASH challenges reflect a triple failure; of system infrastructure, system operation and behaviour of residents. Hove and Tirimboi (2011) also highlight institutional failure. They cite the takeover of WASH service delivery by ZINWA in 2005 as having triggered performance constraints for Harare. They further contend that resistance by residents to pay fixed monthly charges and the perception by 54.8%[[11]](#footnote-12) of the residents that water was of poor quality affected service sustainability.

Many towns are currently unable to meet the demand for WASH services as Table 1 below shows regarding water. The study of seven towns[[12]](#footnote-13) by Economic Consulting Associates showed that only two (Mutare and Kwekwe) nearly provided sufficient water. Zimbabwe’s Urban WASH challenge is generally considered to be multifaceted (Makwara and Tavuyanago 2012), requiring fundamental decisions regarding the roles, responsibilities and funding of Urban Councils (Economic Consulting Associates 2011; Human Rights Watch 2013), and among others, raising residents’ awareness (Chinyama and Toma 2013)

### Table 1: Water Supply Performance for selected urban areas



Source: African Development Bank Group (2010[[13]](#footnote-14))

Makwara and Tavuyanago (2012:1) sum up the urban WASH challenges when they note that ‘

Zimbabwe’s urban areas are choking under the weight of over-crowdedness…dilapidated infrastructure…constant service failure…[and] water and sewer systems…are on the verge of collapse…putting millions…in danger of consuming contaminated water…The quality and quantity of water supplied in Zimbabwe’s urban centres has plummeted…owing to the difficult economic situation and other challenges faced by the country”.

Further the Government of Zimbabwe (2013: 16ff[[14]](#footnote-15)) characterises service delivery slippage thus:

‘Access to urban water supply decreased from 97% in 1990 to 60% in 2008…sanitation decreased from 99% in 1990 to 40% in 2008…water dropped from 24hrly supply to between 6 and 12 hours per day, and costs exceeded tariffs in 50% of urban local authorities as of 2012…in 2004, WASH inventory estimated that 75% of the…47000 hand pumps were non-functional. A 2009 report indicated that 48% of…rural population did not have a toilet facility’.

In response to the inadequate WASH service delivery urban residents have resorted to multiple alternatives. The Municipality of Chinhoyi et al (2014) study observed cases where individual households were accessing three sanitation options of ecological sanitation, flush and pit toilets with open defecation reportedly rising. It highlights residents resorting to what the study called improvised water sources. Hove and Tirimboi (2011) cite Harare households resorting to household level water purification, use of borehole and bottled drinking water. Other studies have also observed a decline in social values, principles, standards and ethics amongst the population as they adapt to unacceptable service standards, environmental situations and social behaviours (ISF‐UTS 2011[[15]](#footnote-16)). These new behaviours are largely enforced by inadequate or a complete lack of services. Unfortunately they have the potential of obstructing plans to improve the standard of water and sanitation in the country. Responses to inadequate WASH services that ISF‐UTS (2011) cite include household level treatment of drinking water and waste management, lowering of WASH standards and sometimes engaging in unsafe practices, and have become accustomed to not demanding better service standards. The suite of alternative suggests considerable desperation if cases of typhoid and diarrhoea in urban areas like Harare is taken into account. The World Bank (2013) report records 3539 diarrhoeal deaths related to inadequate WASH.

## 1.2 Policy and Institutional Environment

Zimbabwe has enshrined the right to water and sanitation in the 2013 national constitution (Sections 73:1a and 77a), which is consistent with international law and UN resolution of 2010[[16]](#footnote-17) as shown below. The country also has a Water Policy (adopted in 2013) and other complementary national and local authority level policy and legislative instruments for regulating the sector, plans and programmes for responding to WASH gaps.

|  |
| --- |
| Box 1: UN Resolution on the Human Right to Water and Sanitation In July 2010, a UN Resolution2 formally recognized the right to water and sanitation and acknowledged that clean drinking-water and sanitation are essential to the realization of all human rights. “The human right to water and sanitation entitles everyone to ***sufficient, safe, accessible, culturally acceptable and affordable*** water and sanitation services for personal and domestic uses, and which are delivered in a ***participatory, accountable and non-discriminatory manner***. Governments are obliged to ensure that everybody gains access to these services over a considered timeframe, through creating an enabling environment, namely by adopting appropriate legislation, policies, programmes and ensuring that these are adequately resourced and monitored.”  Source: UN-Water and WHO (2014) |

It is critical to interrogate the extent to which the policy is clear on public participation in WASH activities. Is the policy understood, how is it expected to work and what are the type of institutions established (or necessary but not in place) to ensure public participation? These questions have to be explored within an urban context as part of elaborating what a pro-poor WASH policy would like broadly but with respect to people’s participation in particular. The focus has to be nuanced to ensure that girls, women and other categories of vulnerable residents are taken into account as well.

The discourse on rights as enshrined in policy is easier to put into practice where standards are laid out say for water and sanitation both broadly and at a town level particularly for different categories of vulnerable groups. Clarity on specific service standards is needed e.g. regarding the siting of pit latrines, sewer connections, signage on facilities and access rumps. These are critical and can be observed (or verified) at public institutions (schools and clinics, bus termini and markets, beer halls, stadia, service stations.

Public WASH facilities have a role to play in terms of acting as alternatives that relieve the burden on private facilities and the environment. As such, it is critical to establish their presence, quality and functionality, access by different groups, their spatial location. At the same time public (and private) open spaces need to be understood in any given town. These can be looked at in terms of the characteristics of the areas where dumping of rubbish occurs. A process of identifying public streams and wetlands, establishing their status, how they are being utilized, the groups accessing them and how they are being maintained is critical as part of understanding WASH issues.

The complexity of WASH rights, their realization and the dire consequences for individuals and communities where they go unmet is what generally informs the need for inclusive WASH approaches. In ZImbabwe the planning and implementation of WASH services applies a multi-stakeholder approach under the sector leadership of the Ministry responsible for water, environment and climate change working closely with the Ministry responsible for local government and other strategic Ministries[[17]](#footnote-18). The Ministries responsible for labour and social services (targeting of vulnerable groups) and education (WASH in schools), Agriculture (land use planning and integrating livelihoods into WASH), specific departments in the Ministry responsible for local government (Department of Physical Planning, Civil Protection) and state-owned agencies like EMA, ZINWA, DDF and the National AIDS Council are also critical members of WASH coordination spaces at national and sub-national levels. Apart from state institutions, UNICEF and other relevant UN agencies and non-state agencies (NGOs and private sector organizations) also participate in the WASH sector at all levels including in direct implementation of activities. The principal coordinating agency for the sector is the National Action Committee with a Secretariat (the National Coordination Unit, NCU).

The multi-stakeholder and integrated approach (i.e. working on water, sanitation, health and hygiene education as a package) is historical and has components of training and capacity building, community mobilisation and education, and establishing systems for sustainable operation and maintenance. The approach was adopted under the National Master Plan for Rural Water Supply and Sanitation developed shortly after independence. This also saw the creation of the National Action Committee (NAC) as a sector coordinating body for the ‘Integrated Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Program’ (IRWSSP) implemented from early independence. Although principally rural in focus the programme led to a near doubling of national coverage over the first post-independence years including close to 100% coverage in both water and sanitation in urban areas.

Since the 1980s two major sector reform cycles have followed. The first was based on the 1998 Water Act and the creation of the Zimbabwe National water Authority (ZINWA) as well as the associated sub-national (catchment-based) water resource management institutions based on the concept of decentralizing functions to the lowest appropriate authority (Dube and Swatuk 2002[[18]](#footnote-19)). This led to the authority playing a more critical role in national water resources planning, management and development. From 2005 ZINWA played an even more direct role in urban water supply and sewerage. The second is the period after 2009 when the ZINWA centralization was reversed in February of that year. There has been considerable restructuring of sector leadership, seeking to create clarity in ministerial roles and responsibilities and a coordination framework.

The performance of public institutions (central government, local authorities and parastatals) has been stressed for more than two decades. This has affected the policy and institutional environment as most public institutions have not been able to meet their obligations complicating coordination. This has been a result of a combination of economic decline and the new aid architecture informed by Zimbabwe’s altered relations with donor countries. This has seen a shift from WASH investments being principally donor funded and through government (Government of Zimbabwe 2013) to one where funding comes through UN agencies and NGOs. Coupled with declining service delivery that has triggered customer resistance, among other outcomes, the institutional structures for WASH development and their engagement with citizens (for participatory planning and implementation necessary for sustainability) are decidedly stretched. It is worth acknowledging that what Dube and Swatuk (2002) noted remains valid that inclusivist language does not always translate into wider benefits. This is because beyond legal provisions and establishment of institutions equity has to be practically sought. Such an approach requires nuanced understanding of specific WASH governance dynamics because the politics of reforms tend to ignore concerns of the poor who may actually not be included in formal structures, spaces and processes. Without engaging with the social, economic and political realities of service delivery at a local level good and making of long-term decisions WASH policies, laws, institutional arrangements and programmes (Dube and Swatuk 2002; Economic Consulting Associates 20011; Municipality of Chinhoyi et al 2014; UN Water and WHO 2014; Chinyama and Toma 2013).

## 1.3 Emerging Initiatives

A number of national initiatives have been underway covering actual service delivery (rehabilitation and installation of new services) in both rural and urban local authority areas as well as addressing policy issues. These include the UNICEF implemented Water Treatment Chemical Support programme, Rural WASH programme covering 30 districts and the 14 small towns WASH programme. The African Development Bank, GIZ, the World Bank and other UN agencies[[19]](#footnote-20) have also carried out relevant work from which this current baseline survey will learn. The main sector donors include European Community (EC), the governments of Australia, Canada, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States, the African Development Bank and the World Bank. Individual Councils have also accessed loan finance from local banks like Banc ABC for WASH related running costs and purchase of equipment. Most donor support is currently being provided as humanitarian or transitional support through UN agencies and NGOs not through central government.

The World Bank supported Service-Level Benchmarking (SLB[[20]](#footnote-21)) process since August 2012 has supported the participatory development data collection tools, definition and adoption of key indicators. Some of the challenges that the SLB has faced include poor or incomplete Municipal databases (e.g. valuation rolls or property stock records), weak customer care, high non-revenue water, low revenue collection efficiency, low coverage, low investments in maintenance, low capacity, demand outstripping supply, poor quality data for management and decision making, poor services, and  high levels of pollution. However, despite these challenges the project has generated some results, which include

* Councils and ZINWA now have a better understanding of the status of their Water, Sanitation and Hygiene services and are able to peg themselves against peers;
* Data on property stock has improved and this will plug off revenue losses due to underhand activities in the system
* Asset accounting and management has improved, standardised and strengthened
* Budgeting systems have improved through rational cost build up in tariffs
* There is more transparency on the operations of councils as most council utility data is now readily available
* Research and teaching can now improve on local authority management as the academia were involved in the SLB processes
* Knowledge products are being developed and these will improve policy and decision making

On the demand side national poor people’s movements have made efforts to address housing and related WASH issues. For instance an affiliate of the SDI[[21]](#footnote-22) has mobilized upwards of 50 000 households to address land, housing and WASH access and affordability issues across the country. The ZHPF’s approach emphasizes, among others, the following:

* Getting local residents to coordinate and combine their demands for sanitary improvement;
* Finding and implementing improvements that are affordable and acceptable to both the local authorities and the residents;
* Getting local authorities to work with residents and their organisations to co-produce the needed improvements; and
* Ensuring that other poverty-related problems, such as insecure tenure, do not undermine improvement efforts (Municipality of Chinhoyi et al 2014[[22]](#footnote-23)).

# 2.0 About the Baseline Survey

This document contains tools that Research Assistants will use to gather relevant qualitative data from each of the 14 Towns[[23]](#footnote-24). The development of the tools and suggested processes draws from the team’s review of available literature (which will continue during the survey) and is guided by the focus of the whole 14 towns WASH baseline study. The objective of the whole survey (which has a separate quantitative part) is to:

‘…determine the current status of water, sanitation services and hygiene practices (with a special focus on, equity and disability) and to establish benchmarks (***qualitative*** and quantitative) which programme progress and success will be measured against’.

The qualitative component emphasizes gender, vulnerability and disability. It focuses on access to existingservices andfacilities *(satisfactoriness)*, their sustainability (*individual, group and community participation*), willingness and ability to pay (*use and Customer Care mechanisms*) and hygiene knowledge and practices (*attitudes*). For satisfaction, functionality, reliability and quality of services will be important. An equity-inclusion approach (gender, age, location, socio-economic status etc) will be emphasized. In-town method-related nuances to allow better understanding of inequities will be used without limiting analysis across the towns.

## 2.1 Key Methods

These will include review of available literature (programme and other documents), survey launch with stakeholders at Council, institutional and WASH service mapping[[24]](#footnote-25), focus group discussion (FGD) sessions, key informant interviews and direct observations. FGD sessions will be held in different parts of the town with most being in least-served areas.

About 8-12 residents will be identified for each FGD session as follows:

1. Young people (mixed and separate boys and girls, in and out of school);
2. Women with a focus on what will be categorized as critical members of households (one or multi-member, with and without children, married and unmarried);
3. Men with a focus on what will be categorized as critical members of households (one or multi-member, with and without children, married and unmarried);
4. Religious groups with a preference for at least one ‘under-the-tree’ sect;
5. People with disabilities;
6. The elderly (mixed) with a focus on longest-staying elderly town residents;
7. Market traders;
8. Shop-owners at the town’s busiest centre (preference for the centre closest to the town’s busiest bus or transport node);
9. The town’s staff directly involved in **delivery and maintenance of WASH services** (including those in finance);
10. Small scale WASH private sector actors like water vendors, recyclers/garbage collectors, those hiring out sanitation facilities (e.g. mobile toilets), plumbers etc

Key informant interviews will target the following:

1. Senior Council officials responsible for WASH services/activities both hard (e.g. Engineering) and soft (e.g. health education);
2. Central Government agencies active in the town with a WASH responsibility;
3. Community leaders at neighbourhood level targeting critically under-served areas of the town e.g. Pastor’s Fraternity in Mvurwi, leaders of health clubs where in existence etc;
4. Head Teachers and Health Masters at selected schools;
5. Health facility Managers for selected facilities in the town;
6. Heads or Programme Staff of WASH-related NGOs or CBOs active in the town especially those working with specific groups of vulnerable groups;
7. Heads or other officials of companies e.g. Mining Companies and utilities like ZINWA involved in the WASH sector;
8. Heads of selected religious sects etc

## 2.2 Preparatory Work, Town Entry and Exit Outline

Prior to deploying Research Assistants who will gather data in each town using the tools presented below NGO partners will be engaged to provide basic information on WASH issues. Our team will present them in spatial form on maps for later integration and analysis with field data. The information to be provided by the NGOs includes the following:

1. Historical profile of WASH in the town;
2. Areas covered in terms of reticulated water and sanitation services;
3. Areas serviced by alternative (non-reticulated) water and sanitation services providing details of the alternative e.g. boreholes, wells for water, public/communal toilets, VIP or other for sanitation;
4. List of non-state community organizations and private sector companies (large and small) working on WASH issues in the town;
5. Spatial areas where these non-state organizations work in and their activities; and
6. Solid Waste disposal sites (both formal and informal sites) in the town and summary of activities e.g. presence of informal waste collectors/recyclers.

This information will guide purposive identification of FGD sites and Key Informants for the data gathering exercise. Three inter-connected and iterative processes are envisaged for our team’s fieldwork as depicted in the figure below. The Project Steering Committee (PSC) members, Town CEOs or designated Council officials and UNICEF’s implementing partners (NGOs) will assist with facilitating the survey. The Research Team will liaise with the Focal Persons ahead of fieldwork to ensure the appropriate groups and key informants are identified and informed of their role in the survey.

### Figure 1: Field/town entry and exit processes

## 2.3 Grounding the Analyses

The qualitative component of the survey will detail, among others, the following:

1. WASH activities being undertaken in/by each town: what, where, with whom and approaches covering both governmental and non-governmental activities;
2. Available WASH services (type, governance, access and reliability);
3. The town-level regime for WASH service provision, management (e.g. public facilities), maintenance and overall governance including budgeting and expenditure tracking (including short, medium and long range planning and awareness of service gaps);
4. Individual, household and community WASH practices (what, how managed and approaches including local institutional arrangements) and their implications for;

## 2.4 Data Gathering Principles

While a detailed protocol will be developed for use during the training of Research Assistants, the basic guiding principles for the Qualitative Survey include the following:

1. Ensuring the survey purpose and broader institutional context is clarified with direct input of the town authorities (technical-administrative and political leadership);
2. Approaching the survey not as an extractive process but part of contributing to a desired framework for addressing WASH challenges in each town;
3. Use of a sustainable, systemic and action-oriented ethos to data gathering i.e. not one inspired by an externally-driven quick fix to WASH issues. This involves balancing demand and supply side WASH responsibilities;
4. Reinforcing mutual respect amongst individuals, officials and institutions (steering conversations from blame-gaming);
5. Assuring respondents of confidentiality of their responses and encouraging candid yet truthful input;
6. Ensuring active participation by all those involved in the data gathering process;
7. Informed consent and participation by a representative cross-section of town residents. Town authorities and Researchers/Research Assistants will help build this jointly; and
8. Balancing group/individual/institutional responses with a resident approach to ensure that professionals also contribute as heads or members of households in the town (encouraging the ‘you-are-a-resident-too’ realism).

## 2.5 Indicative Work Plan

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ACTIVITY | TIMELINE FOR THE QUALITATIVE SURVEY |
| 1. Preparation of survey tools and literature review | January 5-23, 2015 |
| 1. Gathering preliminary data by NGOs on each town | January 19-23, 2015 |
| 1. Deadline for receiving input from NGOs | January 26th, 2015 |
| 1. Training of Qualitative Survey Research Assistants with field testing in Chivhu | January 26-27, 2015 (visit to Chivhu on the 27th of January) |
| 1. Finalizing tools (adapted after RA training) & emailing to RAs | January 29-30, 2015 |
| 1. Finalizing logistics/schedules for fieldwork | January 25th to 30th, 2015 |
| 1. Data gathering | February 6th to 20th, 2015 |
| 1. Data analysis and report writing for each town | February 20th to March 6th, 2015’ |
| 1. Compilation of combined Qualitative Survey Report | March 2nd to 18th 2015 |

# 3.0 Qualitative Tools

## 3.1 Checklist & Strategic Questions for Town CEO or Project Steering Committee Chairperson

Name of Town: ………………………Date: …………2015

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Guiding questions** | **COMMENTS** |
| Comment on the state of the town’s reticulated water system  Probe on availability, reliability etc. |  |
| For uncovered areas what alternative services exist? Comment on the quality, reliability etc of alternative services  Probe on future plans. | |
| Comment on the state of the town’s reticulated sanitation service? |  |
| For uncovered areas what alternative services exist? Comment on the quality, reliability etc of alternative services  Probe on future plans | |
| Comment on public toilets (their presence, location/distribution, signage, management, use/access etc) | |
| Are the town’s WASH services and facilities friendly to the disabled, women and children? |  |
| Comment on the town’s solid waste management system.  Existence of system as first question. | |
| Are there ‘unofficial’ landfills and dump-sites in the town? If yes indicate these on the Town Map. | Probe on characteristics of the areas (e.g. inactive open spaces, poorly lit alleys etc), the causes, concentration, environmental effects and future plans to address issues; |
| Are there open defecation sites in the town? |
| Does the town have areas classifiable as high risk areas in terms of diarrhoeal disease transmission? Identify these and map to include both spatial areas e.g. markets and activities e.g. household food and water handling |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Are there WASH organizations other than Council & it’s departments in the town? Name/List these on FORM A. |  |
| Does the town have a structure for multi-sectoral coordination of WASH issues? |  |
| Does the town have a pro-poor WASH policy? If so what are its key features  Probe on whether they implement it. Do a SWOT of the implementation of the policy. |  |
| If no how does the town cater to the WASH needs of the poor and vulnerable? Specific focus on people living on the street, street vendors | |
| How does the Town involve residents in the planning, operation and maintenance of WASH services? | Probe on feedback mechanisms |
| Describe the desired benchmarks for public participation in WASH service delivery for your town.  Probe on stakeholders involved, satisfaction of participation, how to increase, stages of involvement | |
| Does the Town involve residents in the planning, operation and maintenance of WASH infrastructure? |  |
| Describe the desired benchmarks for public participation in WASH infrastructure O&M for your town. | |
| Are boys, girls, women, the elderly, disabled etc satisfied with WASH services in the town? | Probe on feedback mechanisms on level of satisfaction. The nature of complaints, how they cater for special needs and the mechanisms that are currently functional |
| If no what are some of the complaints they bring to the town’s attention? | |
| Comment on the town’s billing system for/of WASH services (whether it is accurate, up to date, acceptable to residents/users etc) | Probe on the system in use (manual receipting, printed statements etc), is the town billing, is the billing actual of estimate, is the d-base updated, collection efficiency, the billing system |
| Are residents satisfied with the billing for/of WASH services?  Probe on how they qualify satisfaction |  |
| Comment on whether the town has a WASH-oriented Customer Care practices |  |
| Would you consider the town’s Customer Care practices ‘fit for purpose’? |  |

**Add: what WASH (including HE) are run by Council (link to tool 3), target groups, current and planned strategies.**

### Form A: Non-Council WASH Organizations in the Town

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Location (Ward or Neighbourhood) | Members e.g. youths, women etc | Main activities |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 3.2 Key Informant Guide

**Name: ………………………………………. Date: …………..**

**Institutional affiliation of key informant: …………………………...**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Guiding questions** | **COMMENTS** |
| Comment on the town’s water system? |  |
| For areas not covered by the reticulated system what alternative service exists and what is their general quality, reliability of such services? | |
| Comment on the town’s reticulated sanitation service? |  |
| For areas not covered by the reticulated service what alternatives exist and what is the quality, reliability etc of the alternative services? | |
| Comment on the town’s solid waste management system |  |
|  | |
| Are there ‘unofficial’ landfills and dumb-sites near your home/institution |  |
| Does the town have open defecation sites? |  |
| Note also the informant’s insights on household WASH practices like water handling, waste management, use of public toilets and water points | |
| What WASH (including hygiene education) activities are run by your Council/institution[[25]](#footnote-26)? |  |
| Does the town have a pro-poor WASH policy? If so what are its key features including whether it targets the disabled, poor etc |  |
| If no how does it cater to the WASH needs of the poor and vulnerable? | |
| How does the Town involve residents, institutions or companies in the planning, operation and maintenance of WASH services? If yes note these. |  |
| Describe the desired benchmarks for public participation in WASH service delivery in your town. | |
| How does the Town involve residents in the planning, operation and maintenance of WASH infrastructure? |  |
| Describe the desired benchmarks for public participation in WASH infrastructure O&M in your town. | |
| Are boys, girls, women, the elderly, disabled satisfied with WASH services in the town? |  |
| If no what are some of the complaints that are made by these groups? | |
| Comment on the billing for/of WASH services in your town |  |
| How satisfied are customers with the billing for/of WASH services? |  |
| Does the town have WASH-oriented Customer Care practices? Name/List these |  |
| Does the town have Customer Care practices ‘fit for purpose’? |  |

## 3.3 KII guide for organizations targeting socially excluded groups on WASH matters

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Name of organization |  |
| 1. Type of Organization (e.g. NGO, CBO, private company or other) |  |
| 1. WASH specific activities |  |
| 1. Target group(s) i.e. gender, numbers and other socio-economic characteristics |  |
| 1. Number of members/beneficiaries |  |
| 1. Key WASH-related problems faced by target group |  |
| 1. Solutions offered by the organization to benefit group(s) |  |
| 1. Responses by Council to benefit group(s) |  |
| 1. Summary of future WASH initiatives by organization |  |
| 1. How does the organization work with Council on WASH issues? |  |
| State the desired benchmarks for working with Council on WASH issues to benefit different socio-economic groups | |
| 1. How does the organization work with other WASH (and non-WASH organizations) to meet the needs of the group(s) it serves? |  |
| 1. What major challenges faced by the organization in designing & implementing WASH activities |  |

## 3.4 FGD Guide

The focus of all FGD sessions will be satisfaction (access, quality and functionality or reliability) with WASH services. The sessions will be held with different groups and in different locations within the town.

**Desirable/satisfactory WASH services**

1. What are the characteristics of desirable/satisfactory WASH services? How satisfactory are the services generally and in relation to the needs of the specific FGD participants? **Probe: this could be put differently/negatively by asking the indicators of unsatisfactory WASH services**

**Link between economic/livelihood activities and WASH issues**

1. What are the main economic activities (general and group specific) in the town? What WASH services are provided to support such activities? Do the services meet your needs (in relation to the activities) e.g. toilets and water at markets? Which key WASH issues **(and actors involved)** affect you and your community (general and related to the economic activities)? Probe for seasonality of issues.

**Mapping affected areas or WASH pressure points in the town**

1. Which areas (locations) face are high risk WASH problems in the town and why? Who lives in such areas? What are the key characteristics of the areas (socio-economic, topography, land tenure etc)? What responses are being offered and by who?

**Perceptions of service quality**

1. What is the group’s perspective on the quality of drinking water in your town?
2. For Solid Waste Management the FGD sessions will explore [Probing using maps]:
   1. Issues/problems and actors (users and managers or service providers) regarding location, collection and dumpsite management;
   2. Roles and performance of residents and Councils;
   3. Waste characteristics, separation and recycling; and
   4. Socio-economic activities associated with solid waste management.

**Participation in WASH**

1. What participation [& consultation] mechanisms exist for individuals, groups and communities to be involved in WASH planning, O&M in the town? What strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats regarding taking part in planning, Operation and Maintenance;

**WASH customer care**

1. What WASH-oriented Customer Care mechanisms exist in the town? How satisfactory are they across the whole WASH service delivery cycle? What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the Customer Care system in your town? Probe on how Council/service providers deal with people with special needs. Also probe on waiting times for services, inquiries, attitudes etc

**WASH information**

1. What sources of WASH information are accessible to you (the specific FGD participants)? Comment on the reliability and usefulness of the information you receive. How reliable are they? How do you verify? What alternatives would you suggest?

**Recommendations to improve situation**

1. What can the group in particular, Council and other residents in general do to improve WASH services in the town?

## 3.5 WASH-related Activity Calendar

**Map to ensure the town dynamics inform who will be involved in the calendar activity. In some cases boys and men are involved in activities that are traditionally performed by girls and men.**

1. Using visuals depicting a 24 hour day Research Assistants/Researchers will facilitate discussions with girls and women to determine the amount of time (and actual times in a given day) allocated to WASH related activities at household or other levels e.g. at the market, in school etc;
2. Using visuals depicting a seven day week participants will also be asked to indicate a weekly calendar showing the amount of time (and actual times in a given day) allocated to WASH related activities at household or other levels e.g. at the market, in school etc;
3. For both the daily and weekly calendar, participants will be asked to explain the time allocations, the challenges faced in executing the identified WASH-related activities and the actors they interact with;

One agreed calendar (one daily and one weekly) per group and per town will be used i.e. 14 daily and 14 weekly calendars each for girls and women. This means that from each town two daily and two weekly calendars will be produced for further analysis;

The calendars will be done with at most three separate groups in each town;
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