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**Executive summary**

**Baseline data on water, sanitation, and hygiene (WaSH) infrastructure and practices were collected in selected households, schools and health facilities with the aim of estimating the coverage of WaSH prior to the intervention. Overall data is presented from six woredas.**

**Damot Sore and Damot Pulasa – Arm 1, targeted for WaSH intervention but not the census: A WaSH survey was conducted in two woredas where seven kebeles in Damot Sore and eight kebeles in Damot Pulasa were selected at random. In total 2,159 households, 16 schools and 15 health facilities were surveyed. The surveys were conducted in September 2019.**

**Bolosso Bombe and Damot Gale – Arm 1, targeted for WaSH intervention and the census: A census including WaSH assessment was conducted in these two woredas where all of the kebeles were sampled, this was 20 kebeles in Bolosso Bombe and 29 in Damot Gale.**

**Damot Weydie and Abela Abaya – Arm 2, not targeted for WaSH intervention but part of the census: A census was conducted in all the kebeles, which was 24 kebeles in Damot Weydie and 16 in Abela Abaya in total. The census was conducted between October and December 2019. The analysis was done using the agreed and final Geshiyaro WaSH indicator list (Annex).**

**Community-level (Household only) WaSH summary for the six woredas were:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Arm** | **Woreda** | **Access to “basic” drinking water** | **Safe water storage and handling** | **Access to “basic” sanitation** | **Access to “basic” handwashing** | **Exposure to surface water** |
| 1 | Damot Sore | 30.2% | 48% | 0.0% | 0% | 86.7% |
| 1 | Damot Pulasa | 35.0% | 60.5% | 0.8% | 2.6% | 49.6% |
| 1 | Bolosso Bombe | 30.4% | 58% | 0.1% | 0.6% | 82.2% |
| 1 | Damot Gale | 28.7% | 41.5% | 0.2% | 0.7% | 65.1% |
| 2 | Damot Weydie | 27.8% | 49.7% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 68.3% |
| 2 | Abela Abaya | 30.7% | 48.6% | 0.1% | 0.2% | 56.8% |

**Out of 119 schools visited across the six woredas, only 11.5% had access to basic drinking water and 1.6% had basic sanitation facilities. The presence of a WaSH club was reported in almost all schools, although how active these clubs are was not be verified. Experience in Bolosso Sore has demonstrated that they are normally non-functional. There were virtually no handwashing facilities with both soap and water in any schools. In addition, of the 15 health centres surveyed 42.2% across the six woredas had access to basic drinking water and 0.5% had access to basic sanitation. There was no access to hand washing facilities in any health facility.**

**In summary, access to basic drinking water was relatively high in certain woredas (Abela Abaya) and low in others (Damot Sore) and varied by kebele. Approximately half of the households reported safe water handling throughout. Access to basic sanitation was extremely low in all woredas, typically less than 10% in all woredas except Damot Pulasa. Two woredas will not receive a WaSH focus from the Geshiyaro project and so should provide controls against which to measuring the WaSH intervention. Access to basic hand washing facility was absent in all households, schools, and health facilities across all woredas. Finally, exposure to surface water was extremely high, particularly in Damot Sore. These present very high-risk factors for STH and schistosomiasis, the elimination of which is the end goal of the Geshiyaro project. One of the key findings of this evaluation survey is that not only coverage, but function, maintenance, usage and activeness of WaSH activities collectively are paramount in driving effectiveness of WaSH interventions in these communities.**

1. **Introduction**

Baseline data on household (HH) water, sanitation, and hygiene (WaSH) infrastructure and practices were collected at all consenting households during a WaSH survey in September 2019. The survey was carried out in two woredas, Damot Pulasa and Damot Sore, which were not selected for the population census but will still receive WaSH intervention. The purpose of this survey was to collect baseline WaSH coverage prior to the start of the intervention by World Vision Ethiopia. The primary objectives of the survey were:

* To estimate the coverage of WaSH access prior to the intervention in Damot Pulasa and Damot Sore.
* To provide a baseline against which to measure progress made in hardware and software improvements by comparing with the baseline WaSH findings (this survey) with a WaSH Assessment survey to be carried out later in 2021.

1. **Methods**

*Survey Design*

The WaSH survey was conducted in eight kebeles in Damot Pulasa and seven kebeles in Damot Sore, in September 2019. A random selection of households (HHs) were visited. The selected households were then interviewed with a face-to-face questionnaire consisting of five sections:

*Section 1 – General Questionnaire*:

- kebele where the interview took place

- household profile (number of household members)

*Section 2 - Water questions*

- Access to drinking, cooking and recreational water resources used by the household

- Water handling within the household

*Section 3 – Sanitation questions*

- Defecation practices of the household

- Latrine facilities available to the household

*Section 4 – Hygiene questions*

- Hand washing practices, particularly at the latrine

- Soap and water facilities available

- Latrine facilities available to the household

Observations to verify water and sanitation coverage

All schools and health centres in each selected kebele also received a school-based survey and health-facility questionnaire, including questions on WaSH activities, respectively.

*Survey Implementation*

Approximately two days per kebele were allotted for data collection. The first day consisted of 15 HH face-to-face interviews, and all of the kebele school and local health centre interviews. The second day consisted of more HH interviews (depending on the number of HHs required per kebele – sample size was proportional to population). For each kebele, the team leaders determined the number of gotts (a sub-kebele administrative structure) and divided the gotts evenly among the enumerators so that some HHs were selected from each gott. HHs were then selected using the “Modified Random Walk Procedure”.

1. **Non-Census (Damot Gale/Damot Pulasa) community-level WaSH results**

In total 2,235 individual HHs were selected for interview in Damot Pulasa (1132) and Damot Sore (1103), of which 2,159 (96.6%) consented to participate. Of the 76 who did not consent to be interviewed, reasons included ‘do not wish to say’ (32), ‘not interested to participate’ (7) and ‘moving from the kebele’ (2). The analysis was conducted only on consenting adults in a HH. On average, there were three adults (range 1-5) and two children (range 0-10) per HH.

**3.1. Proportion of households with access to basic drinking water**

Overall, 65.5% and 58.6%HHs in Damot Pulasa and Damot Sore respectively, had access to basic drinking water. Basic drinking water was defined using the following indicators (*see Annex 1, WaSH Indicators Document*):

(1) **Reliability**: Year-round daily access to improved water;

(2) **Accessibility**: Less than 30 minutes round trip of the household, including queuing time; and

Reliability: By individual criteria, most houses had access to improved water sources with overall 93.9% and 75.5% coverage in Damot Pulasa and Damot Sore, respectively (Table 1). Of those who had improved water access, the year-round availability was assessed.

Accessibility: Having access to improved water source had to be ≤30 min round trip to collect water, which was 62.3% and 74%, in Damot Pulasa and Damot Sore, respectively.

Quantity: A question was included about how much water is consumed by the HH per day. Unfortunately, we did not have a question in the questionnaire that could help us determine how much water everyone has access to, but just how much water households are collecting. Quantity was not therefore included in the Basic Water access calculation as it does not answer the question on access.

**Table 1: Proportion % of households with access to Basic drinking water**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda | Kebele | **Reliability** | | **Accessibility** | **Quantity** | **% HH with access to Basic Water\*\***  N (%) |
| Improved drinking water source\*  N (%) | Year-round daily access  N (%) | Journey time to collect water is less than 30min round trip  N (%) | More than 25 litres of water collected per person/day\*  N (%) |
| Damot Pulasa | Golo Shanto | 99.3 | 60.7 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 32.9 |
|  | Galcha Suke | 100 | 58.5 | 96.9 | 0.0 | 58.5 |
|  | Pulassa Bakala | 70.6 | 25.7 | 51.9 | 0.0 | 16.0 |
|  | ZamineWulisho | 100 | 51.2 | 54.4 | 0.0 | 24.8 |
|  | Olola | 91.2 | 49.5 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 33.0 |
|  | Waribira Suke | 100 | 50.0 | 78.7 | 1.9 | 28.7 |
|  | Wasedo | 100 | 63.4 | 86.6 | 0.0 | 53.0 |
|  | Busha (DP) | 100 | 53.1 | 75.3 | 0.0 | 44.4 |
|  | **Total** | **93.9** | **50.3** | **67.2** | **0.2** | **35.0** |
| Damot Sore | Demba Zamine | 78.3 | 43.4 | 73.5 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  | Dogie Shakiso | 56.2 | 51.5 | 79.3 | 0.0 | 20.7 |
|  | Dogie Hanchicho | 50.3 | 48.5 | 80.4 | 0.0 | 21.9 |
|  | Sunkale | 99.0 | 32.1 | 59.1 | 0.0 | 25.9 |
|  | Sore Mashdo | 87.8 | 47.0 | 77.4 | 0.0 | 36.5 |
|  | Bololla | 93.9 | 53.5 | 94.7 | 2.6 | 49.1 |
|  | Zamine Nare | 98.4 | 39.5 | 62.9 | 0.0 | 33.1 |
|  | **Total** | **79.1** | **44.5** | **74.3** | **0.3** | **30.2** |

**\****Improved* was classified as water supply systems piped directly into dwelling with a tap in the household or compound and maybe shared with other households, Piped to a neighbour, Public tap (standpipe), Shallow well with hand pump, hand dug well with lid (protected), A hand dug well with lid (protected), or Water collected from a protected spring.

\*\* The table is constructed by converting Bucket (to 10 litres) and pot (to 20 litres). An average amount is calculated from amount of water fetched in dry and rainy seasons. To get per person consumption, this average is divided by the family size in each households (n\_adult + n\_children). Initially this variable was used in the calculation of access to basic water (Table 1), however, there was 0% of households with basic water access. We then realized that this was due to quantity. Given that it is the amount of water fetched and not consumed it was removed from the basic water access calculation.

[**3.2 Proportion of households with Basic safe water storage and handling**](#_Toc21951197)

Overall, 630 and 515 HHs (60.5% and 48%) in Damot Pulasa and Damot Sore respectively, stored and handled their water correctly. Safe water storage was defined by combining four variables:

(1) Water that is stored in a container that protects the water from re-contamination such as plastic, ceramic, or metal containers, which serve as physical barriers to recontamination;

(2) A covered water container that allows easy and safe access to the water without requiring the insertion of hands or objects into the container;

(3) Safe cleaning of the container; and

(4) Reported regular cleaning of the container.

Most HHs stored their water in jerry cans (98.3% and 99.9% in Damot Pulasa and Damot Sore, respectively). The majority of HHs had a covered container (93.3% and 89.6% in Damot Pulasa and Damot Sore, respectively). When drawing water from the container in an “unsafe” manner, only 0.1% drinking directly from the container and 14.4% and 13% using any scooper available in Damot Pulasa and Damot Sore, respectively. Cleaning the water container (or lack of) was where most HHs exhibited “unsafe water handling”, with many houses cleaning the container with gravel (26.6% and 39.5%). Within the context of a STH elimination project washing with gravel/soil was deemed unsafe (*see Annex 2, Table 19: Proportion of households (n (%)) how they take care of the water container)*.

**Table 2: Proportion of households (n (%)) with Basic safe water storage and handling**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Woreda** | **Kebele** | % HH storing water in a protective container (metal/plastic/clay) | Water storage container is covered | Water is collected safely\* | Water storage container is cleaned\*\* | Container is cleaned frequently\*\*\* | **% HH with access to Basic water storage / handling** |
| Damot Pulasa | Golo Shanto | 140 (100.0) | 122 (87.1) | 140 (100.0) | 105 (75.0) | 133 (95.0) | 74 (52.9) |
| Galcha Suke | 65 (100.0) | 65 (100.0) | 64 (98.5) | 37 (56.9) | 65 (100.0) | 37 (56.9) |
| Pulassa Bakala | 187 (100.0) | 182 (97.3) | 187 (100.0) | 154 (82.4) | 187 (100.0) | 149 (79.7) |
| ZamineWulisho | 125 (100.0) | 112 (89.6) | 125 (100.0) | 100 (80.0) | 124 (99.2) | 61 (48.8) |
| Olola | 91 (100.0) | 87 (95.6) | 91 (100.0) | 61 (67.0) | 91 (100.0) | 59 (64.8) |
| Waribira Suke | 108 (100.0) | 95 (88.0) | 106 (98.1) | 87 (80.6) | 108 (100.0) | 55 (50.9) |
| Wasedo | 163 (100.0) | 159 (97.0) | 161 (98.2) | 98 (59.8) | 164 (100.0) | 91 (55.5) |
| Busha (DP) | 162 (100.0) | 150 (92.6) | 162 (100.0) | 115 (71.0) | 162 (100.0) | 104 (64.2) |
| **Total** | **1041 (99.9)** | **972 (93.3)** | **1036 (99.4)** | **757 (72.6)** | **1034 (99.2)** | **630 (60.5)** |

**Table 2: Proportion of households (n (%)) with Basic safe water storage and handling, cont.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Woreda** | **Kebele** | % HH storing water in a protective container\* | Water storage container is covered | Water is collected safely\*\* | Water storage container is cleaned\*\*\* | Container is cleaned frequently\*\*\*\* | **% HH with access to Basic water storage and handling** |
| Damot Sore | Demba Zamine | 189 (100.0) | 179 (94.7) | 189 (100.0) | 131 (69.3) | 189 (100.0) | 106 (56.1) |
| Dogie Shakiso | 169 (100.0) | 163 (96.4) | 169 (100.0) | 42 (24.9) | 169 (100.0) | 39 (23.1) |
| Dogie Hanchicho | 169 (100.0) | 128 (75.7) | 165 (97.6) | 110 (65.1) | 169 (100.0) | 75 (44.4) |
| Sunkale | 193 (100.0) | 186 (96.4) | 193 (100.0) | 132 (68.4) | 192 (99.5) | 114 (59.1) |
| Sore Mashdo | 115 (100.0) | 99 (86.1) | 113 (98.3) | 66 (57.4) | 115 (100.0) | 53 (46.1) |
| Bololla | 114 (100.0) | 88 (77.2) | 110 (96.5) | 69 (60.5) | 114 (100.0) | 47 (41.2) |
| Zamine Nare | 124 (100.0) | 118 (95.2) | 124 (100.0) | 87 (70.2) | 124 (100.0) | 81 (65.3) |
| **Total** | **1073 (100.0)** | **961 (89.6)** | **1063 (99.1)** | **637 (59.4)** | **1072 (99.9)** | **515 (48.0)** |

\* Jerry can, drum or barrel, plastic bucket, Metal bucket, tap in home or compound  
\*\* Safe was defined as a cup/implement that was purposed only for drawing water, not chosen ad hoc.

\*\*\* Cleaning was defined as cleaning with water and/or soap/detergent only

\*\*\*\* Frequent cleaning was defined as daily, weekly, monthly, or occasionally with a given time frame (no. days)

[**3.3 Proportion of households with access to Basic sanitation**](#_Toc21951197)

Overall, 277 and 79 HHs (26.6% and 7.4%) in Damot Pulasa and Damot Sore, respectively) had access to Basic sanitation. Basic sanitation was defined using the following indicators: (1) Reliability: Year-round access to improved sanitation facilities; (2) Accessibility: On the compound premises; (3) Quantity: One per HH/compound. Not shared with other HHs; (4) Quality: Each latrine must be clean and visually have hand washing facilities & soap present.

Overall, basic sanitation was correlated to the number of HH with access to improved latrine with 28.3% and 9.6% coverage in Damot Pulasa and Damot Sore, respectively. The majority of the HHs (94.6% and 95.1%) did not report sharing their latrine with other households and were located on the compound premises (99.7% and 99.5%). Fewer than half of the HHs had clean latrines, with 42.6 and 49.1%in Damot Pulasa and Damot Sore respectively. Few houses (38.9% and 24.6%) had water and soap visible at the latrine, as observed during the interview.

**Table 3: Proportion of households (%) with access to basic sanitation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda | Kebele | Improved Latrine\* | Latrine is not Shared with other HH\*\* | Latrine on Premises | Latrine must be clean | Handwashing Facilities within 3m of latrine with soap and water | **% Basic Sanitation \*\*\*** |
| Damot Pulasa | Golo Shanto | 36.4 | 98.5 | 99.2 | 56.9 | 0.0 | 0 |
|  | Galcha Suke | 32.3 | 98.4 | 100 | 11.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Pulassa Bakala | 76.5 | 97.9 | 100 | 48.9 | 2.1 | 0.0 |
|  | ZamineWulisho | 28.8 | 98.3 | 100 | 47.4 | 0.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Olola | 67.0 | 95.3 | 100 | 58.1 | 17.4 | 8.8 |
|  | Waribira Suke | 20.4 | 96.3 | 100 | 63.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Wasedo | 32.9 | 99.4 | 100 | 7.5 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Busha (DP) | 69.1 | 98.0 | 98.7 | 41.9 | 3.3 | 0.0 |
|  | **Total** | **48.0** | **97.9** | **99.7** | **42.6** | **2.6** | **0.8** |
| Damot Sore | Demba Zamine | 2.6 | 97.7 | 98.8 | 60.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Dogie Shakiso | 50.3 | 98.2 | 98.8 | 4.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Dogie Hanchicho | 3.0 | 87.5 | 100 | 50.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Sunkale | 1.0 | 97.8 | 100 | 58.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Sore Mashdo | 3.5 | 95.6 | 100 | 65.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Bololla | 4.4 | 93.0 | 100 | 57.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Zamine Nare | 4.0 | 97.4 | 99.1 | 52.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | **Total** | **10.3** | **95.4** | **99.5** | **49.1** | **0.0** | **0.0** |

\* Improved includes pour flush, ventilated, pit latrine with slab.

\*\* This was determined by visible faeces around the opening of the latrine and flies were able to access the faeces, whereby the latrine was deemed unclean.

\*\*\* This was handwashing facilities that were present within 3m of the latrine

[**3.4 Proportion of households with Basic handwashing facilities**](#_Toc21951197)

Overall, 22 HHs (2.2%) in Damot Pulasa only had access to basic handwashing facilities. Basic handwashing facilities was defined using the following indicators: (1) Accessibility: Within 3 metres of the latrine; (2) Quality: Each latrine must have hand washing facilities & soap visually present at the time of interview; (3) Reliability: Each handwashing station must have water and soap available at time of the interview.

**Table 4: Proportion of households with Basic handwashing facilities**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Woreda** | **Kebele** | Handwashing facility within 3m of latrine | Water available at interview | Soap/Detergent available at interview | **% HH with access to Basic handwashing facilities\*\*** |
| Damot Pulasa | Golo Shanto | 24 (17.0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Galcha Suke | 33 (50.8) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pulassa Bakala | 98 (52.4) | 4 (80.0) | 4 (70.0) | 4 (2.1) |
| ZamineWulisho | 20 (16.0) | 1 (100.0) | 1 (100.0) | 1 (0.9) |
| Olola | 41 (45.1) | 15 (100.0) | 15 (100.0) | 15 (17.4) |
| Waribira Suke | 17 (15.7) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wasedo | 74 (45.1) | 1 (100.0) | 1 (100.0) | 1 (0.7) |
| Busha (DP) | 76 (46.9) | 5 (100.0) | 5 (100.0) | 5 (3.3) |
| Total | 383 (36.8) | 26 (96.3) | 26 (96.3) | **26 (2.6)** |
| Damot Sore | Demba Zamine | 33 (17.5) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dogie Shakiso | 105 (62.1) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dogie Hanchicho | 9 (5.3) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sunkale | 26 (13.5) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sore Mashdo | 10 (8.7) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bololla | 27 (23.7) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Zamine Nare | 41 (33.1) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | 251 (23.4) | 0 | 0 | 0 |

[**3.5 Proportion of households who report open defecation**](#_Toc21951197)

Overall, 228 HHs (22.8%) in DP and 310 HHs in DS (30.3%) reported open defecation practice.

**Table 5: Proportion of households (n (%)) who report open defecation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Woreda** | **Kebele** | A household w/ latrine | Household w/ HW facilities1 | A household member does not use latrine2 | Improper disposal of child faeces3 | % HH meet ODF criteria |
| Damot Pulasa | Golo Shanto | 93.6 | 17.9 | 92.1 | 79.5 | 17.1 |
| Galcha Suke | 98.5 | 53.8 | 98.5 | 93.8 | 53.8 |
| Pulassa Bakala | 100.0 | 53.5 | 95.7 | 98.8 | 48.7 |
| ZamineWulisho | 92.8 | 16.8 | 85.6 | 80.5 | 16.0 |
| Olola | 94.5 | 49.5 | 91.2 | 93.3 | 42.9 |
| Waribira Suke | 100.0 | 31.5 | 91.7 | 100.0 | 30.6 |
| Wasedo | 95.1 | 53.7 | 94.5 | 83.2 | 53.7 |
| Busha (DP) | 93.2 | 50.0 | 93.2 | 91.7 | 47.5 |
| **Total** | **95.9** | **41.2** | **92.8** | **89.5** | **39.1** |
| Damot Sore | Demba Zamine | 91.0 | 25.4 | 87.3 | 87.2 | 24.3 |
| Dogie Shakiso | 97.0 | 68.0 | 95.3 | 100.0 | 66.9 |
| Dogie Hanchicho | 94.7 | 8.9 | 92.3 | 85.1 | 8.9 |
| Sunkale | 94.8 | 20.2 | 92.2 | 79.5 | 17.6 |
| Sore Mashdo | 98.3 | 14.8 | 95.7 | 90.5 | 14.8 |
| Bololla | 100.0 | 27.2 | 100.0 | 93.6 | 27.2 |
| Zamine Nare | 93.5 | 51.6 | 91.1 | 93.0 | 48.4 |
| **Total** | **95.2** | **30.7** | **92.9** | **89.9** | **29.5** |

1 Handwashing facilities in the household were included if no latrine-specific facility was present. Presence of soap and water was not accounted for in this figure.  
2 This excludes households where a member does not use the latrine because they are too young.  
3 For households where there is a child/children younger than 5 years old.

[**3.6 Proportion of households exposed to surface water**](#_Toc21951198)

Overall, 517 and 930 HHs (49.6% and 86.7%) reported exposure to surface water through cooking, handwashing, bathing and washing. Access to fresh water will obviously be highly focal as not all communities are close to water bodies, so some are at more at risk than others. This highlights the need to map water bodies and tailor the SCH WaSH strategies accordingly, with a focus on reducing recreational water contact.

**Table 6: Proportion % of HH where no member is exposed to surface water sources**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda | Kebele | **Exposure through drinking water** | **Exposure through cooking or handwashing water** | **Exposure through bathing** | **Exposure through washing clothes** | **% Exposed to Surface Water** |
| Damot Pulasa | Golo Shanto | 0.0 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 28.6 |
|  | Galcha Suke | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.2 | 66.2 | 69.2 |
|  | Pulassa Bakala | 24.1 | 40.6 | 49.7 | 55.1 | 63.6 |
|  | ZamineWulisho | 0.0 | 15.2 | 48.0 | 51.2 | 56.0 |
|  | Olola | 1.1 | 1.1 | 30.8 | 34.1 | 36.3 |
|  | Waribira Suke | 0.0 | 3.7 | 27.8 | 28.7 | 32.4 |
|  | Wasedo | 0.0 | 1.2 | 68.3 | 68.3 | 75.0 |
|  | Busha (DP) | 0.0 | 1.2 | 27.2 | 27.2 | 32.1 |
|  | **Total** | **4.4** | **10.0** | **43.2** | **44.9** | **49.6** |
| Damot Sore | Demba Zamine | 3.2 | 13.8 | 49.2 | 60.8 | 66.1 |
|  | Dogie Shakiso | 1.2 | 11.2 | 95.9 | 95.3 | 98.8 |
|  | Dogie Hanchicho | 6.5 | 28.4 | 89.3 | 90.5 | 95.3 |
|  | Sunkale | 0.0 | 38.9 | 70.5 | 72.0 | 78.2 |
|  | Sore Mashdo | 0.9 | 47.0 | 92.2 | 89.6 | 98.3 |
|  | Bololla | 2.6 | 36.0 | 78.9 | 77.2 | 81.6 |
|  | Zamine Nare | 0.0 | 4.8 | 90.3 | 94.4 | 96.8 |
|  | **Total** | **2.1** | **25.1** | **79.2** | **81.6** | **86.7** |

[**4 School-level WaSH results**](#_Toc21951195)

Overall, 14 out of 16 schools reported access to an improved water source, however, only two of these had water regularly available in the last two weeks. There was a WaSH club reported in nearly all (15) schools, although there is unfortunately no data on how active this is. There were gender separated latrines reported in nearly all (15) schools for the students, and 11 schools reported separate latrines for staff. Half of the latrines (9) were improved. Only three schools reported handwashing facilities, of which one had soap and water. In ten out of 16 schools the latrines were clean.

**Table 7: Proportion % of schools with access to a Basic drinking water source on premises**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda | n Schools | Access to improved water source | Water at time of the survey | **% With Basic Water Access** |
| Damot Pulasa | 9 | 3 (33.3) | 3 (33.3) | 2 (22.22) |
| Damot Sore | 8 | 4 (50.0) | 1 (12.5) | 1 (12.5) |

**Table 8: Proportion % of schools with access to a Basic sanitation on premises**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda\* | n Schools | Improved Latrine | Separate Gender Latrines | Number of students/ latrine meeting the target\* | Menstrual Hygiene Facilities | Handwashing facilities with Soap/Water | Latrines Clean at time of survey | **% With ‘Basic Sanitation’** |
| Damot Pulasa | 9 | 5 (55.6) | 8 (88.9) | 6 (75.0) | 3 (33.3) | 1 (11.1) | 7 (77.8) | 0 (0.0) |
| Damot Sore | 8 | 4 (50.0) | 8 (100.0) | 6 (75.0) | 1 (12.5) | 1 (12.5) | 4 (50.0) | 0 (0.0) |

\* Only 8 schools shown for Damot pulasa, since one school had no separate toilet for boys and girls

[**5 Health-facility level WaSH results**](#_Toc21951195)

Overall, 6 out of 15 health centres reported access to an improved water source, of these four reported the water source more than 500m from the health centre. In total 11 health centres reported access to a functional latrine for outpatients, of which 7 had access to an improved latrine. In total 13 health centres reported access to a functional latrine for staff, of which 9 was an improved latrine. No health centres had access to functional handwashing facilities.

**Table 9: Proportion % of Health care facilities with access to a Basic drinking water**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda\* | n Health Facility | Improved Water Source | On Premises | Currently Available\* | **% With Basic Water Access** |
| Damot Pulasa | 9 | 3 (33.3) | 7 (77.8) | 2 (22.2) | 1 (11.1) |
| Damot Sore | 6 | 4 (66.7) | 1 (16.7) | 2 (40.0) | 1 (20.0) |

**Table 10: Proportion % of Health care facilities with access to a Basic sanitation on premises**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda\* | n Health Facility | Improved Latrine | Currently Functionable | Handwashing Facilities Present | Soap/Water Available\* | **% Facilities with Basic Sanitation** |
| Damot Pulasa | 9 | 5 (55.6) | 5 (55.6) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (12.5) | 0 (0.0) |
| Damot Sore | 6 | 4 (66.7) | 6 (100.0) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (16.7) | 0 (0.0) |

\*Present in two health centers where handwashing facility is reported but not observed.

[**6**](#_Toc21951195) **Community knowledge of hygiene practices**

During the WaSH survey each household was asked questions about basic hygiene practices, which were relevant to NTD specific indicators. As seen in Table 11 there was a good understanding among community members of why handwashing is important, with the majority citing getting rid of germs and sickness. However, access to soap seems to be the limiting factor on why people are not practicing it. Likewise there is good knowledge regarding causes of diarrhoea, again with handwashing commonly reported as a preventive measure. On the contrary, only a quarter of the sample reported usage of a latrine.

**Table 11: Household Hygiene Knowledge: Why do you wash your hands with soap?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda | Get rid of dirt and cleans hands | Stops germs or sickness | Smells or feels nice | It is our practice | NGO/Government/HEW/School told us to | Soap/ash is accessible | Soap/ash is easy |
| Damot Pulasa | 965 (92.5) | 643 (61.7) | 146 (14.0) | 21 (2.0) | 337 (32.3) | 39 (3.7) | 15 (1.4) |
| Damot Sore | 934 (86.6) | 833 (77.2) | 157 (14.6) | 37 (3.4) | 187 (17.3) | 11 (1.0) | 3 (0.3) |

**Table 12: Do you know any ways that diarrhoea can be prevented?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda | Wash hands with water | Wash hands with water and soap | Use a latrine | Covering food | Store water safely | Prayer | Traditional healer | Eating clean food |
| Damot Pulasa | 898 (86.1) | 727 (69.7) | 265 (25.4) | 305 (29.2) | 125 (12.0) | 153 (14.7) | 124 (11.9) | 153 (14.7) |
| Damot Sore | 819 (75.9) | 878 (81.4) | 267 (24.8) | 340 (31.5) | 74 (68.6) | 132 (12.2) | 101 (9.4) | 73 (6.8) |

**7 Census (Bolosso Bombe/Damot Gale/Damot Weydie/Abela Abaya) community WaSH results**

In total 57,885‬ HHs were registered in the census comprising Bolosso Bombe (15,540), Damot Gale (18,713), Damot Weydie (15,352), and Abela Abaya (8,280). Overall, 13,617 households refused to be registered in the census - Bolosso Bombe (1,449), Damot Gale (5,952), Damot Weydie (5,467), and Abela Abaya (747). As a result, there is no WaSH data for these households. Given the large number of kebeles that were sampled across the four woredas, the kebele-level WaSH data has been put in a separate attached excel document *< Geshiyaro\_Census\_Kebele Figures\_ODF Components only\_300420 >.* Woreda level data only is presented here.

**7.1. Proportion of households with access to basic drinking water**

Overall, 64.2%, 71.7%, 70.7% and 81.7% of HHs in Bolosso Bombe, Damot Gale, Damot Weydie and Abela Abaya, respectively, had access to basic drinking water.

**Table 13: Proportion % of households with access to Basic drinking water**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda | **Reliability** | | **Quantity** | **Accessibility** | **% HH with access to Basic Water\*\*** |
| Improved Water Source | Year-round daily access | >= 25L/person  Per day\* | journey time <= 30min |
| 1 | 64.2 | 87.7 | 1.6 | 54.0 | **30.4** |
| 3 | 71.7 | 83.3 | 1.9 | 42.4 | **28.7** |
| 5 | 70.7 | 94.3 | 7.0 | 37.4 | **27.8** |
| 4 | 81.7 | 86.6 | 3.5 | 41.6 | **30.7** |

\* This was measured as the number of households reporting the amount of water that they currently fetch per day. This is not necessarily a measure of the amount available to them. This variable was therefore not included in the definition of “Basic Water”.

\*\* This is defined as Improved water source and journey <= 30min

**Figure 1: Proportion % of households with access to basic water access**

**A close up of a map

Description automatically generated**

**Figure 2: Proportion % of households with access to improved water source**
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[**7.2 Proportion of households with safe water storage and handling**](#_Toc21951197)

Overall, 58.0%, 41.5%, 49.7% and 48.6% of HHs in Bolosso Bombe, Damot Gale, Damot Weydie and Abela Abaya, respectively, stored and handled their water correctly. Safe water storage was defined by combining four variables: (1) Water that is stored in a container that protects the water from re-contamination such as plastic, ceramic, or metal containers, which serve as physical barriers to recontamination; (2) A covered water container that allows easy and safe access to the water without requiring the insertion of hands or objects into the container; and (3) Reported regular cleaning of the container.

Most HHs stored their water in jerry cans and extracting water from this was predominantly done in a safe manner (Table 14). A failure to cover the container and clean the container was where most HH carried out unsafe water handling, with many houses cleaning the container with gravel which was not considered safe given that it is an STH elimination project.

**Table 14: Proportion % of households with safe water storage and handling**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda | % HH storing water in a protective container (metal/plastic/clay) | Water storage container is covered | Water is collected safely\* | Water storage container is cleaned\*\* | Container is cleaned frequently\*\*\* | **% HH with access to Basic water storage and handling** |
| Bolosso Bombe | 100 | 73.9 | 94.4 | 82.1 | 99.0 | 58.0 |
| Damot Gale | 100 | 65.5 | 95.0 | 64.3 | 97.4 | 41.5 |
| Damot Weydie | 100 | 66.7 | 93.8 | 76.2 | 97.5 | 49.7 |
| Abela Abaya | 100 | 67.9 | 96.0 | 70.0 | 98.6 | 48.6 |

\* “Safely” includes tilting and pouring water directly into a cup, using a bottle, using a tap, or using a specific water scoop. Not safe includes using any scooper available or drinking directly from the container.

\*\* Adequate cleaning includes cleaning with water or cleaning with water and soap. This was not considered adequate if the water storage container was cleaned with dirt.

\*\*\* Frequently included daily, weekly, monthly or occasionally if number of days are cited.

\*\*\*\* Basic water storage had to meet all the criteria in the table

[**7.3 Proportion of households with access to basic sanitation**](#_Toc21951197)

Overall, less than 0.5% of HHs had access to Basic sanitation in any of the woredas. Basic sanitation was defined using the following indicators: (1) Reliability: Year-round access to improved sanitation facilities; (2) Accessibility: On the compound premises and not shared; (3) Quantity: One per HH/compound.; (4) Quality: Each latrine must be clean and visually have hand washing facilities & soap present. The results show that the primary reason Basic sanitation was not met by the vast majority of HHs was due to poor handwashing facilities.

**Table 15: Proportion % of households with access to Basic sanitation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda | Improved Latrine\* | Latrine Clean | Latrine is not Shared with other HH\*\* | On HH/ compound premises | Handwashing Facilities within 3m of latrine with soap and water | **% meeting Basic Sanitation \*\*\*** |
| Bolosso Bombe | 13.6 | 41.0 | 90.0 | 92.0 | 0.6 | 0.1 |
| Damot Gale | 14.6 | 49.5 | 93.6 | 96.4 | 0.8 | 0.2 |
| Damot Weydie | 11.2 | 46.7 | 92.8 | 91.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Abela Abaya | 11.5 | 45.8 | 91.5 | 98.5 | 0.3 | 0.1 |

\* Improved latrine: 57,885 HH; Shared latrine: 51,147; On premises: 47,176 HHs (facility exists, observation possible); Handwashing facility present: 47,211 HH (facility exists, and observation possible); Water/Soap present: 47,211 HHs.

\*\*Households with a latrine shared but located in the same compound were not considered as “shared”

\*\*\* Basic sanitation had to meet all the criteria in the table

**Figure 3: Proportion % of households with access to basic sanitation access**
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**Figure 4: Proportion % of households with access to improved latrine access**
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[**7.4 Proportion of households with basic handwashing facilities**](#_Toc21951197)

Overall, less than 1% of HHs had access to Basic handwashing facilities in any of the woredas. Basic handwashing facilities were defined using the following indicators: (1) Accessibility: Within 3 metres of the latrine; (2) Quality: Each latrine must have hand washing facilities & soap visually present at the time of interview; (3) Reliability: Each handwashing station must have water and soap available at time of the interview.

**Table 16: Proportion % of households with access to Basic handwashing facilities**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda | Handwashing facility within 3m of latrine | Water available at interview | Soap/Detergent available at interview | **% meeting Basic Handwashing** |
| Bolosso Bombe | 17.2 | 70.9 | 15.7 | **0.6** |
| Damot Gale | 14.0 | 57.4 | 12.2 | **0.7** |
| Damot Weydie | 14.6 | 78.2 | 13.3 | **0.2** |
| Abela Abaya | 9.0 | 35.9 | 8.6 | **0.2** |

**Figure 5: Proportion % of households with access to basic handwashing access**
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[**7.5 Proportion of households who report open defecation**](#_Toc21951197)

Overall, less than 20% of HHs meet the open defecation free (ODF) criteria. Households were defined as practicing ODF if (1) the household has a latrine (improved/unimproved) with handwashing facilities; (2) household reports that all members use the latrine at all times; (3) proper disposal of child faeces in households with a child under the age of 5 years.

**Table 17: Proportion % of households meeting ODF targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda | Household has a latrine | Household has handwashing facilities1 | All household members use the latrine2 | Proper disposal of child faeces3 | **% meeting ODF criteria** |
| Bolosso Bombe | 89.2 | 20.7 | 87.2 | 78.5 | **17.8** |
| Damot Gale | 89.7 | 14.9 | 87.8 | 80.8 | **12.6** |
| Damot Weydie | 92.1 | 17.5 | 91.6 | 82.4 | **16.2** |
| Abela Abaya | 75.3 | 9.2 | 74.8 | 70.2 | **8.1** |

1 Handwashing facilities in the household were included if no latrine-specific facility was present. Presence of soap and water was not accounted for in this figure.  
2 This excludes households where a member does not use the latrine because they are too young.  
3 For households where there is a child/children younger than 5 years old.

[**7.6 Proportion of households exposed to surface water**](#_Toc21951198)

Overall, over half of HHs across all kebeles (with up to 82.2% in Bolosso Bombo) reported exposure to surface water. When the source is examined by activity among those HHs reporting exposure, washing clothes and bathing revealed to be the most common reasons for exposure.

**Table 18: Proportion % of households where no member is exposed to surface water sources**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda | Exposure through drinking water | Exposure through cooking or handwashing water | Exposure through bathing | Exposure through washing clothes | **% Exposed to Surface Water** |
| Bolosso Bombe | 15.1 | 44.0 | 72.3 | 75.6 | **82.2** |
| Damot Gale | 12.3 | 18.1 | 55.5 | 58.8 | **65.1** |
| Damot Weydie | 8.4 | 16.7 | 60.9 | 63.7 | **68.3** |
| Abela Abaya | 9.1 | 11.3 | 51.3 | 53.4 | **56.8** |

**Figure 6: Proportion % of households with exposure to surface water**
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**8 Census (Bolosso Bombe/Damot Gale/Damot Weydie/Abela Abaya) School WaSH results**

Overall, 103 schools assessed in the census, only in Abela Abaya did over a third of schools have basic water access. Otherwise very few schools had water available on the premises. Schools all woredas failed to meet the composite access to basic sanitation criteria, except for Bolosso Bombe (3.2%).

**Table 19: Proportion % of schools with access to a Basic drinking water source on premises**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda | n Schools | Access to improved water source | Water at time of the survey | **% With Basic Water Access** |
| Bolosso Bombe | 31 | 9.7 | 38.7 | **6.5** |
| Damot Gale | 34 | 11.8 | 17.6 | **5.9** |
| Damot Weydie | 24 | 16.7 | 20.8 | **8.3** |
| Abela Abaya | 14 | 50.0 | 42.9 | **35.7** |

**Table 20: Proportion % of schools with access to a Basic sanitation on premises**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda\* | Improved Latrine | Separate Gender Latrines | Number of students/latrine meeting the target | Menstrual Hygiene Facilities | Handwashing facilities with Soap/Water | Latrines Clean at time of survey | **% With ‘Basic Sanitation’** |
| Bolosso Bombe | 19.4 | 87.1 | 9.7 | 43.3 | 6.5 | 32.3 | **3.2** |
| Damot Gale | 50.0 | 76.5 | 26.5 | 35.3 | 2.9 | 23.5 | **0.0** |
| Damot Weydie | 45.8 | 95.8 | 41.7 | 37.5 | 0.0 | 41.7 | **0.0** |
| Abela Abaya | 28.6 | 78.6 | 14.3 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 21.4 | **0.0** |

\* Number of schools assessed is the same as Table 14.

[**9 Health-facility level WaSH results**](#_Toc21951195)

Overall, 6 out of 15 health centres reported access to an improved water source, of these four reported the water source more than 500m from the health centre. In total 11 health centres reported access to a functional latrine for outpatients, of which 7 had access to an improved latrine. In total 13 health centres reported access to a functional latrine for staff, of which 9 were improved latrines. No health centres had access to functional handwashing facilities. Only 3 schools reported handwashing facilities, of which one had soap and water.

**Table 21: Proportion % of Health care facilities with access to a Basic drinking water**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda\* | n Health Facility | Improved Water Source | On Premises | Currently Available | **% With Basic Water Access** |
| Bolosso Bombe | 19 | 31.6 | 21.1 | 26.3 | **0.0** |
| Damot Gale | 40 | 60.0 | 15.0 | 30.0 | **10.0** |
| Damot Weydie | 27 | 59.3 | 25.9 | 25.9 | **14.8** |
| Abela Abaya | 13 | 76.9 | 23.1 | 38.5 | **15.4** |

**Table 22: Proportion % of Health care facilities with access to a Basic sanitation on premises**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda\* | n Health Facility | Improved Latrine | Currently Functionable | Handwashing Facilities Present | Soap/Water Available | **% Facilities with Basic Sanitation** |
| Bolosso Bombe | 19 | 36.8 | 57.9 | 26.3 | 15.8 | **5.3** |
| Damot Gale | 40 | 45.0 | 82.5 | 20.0 | 7.5 | **7.5** |
| Damot Weydie | 27 | 33.3 | 85.2 | 29.6 | 18.5 | **3.7** |
| Abela Abaya | 13 | 46.2 | 53.8 | 23.1 | 30.8 | **15.4** |

[**10**](#_Toc21951195) **Community knowledge of hygiene practices**

As seen in Table 22, like Damot Sore and Damot Pulasa, there was a good understanding among community members of why handwashing is important, with the majority citing getting rid of germs and sickness. This survey was conducted pre-COVID and therefore this figure will likely be even higher now. Again, access to soap seems to be the limiting factor. Likewise there is good knowledge regarding causes of diarrhoea, again with handwashing commonly reported as a preventive measure and few reporting the importance of using a latrine.

Households were able to select multiple responses to each question.

**Table 23: Household Hygiene Knowledge: Why do you wash your hands with soap?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda | Get rid of dirt and cleans hands | Stops germs or sickness | Smells or feels nice | It is our practice | NGO/Government/HEW/School told us to | Soap/ash is accessible | Soap/ash is easy |
| Bolosso Bombe | 90.6 | 52.3 | 24.4 | 8.1 | 18.1 | 2.6 | 1.0 |
| Damot Gale | 90.0 | 54.8 | 29.5 | 9.6 | 19.6 | 6.6 | 3.5 |
| Damot Weydie | 93.2 | 54.8 | 28.4 | 10.6 | 20.7 | 2.0 | 0.8 |
| Abela Abaya | 88.4 | 55.8 | 28.3 | 14.5 | 21.0 | 7.1 | 3.8 |

**Table 24: Household Hygiene Knowledge: Why do you wash your hands with soap?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda | Wash hands with water | Wash hands with water and soap | Use a latrine | Covering food | Store water safely | Prayer | Traditional healer | Eating clean food |
| Bolosso Bombe | 82.8 | 59.2 | 30.6 | 25.2 | 13.3 | 8.1 | 11.9 | 6.7 |
| Damot Gale | 81.8 | 60.6 | 34.8 | 26.7 | 15.2 | 10.0 | 12.8 | 14.3 |
| Damot Weydie | 89.2 | 61.0 | 36.9 | 28.0 | 14.6 | 10.2 | 13.5 | 8.1 |
| Abela Abaya | 5.5 | 56.1 | 35.7 | 24.5 | 16.1 | 9.4 | 9.2 | 12.8 |

**Annex 1 : Geshiyaro Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WaSH) Indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Accountable** | **Indicator** | **Indicator definition** | **Baseline** | **End of year 1\*** | **Year 2 target** | **Year 5 target** |
| **MDA** | | | | | | |
| FMOH | Verified percentage of population treated with PZQ at each round at the kebele level | * Defined as all individual treatment records based on individuals verified by biometrics and/or unique study ID card * Excludes all those not eligible for treatment as per WHO guidelines | n/a | 88.2 | 90% | 90% |
| FMOH | Verified percentage of population treated with ALB at each round at the kebele level | n/a | 88.4% | 90% | 90% |
| **Community-level WaSH indicators (%with functional sanitation and improved water)** | | | | | | |
| WVE | % of households (HH) with access to a **BASIC** drinking water | * **Reliability**: Year-round daily access to an improved water source**\*\*** * **Quantity**: Min 25 litres/person/day * **Accessibility:** within 30 minutes round trip of the household, including queuing time * **Quality:** Water must be free from contamination at both point of collection and point of use (in the HH), compliant with WHO/National Water Quality guideline/standards. As determined by regular water quality monitoring. * **Sustainability:** Institutionalised water supply system management in place (responsible body for O&M, tariff collection and management, and Financing mechanism using Life Cycle Cost Approach). | 63%  (public tap only) | 83.6%  (n=1612  public tap: 56.9%  Hand pump: 26.2%) | 85% | 85% |
| WVE | % of HHs with safe water storage and handling | * Safe water storage means that the water is stored in a container that protects the water from re-contamination. * Storage in plastic, ceramic, or metal containers with the following characteristics, which serve as physical barriers to recontamination: * A small opening with a lid or cover that allows easy and safe access to the water without requiring the insertion of hands or objects into the container; and * Reported regular cleaning of the container. |  |  | 85% | 85% |
| WVE/FMoH | % of HHs with access to functioning **BASIC** sanitation. | * **Reliability**: Year-round access to improved sanitation facilities\*\*\*. * **Quantity**: One per HH/compound. Not shared with other HHs. * **Accessibility:** On the compound premises. * **Quality**: Each latrine must be clean and have hand washing facilities & soap present. Regular cleaning and maintenance system in place as determined by visual inspection during assessment. | 19.4% | 33.9% | 85% | 85% |
| WVE | % of households that have functional **BASIC**handwashing facilities | * **Reliability**: Year-round access. * **Quantity**: Not shared with other households * **Accessibility:** Within 3m of the latrine. * **Quality**: Each handwashing facility must have water and soap. | 20.2% | 17.8%  (soap only present in 60.7% of these HH) | 70% | 70% |
| FMoH | % of kebeles declared ODF | * Every household must have a latrine with handwashing (water and soap) facilities. * All household members report using the latrine at all times. * Institutional latrines (community schools, health care centre, roadside) are in place, hygienic and offer privacy. | 0 | n/a (green flag) | 100% | 82% (White flag) |
| WVE | % of HH where no member is exposed to surface water sources | * Exposure includes drinking, cooking, bathing, and clothes washing in open surface water sources * Surface water source is defined as a river, stream, lake, or unprotected spring | n/a | 16.2% | 85% | 85% |
| WVE | % of HH with children who do not bathe, swim and play in surface water sources | n/a | 21.2% | 85% | 85% |
| **School-level WaSH indicators (%with functional sanitation and improved water)** | | | | | | |
| WVE | % of schools with access to a **BASIC** drinking water source on premises | * **Reliability**: Year-round daily access to an improved water source**\*\*** * **Quantity**: At least one functioning tap for 100 students * **Accessibility:** On the school premises. * **Quality:** Water must be free from contamination, compliant with WHO/National Water Quality guideline/standards, determined by regular water quality monitoring. * Institutionalised water supply management in place (responsible body for O&M and Financing mechanism using Life Cycle Cost Approach). |  |  | 60% | 100% |
| WVE | % of schools with access to **BASIC** sanitation facilities on premises | * **Reliability**: Year-round access on premises to improved sanitation facilities\*\*\* * **Quantity**: Gender segregated. One latrine for 100 girls and 125 boys. * **Accessibility**: On the school premises, accessible for people with disabilities & at least one latrinewithmenstrual hygiene management. * **Quality**: Each latrine block must have hand washing facilities & soap (one tap per 100 students). Institutionalised daily cleaning must be in place rather than ad hoc. A clear, long-term sewage management system in place safely treated in situ or transported and treated off-site every 6 months. | 20% | 80% (n=5) | 60% | 100% |
| **Health care facility-level WaSH indicators (% with functional sanitation and improved water)** | | | | | | |
| WVE | % of Healthcare Facilities with access to a **BASIC** drinking water source on premises | * **Reliability**: Year-round daily access on premises to an improved water source**\*\*** * **Quantity**: Min 10 litre/person/day * **Accessibility:** On the healthcare facility premises, delivery room and OPD * **Quality:** Water must be free from contamination, compliant with WHO/National Water Quality guideline/standard for faecal (*E.coli*) and chemical (?) contamination. As determined by regular water quality monitoring. * Institutionalised water supply management in place (responsible body for O&M and Financing mechanism using Life Cycle Cost Approach). |  |  | 60% | 100% |
| WVE | % of healthcare facilities with access to **BASIC** sanitation facilities on premises | * **Reliability**: Year-round access to improved sanitation facilities\*\*\*. * **Accessibility**: On the healthcare facility premises. Accessible for people with disabilities and Gender segregated. * **Quality**: Each latrine block must have hand washing facilities & soap (one tap per 100 students). Institutionalised daily cleaning must be in place rather than ad hoc. A clear, long-term sewage management system in place where the excreta is safely treated in situ or transported and treated off-site every 6 months. | n/a | 100%  (n=1) | 60% | 100% |
| **Governance, coordination, and education** | | | | | | |
| WVE | % kebeles with active WaSH Business Centres | * WaSH business centre must be present and active in each kebele, defined by knowledge of business centres through interviews with different members of community | 0 | 100% (n=10) | 100% (n=10) | 100% |
| WVE | % of schools where NTD-WaSH related behaviour change promotion activities held (with IEC materials) | * Schools with WaSH promotion activities present * % of SAC who have basic knowledge of hygiene practices [by relevant NTD specific indicators] | 0 | 0 | 100% | 100% |
| FMOH | % of schools with active\*\*\* WaSH clubs (with IEC materials) | * Schools with WaSH clubs who had a club in the last month * % of SAC who participate in the WaSH clubs * % of SAC who have basic knowledge of hygiene practices [by relevant NTD specific indicators] |  |  |  |  |
| WVE | % of HEW trained on WaSH | * HEW who report attending training * HEW with WaSH promotion materials * % of HEW who have basic knowledge of hygiene practices [by relevant NTD specific indicators] | n/a | n/a | 100% | 100% |
| WVE | % of community who have basic knowledge of hygiene practices [broken down by relevant NTD specific indicators] | * % of community members who have basic knowledge of hygiene practices [broken down by relevant NTD specific indicators] * Reported source of knowledge within community on WaSH | n/a | n/a | 100% | 100% |

\*This assessment was conducted in 10 kebeles that WVE certified as ready for inspection in Oct 2019. This data is not reflective of Bolosso Sore as a whole.

\*\* **Improved drinking water** is as per OneWaSH Ethiopia definition and includes (1) piped supplies (tap into dwelling or compound, piped to neighbour, or public tap/standpipe) and (2) non-piped supplies (borehole or tube well, protected well or spring).

\*\*\* **Improved sanitation facilities** is as per OneWaSH Ethiopia definition includes (1) wet sanitation: flush/pour flush piped sewer system and (2) dry sanitation: ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrine, pit latrine with slab, or composting toilet covered with slab, super structure and door. In addition, the latrine must have handwashing facilities with soap and is not shared with other households. If one missed in this list it is an unimproved latrine.

**Annex 2: Additional Data**

**Table 10: Number of households sampled vs. minimum expected HH in Damot Sore and DamotPulasa**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woreda | Kebele | Sampled HH | Consented sampled HH | **Minimum expected #HHs** |
| DamotPulasa | GoloShanto | 173 | 140 | 45 |
| GalchaSuke | 65 | 65 | 75 |
| PulasaBakala | 188 | 187 | 45 |
| ZamineWulisho | 158 | 125 | 60 |
| Olola | 91 | 91 | 60 |
| WaribiraSuke | 131 | 108 | 60 |
| Wasedo | 164 | 164 | 45 |
| BushaDp | 162 | 162 | 60 |
| **Total** | **1132** | **1042** | **450** |
| Damot Sore | DembaZamine | 199 | 189 | 60 |
| DogieShakiso | 169 | 169 | 60 |
| DogieHanchicho | 169 | 169 | 75 |
| Sunkale | 206 | 193 | 60 |
| Sore Mashdo | 115 | 115 | 45 |
| Bololla | 114 | 114 | 60 |
| ZamineNare | 131 | 124 | 45 |
| **Total** | 1103 | 1073 | 405 |

**Table 11: Proportion of households (n (%)) by reasons of alternative drinking water sources by kebele**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Woreda** | **Kebele** | Why do you need to get your drinking water from other sources | | | |
| Seasonal - main source only available at certain times of the year | Technical - main source broken/no one to facilitate | Access - can't get to main source | Financial - not enough money to pay for water |
| DamotPulasa | GoloShanto | 18 (12.86) | 35 (25.00) | 0 (0.00) | 7 (5.00) |
| GalchaSuke | 19 (29.23) | 8 (12.31) | 0 (0.00) | 0 (0.00) |
| PulassaBakala | 115 (61.50) | 9 (4.28) | 25 (5.35) | 5 (2.14)) |
| ZamineWulisho | 26 (20.80) | 45 (35.20) | 15 (22.40) | 5 (4.00) |
| Olola | 37 (40.66) | 1 (1.10) | 7 (7.69) | 1 (1.10) |
| WaribiraSuke | 42 (38.89) | 13 (9.26) | 14 (12.96) | 2 (1.85) |
| Wasedo | 41 (25.00) | 18 (10.98) | 1 (0.61) | 1 (0.61) |
| Busha (DP) | 67 (41.36) | 5 (3.09) | 3 (1.85) | 1 (0.62) |
| **Toal** | **365 (35.03)** | **129 (12.38)** | **63 (6.05)** | **21 (2.02)** |
| Damot Sore | DembaZamine | 85 (44.97) | 80 (42.33) | 44 (23.28) | 9 (4.76) |
| DogieShakiso | 55 (32.54) | 23 (13.61) | 13 (7.69) | 0 (0.00) |
| DogieHanchicho | 7 (4.14) | 4 (2.37) | 81 (47.93) | 31 (18.34) |
| Sunkale | 98 (50.78) | 79 (40.93) | 29 (15.03) | 5 (2.59) |
| Sore Mashdo | 1 (0.87) | 31 (26.96) | 52 (45.22) | 9 (7.83) |
| Bololla | 26 (22.81) | 9 (7.90) | 20 (17.54) | 2 (1.75) |
| ZamineNare | 39 (31.45) | 102 (82.26) | 31 (25.00) | 1 (0.81) |
| **Total** | **311 (28.98)** | **328 (30.57)** | **270 (25.16)** | **57 (5.31)** |

**Table 12: Proportion of households (n (%)) who currently pay for drinking water**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Woreda** | **Kebele** | **Pay for drinking water** | |
| Yes | No |
| DamotPulasa | GoloShanto | 50 (35.71) | 90 (64.29) |
| Galcha Suke | 33 (50.77) | 32 (49.23) |
| Pulasa Bakala | 33 (17.65) | 154 (83.35) |
| Zamine Wulisho | 40 (32.00) | 85 (68.00) |
| Olola | 13 (14.29) | 78 (85.71) |
| Waribira Suke | 35 (32.41) | 73 (67.59) |
| Wasedo | 79 (48.17) | 85 (51.83) |
| BushaDp | 25 (15.43) | 137 (84.57) |
| **Total** | **308 (29.56)** | **734 (70.44)** |
| Damot Sore | Demba Zamine | 50 (26.45) | 139 (73.55) |
| Dogie Shakiso | 59 (34.91) | 110 (65.09) |
| Dogie Hanchicho | 6 (3.55) | 163 (96.45) |
| Sunkale | 51 (26.42) | 142 (73.58) |
| Sore Mashdo | 1 (0.87) | 114 (99.13) |
| Bololla | 30 (26.32) | 84 (73.68) |
| ZamineNare | 24 (19.35) | 100 (80.65) |
| **Total** | **221(20.60)** | **852 (79.40)** |

**Table 13: Proportion of households (n (%)) who currently treat their drinking water**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Woreda** | **Kebele** | **Treat drinking water** | |
| Yes | No |
| DamotPulasa | GoloShanto | 50 (35.71) | 90 (64.29) |
| Galchauke | 33 (50.77) | 32(49.23) |
| PulasaBakala | 33(17.65) | 154 (82.35) |
| ZamineWulisho | 40(32.00) | 85(68.00) |
| Olola | 13(14.29) | 78(85.71) |
| WaribiraSuke | 35(32.41) | 73(67.59) |
| Wasedo | 79(48.17) | 85(51.83) |
| BushaDp | 25(15.43) | 137(84.57) |
| **Total** | **308 (29.56)** | **734 (70.44)** |
| Damot Sore | DembaZamine | 50(26.46) | 139(73.54) |
| DogieShakiso | 59(34.91) | 110(65.09) |
| DogieHanchicho | 6(3.55) | 163(96.45) |
| Sunkale | 51(26.42) | 142(73.58) |
| Sore Mashdo | 1(0.87) | 114(99.13) |
| Bololla | 30(26.32) | 84(73.68) |
| ZamineNare | 24(19.35) | 100(80.65) |
| **Total** | **221(20.60)** | **852 (79.40)** |

**Table 14: Distribution of households (n (%)) by method of water treatment by kebele**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Woreda** | **Kebele** | **Aqua Tablets** | **Boil** | **Add Bleach/ chlorine** | **Strain through cloth** | **Water filter** | **Solar**  **Disinfection** | **Let stand and settle** |
| Damot  Pulasa | GoloShanto | 27(54.0) | 8 (16.0) | 14 (28.00) | 1 (2.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) |
| GalchaSuke | 0(0.00) | 15(45.5) | 15(45.5) | 1(3.03) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) |
| PulassaBakala | 0(0.00) | 0 (0.00) | 6(18.18) | 0(0.00) | 14(42.42) | 1(3.03) | 0(0.00) |
| ZamineWulisho | 29(72.50) | 9(22.50) | 1(2.50) | 0 (0.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) |
| Olola | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 9(69.23) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) |
| WaribiraSuke | 15(42.86) | 11(31.43) | 9(25.71) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) |
| Wasedo | 1(1.27) | 35(44.30) | 38(48.10) | 5(6.33) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) |
| Busha(DP) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 10(40.00) | 0(0.00) | 9(36.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) |
|  | **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Damot  Sore | DembaZamine | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 47(94.00) | 3(6.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) |
| Dogie Shakiso | 0(0.00) | 48(81.36) | 6(10.17) | 5(8.47) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) |
| Dogie Hanchicho | 1(16.67) | 3(50.00) | 0(0.00) | 1(16.67) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) |
| Sunkale | 1(1.96) | 0(0.00) | 45(88.2) | 6(11.8) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) |
| \*\*Sore Mashdo | 0(0.00) | 0 (0.00) | 45 (--) | 6 (--) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) |
| Bololla | 15(50.00) | 11 (36.7) | 0 (0.00) | 1 (3.33) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) | 3(10.00) |
| ZamineNare | 0(0.00) | 2 (8.33) | 17 (70.8) | 0 (0.00) | 2(8.33) | 0(0.00) | 0(0.00) |

**Table 15: Proportion of households (n (%)) how they withdraw drinking water from the container/storage by kebele**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Woreda** | **Kebele** | Tilt and pour directly in to a cup | Using a bottle | Using a tap | Using a specific water scooper | Using any scooper that is available | Drinking straight from the container |
| Damot Pulasa | Golo Shanto | 53 (37.9) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (0.7) | 46 (32.9) | 40 (28.6) | 0 (0.0) |
| Galcha Suke | 40 (61.5) | 16 (24.6) | 0 (0.0) | 9 (13.8) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) |
| Pulasa Bakala | 143 (76.5) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 44 (23.50 | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) |
| Zamine Wulisho | 43 (34.4) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 24 (19.2) | 58 (46.4) | 0 (0.0) |
| Olola | 66 (72.5) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 25 (27.5) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) |
| Waribira Suke | 40 (37.0) | 1 (0.9) | 0 (0.0) | 16 (14.8) | 50 (46.3) | 1 (0.9) |
| Wasedo | 93 (56.7) | 44 (26.8) | 0 (0.0) | 25 (15.2) | 2 (1.2) | 0 (0.0) |
| Busha (DP) | 122 (75.3) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 40 (24.7) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) |
| **Total** | **600 (57.5)** | **61 (5.9)** | **1 (0.1)** | **229 (22.0)** | **150 (14.4)** | **1 (0.1)** |
| Damot Sore | Demba Zamine | 84 (44.4) | 0 (0.0) | 0(0.0) | 62 (32.8) | 43 (22.8) | 0 (0.0) |
| Dogie Shakiso | 88 (52.1) | 63 (37.3) | 1 (0.6) | 17 (10.1) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) |
| Dogie Hanchicho | 132 (78.1) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 12 (7.1) | 25 (14.8) | 0 (0.0) |
| Sunkale | 105 (54.4) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 60 (31.1) | 28 (14.5) | 0 (0.0) |
| Sore Mashdo | 89 (77.4) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 6 (5.2) | 19 (16.5) | 1 (0.9) |
| Bololla | 83 (72.8) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 20 (17.5) | 11 (9.6) | 0 (0.0) |
| Zamine Nare | 75 (60.5) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 36 (29.0) | 13 (10.5) | 0 (0.0) |
| Total | **656 (61.1)** | **63 (5.9)** | **1 (0.1)** | **213 (19.8)** | **139 (13.0)** | **1 (0.1)** |

**Table 16: Proportion of households (n (%)) how they take care of the water container**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Woreda** | **Kebele** | Clean it with water | Clean it with  soap and water | Clean it with gravel | Do not clean it |
| Damot Pulasa | Golo Shanto | 64 (45.71) | 41(29.29) | 28(20.00) | 7(5.00) |
| Galcha Suke | 21(32.31) | 16(24.62) | 28(43.08) | 0 (0.00) |
| Pulasa Bakala | 142(75.94) | 12(6.42) | 33(17.65) | 0 (0.00) |
| ZamineWulisho | 71(56.80) | 29(23.20) | 24(19.20) | 1(0.80) |
| Olola | 56(61.54) | 5(5.50) | 30(32.96) | 0 (0.00) |
| WaribiraS uke | 63(58.34) | 24(22.22) | 21(19.44) | 0 (0.00) |
| Wasedo | 48(29.27) | 50(30.49) | 66(40.24) | 0 0(0.00) |
| Busha (DP) | 111(68.52) | 4(2.47) | 47(29.01) | 0 (0.00) |
| **Total** | **576 (55.28)** | **181 (17.37)** | **277 (26.58)** | **8 (0.77)** |
| Damot Sore | Demba Zamine | 118(62.43) | 13(6.88) | 58(30.69) | 0 (0.00) |
| Dogie Shakiso | 15(8.88) | 27(15.98) | 127(75.14) | 0 (0.00) |
| Dogie Hanchicho | 52(30.77) | 58(34.32) | 59(34.91) | 0 (0.00) |
| Sunkale | 121(62.69) | 11(5.70) | 60(31.09) | 1(0.52) |
| Sore Mashdo | 28(24.35) | 38(33.04) | 49(42.61) | 0 (0.00) |
| Bololla | 27(23.68) | 42(36.84) | 45(39.48) | 0 (0.00) |
| Zamine Nare | 76(61.29) | 11(8.87) | 37(29.84) | 0 0(0.00) |
| **Total** | **437 (40.73)** | **200 (18.64)** | **435 (40.54)** | **1 (0.09)** |

**Table 17: Proportion of households (n (%)) where faeces are observed at the edge of the toilet by kebele**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Woreda** | **Kebele** | Faeces observed at edge of pit latrine opening | |
| **Observed** | **Not observed** |
| Damot Pulasa | Golo Shanto | 56 (43.1) | 74 (56.9) |
| Galcha Suke | 55 (88.7) | 7 (11.3) |
| Pulasa Bakala | 95 (51.1) | 91 (48.9) |
| Zamine Wulisho | 61 (52.6) | 55 (47.4) |
| Olola | 36 (41.9) | 50 (58.1) |
| Waribira Suke | 39 (36.4) | 68 (63.6) |
| Wasedo | 135 (92.5) | 11 (7.5)) |
| Busha (DP) | 86 (58.1) | 62 (41.9) |
| **Total** | **563 (57.4)** | **418 (42.6)** |
| Damot Sore | Demba Zamine | 67 (39.3) | 104 (60.8) |
| Dogie Shakiso | 154 (95.1) | 8 (4.9) |
| Dogie Hanchicho | 79 (49.7) | 80 (50.3) |
| Sunkale | 76 (41.8) | 106 (58.2) |
| Sore Mashdo | 38 (34.2) | 73 (65.8) |
| Bololla | 48 (42.1) | 66 (57.9) |
| Zamine Nare | 55 (47.4) | 61 (52.6) |
| **Total** | **517 (50.9)** | **498 (49.1)** |

**Table 18: Proportion of households (n (%)) where flies access faeces**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Woreda** | **Kebele** | flies access the faeces | |
| **Yes** | **No** |
| Damot Pulasa | Golo Shanto | 61 (46.9) | 69 (53.1) |
| Galcha Suke | 55 (88.7) | 7 (11.3) |
| Pulasa Bakala | 95 (51.1) | 91 (48.9) |
| Zamine Wulisho | 73 (62.9) | 43 (37.1) |
| Olola | 36 (41.9) | 50 (58.1) |
| Waribira Suke | 56 (52.3) | 51 (47.7) |
| Wasedo | 133 (91.1) | 13 (8.9) |
| Busha (DP) | 86 (58.1) | 62 (41.9) |
| **Total** | **595 (60.7)** | **386 (39.3)** |
| Damot Sore | Demba Zamine | 85 (49.7) | 86 (50.3) |
| Dogie Shakiso | 154 (95.1) | 8 (4.9) |
| Dogie Hanchicho | 91 (57.2) | 68 (42.8) |
| Sunkale | 90 (49.5) | 92 (50.5) |
| Sore Mashdo | 47 (42.3) | 64 (57.7) |
| Bololla | 60 (52.6) | 54 (47.4) |
| Zamine Nare | 59 (50.9) | 57 (49.1) |
| **Total** | **586 (57.7)** | **429 (42.3)** |