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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronyms</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWD</td>
<td>Acute Watery Diarrhoea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoFED</td>
<td>Bureau of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLTS</td>
<td>Community Led Total Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLTBC</td>
<td>Community Led Total Behaviour Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs</td>
<td>Community Based Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoE</td>
<td>Government of Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEW</td>
<td>Health Extension Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIP</td>
<td>Hygiene Improvement Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoWR</td>
<td>Ministry of Water Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoH</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTE</td>
<td>Mid-term Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NatComs</td>
<td>National Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORDA</td>
<td>Organisation for Relief and Development of Amhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td>Population Services International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWSEP</td>
<td>Rural Water Supply and Environmental Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>Southern Nations and Nationalities’ People’s Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNV</td>
<td>Dutch International Development Cooperation (Organisation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (Integrated national programme or campaign)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSGs</td>
<td>Water and Sanitation Support Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB/WSP</td>
<td>World Bank/Water and Sanitation Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 1.  SUMMARY

The EU-UNICEF supported WASH project is largely on track to deliver the stated outputs in terms of physical inputs and deliverables. This is a considerable achievement considering the number of obstacles which must be overcome on an almost daily basis. There have been funding delays, hold ups in procurement, challenging times as business-process-re-engineering kicks in and new staff learns new skills. The population increases, the country’s physical environment continues to deteriorate, there are new hydro-geological challenges to solve and the country doesn’t get any smaller.

With EU-UNICEF support, access to safe water continues to rise under the management of committees in which women play key roles. There has been a strong focus on rehabilitation, shallow well development and more recently the promotion of ‘self-supply’. Sanitation coverage with support from enthusiastic community led total sanitation and the health extension workers has increased dramatically with several woredas ready to declare open defaecation free status. Hand washing remains a key hurdle to overcome and there are efforts underway to promote more comprehensive behavior change with independent verification systems. School WASH has lagged behind because the government universal access programme is focusing on domestic rather than institutional coverage and there is still some way to go to improve sectoral convergence and complete manuals and guidelines.

Key to UNICEF’s role is capacity building which has taken the shape of a wide range technical training but also equipment to improve organizational and administrative efficiency at all levels. Long standing partnerships at regional and zonal level have been consolidated and new ones have been successfully forged with SNV, PLAN, ORDA and Italian Cooperation. Woreda WASH teams are growing in confidence and with the benefit of the new ‘WASH inventory’ system are improving convergent planning and implementation but would benefit from more regular mentoring and support. The private sector is primarily engaged in well drilling, the construction of hand-dug wells and institutional latrines. It is recognized that additional work is needed to create an enabling environment for the private sector, particularly in the context of spare part supply chains.

The mid-term evaluation team has visited 10 woredas in 2 regions and held an extensive range of interviews with stakeholders at all levels using a range of tools and checklists including a household survey which reached 300 households. With UNICEF working in 78 Woredas in all regions, the 10 woredas visited represent a snapshot but a chance nevertheless to appreciate the scale of the WASH challenge and the role played by the UNICEF team in supporting government in its pursuit of universal access. In this, the EU-UNICEF project is making an important contribution although limited, given the magnitude of the demand. There are suggestions that quality Woreda Support Groups and Community Facilitation Teams might be used and communities be encouraged to make cash and kind contributions but the project is generally considered to be in tune with national policy and programmes. UNICEF’s comparative advantage is in bringing a unique blend of experience, innovation and willingness to take risks. As one observer suggested, “UNICEF provide an extra purse and a safe pair of hands.”

In terms of effectiveness, the systems are in place to deliver the stated outputs with only school WASH lagging behind but catching up. Partnering with PLAN and applying community led total sanitation at such scale coupled with support to health extension workers has made a considerable impact on sanitation access. Other strategic partnerships with SNV and Italian Cooperation have boosted capacity building reach and intensity while working through ORDA in Amhara is rapidly boosting coverage although at the expense of bypassing government. The EU-UNICEF approach is considered to be cost effective at an average per capita rate of $20 with what appears to be a good spread of investment (mitigating the risks) among region, zone and woreda as well as other partners (detailed above). There are still gaps in the use
of the private sector which are under review along with issues of shifting from external to local procurement for certain items.

The WASH report card and inventory will ultimately provide all woredas with a useful tool to fully assess progress and measure how far inputs are being translated into outputs and to a lesser extent, outcomes. To appreciate impact on health, well-being and poverty will require dedicated research beyond the timeframe of this project. However, there is still considerable support for the use of proxy behavior indicators which if applied to this project would suggest that it is on track to make significant impact on a multiple range of key welfare indicators and MDGs.

Sustainability remains a major challenge from a number of perspectives. Woreda WASH teams require regular quality support and UNICEF must decide how best to facilitate this process whether through NGOs or Woreda Support Groups. There are also doubts about the ongoing capacity of WASH committees to manage schemes particularly more complex distribution networks and again decisions need to be made about the possible use of Community Facilitation Teams. Supply chains have yet to be established for essential pump spares and pump maintenance relies on the commitment of a number of individuals having a modicum of training expecting limited rewards. There are also considerable environmental challenges particularly where hand-dug wells are drying up during the dry season and deeper aquifers are subjected to draw-down from the increasing number of irrigation pumps. Behaviour change particularly around latrine use and hand washing is also recognized as an ongoing challenge requiring positive reinforcement and the development of sustainable sanitation marketing strategies. Creating a hand washing culture at the critical times remains work in progress.

Visibility has remained a key theme in the project throughout the three years with press releases, stickers and posters with combined logos and organized press visits to WASH scheme inaugurations. Project pumps have the combined EU-UNICEF sticker although there were no visible roadside hoardings as observed for other EU supported initiatives. In terms of complementing other development initiatives, there was no evidence of formal inter-project links. However, the important WASH inspired support being channeled to the Health Extension Workers and their supervisors plus the combined efforts to improve education particularly for girls is known to create multiple synergies.

UNICEF has been very active and open in critically reviewing the project on an annual basis and the mid-term evaluation follows closely behind the internal mid-term review. To this effect, there is no shortage of recommendations as to how to strengthen and improve the project. The task of the evaluation team was therefore largely focused on suggesting priorities. At the end of the day, we had to ask ourselves ‘what does UNICEF bring to the WASH table other than more money and a dedicated, well-qualified, enthusiastic team of facilitators and supervisors? For the answer we turn to an observation by the WES chief at a staff retreat:”A key area of UNICEF’s added value is the ability to take risks which government cannot afford to take and through these risks learn lessons which can be taken to scale”. In this context, he was talking about three key areas: self supply; community-led total sanitation (CLTS) and the WASH Inventory, all of which are now being scaled up and are well on the way to be adopted as key ingredients of national policy.

UNICEF is in a constant dilemma about branding its own approaches and being able to sell a product to its supporters while actually mainstreaming activities in sustainable and workable local systems. UNICEF recommends the sector wide approach but then continues to operate outside it. Perhaps the time is now right for UNICEF to fully align with the National WASH programme blending best practices to multiply the multiples and ensure the delivery of relevant, cost-effective, efficient and sustainable services for the whole of Ethiopia.
SECTION 2. KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section relates the main findings of the MTE to the short and longer term recommendations

2.1.1 Key Findings from the MTE and resulting recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key MTE Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite the funding delays, hold ups in procurement, inexperienced staff, low absorption of woredas and the scale of the WASH challenge project achievements have been substantial.</td>
<td>- Establish a minimum WASH package (not less than $50,000 per woreda)</td>
<td>- UNICEF should align more closely with the national WASH programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Banks need to be instructed/encouraged to speed the flow of funds through the system</td>
<td>- Adopt the revised National WASH Programme Implementation Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The liquidation period needs some flexibility in line with MTR suggestion of the extension to 9 months.</td>
<td>- Work through a quality (certified and regulated) woreda support group with greater mutual accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- UNICEF should align more closely with the national WASH programme.</td>
<td>- simplify financial reporting requirements and extend the liquidation period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adopt the revised National WASH Programme Implementation Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Work through a quality (certified and regulated) woreda support group with greater mutual accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- simplify financial reporting requirements and extend the liquidation period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful women’s empowerment, rehabilitation, self-supply, CLTS but...schools WASH is slow?</td>
<td>- Maximise women’s role in monitoring and evaluation of all WASH facilities as they are the primary users of water points and can provide daily checks on functionality.</td>
<td>In the case of sanitation, place a stronger focus on educating men about the negative health impact on women unable to complete ablutions during daylight hours, emphasising that the availability of a safe, private, convenient and hygienic latrine is a high priority for women on many levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Carry out institutional WASH inventories and expand WASH in schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partner with NGOs and private sector to expand school WASH capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Complete WASH in schools guidelines and manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful capacity building (technical training), new partners, inventory BUT private sector development is slow.</td>
<td>- Convergent planning and implementation for a more integrated, comprehensive WASH package must be strengthened to build the potential school/community synergies</td>
<td>Agree and set woreda target service levels in each of the EU-UNICEF operational woredas including the preparation of detailed plans for each woreda identifying all work required towards achieving the woreda targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- UNICEF should consider expanding their work through partners acting as woreda support groups and community facilitation teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs are generally on track but funding streams slow. The multiple partnerships mean a diversity of approaches and the project is considered cost-effective at $20 per head. The innovative CDF has proved a successful conduit for funds and a means to ensure sustainable community WASH management</td>
<td>- For each technology options identified it is good to estimate per capita investment cost and operation and maintenance (O &amp; M) cost; thus determining the affordability level of the community particularly for covering cost of O &amp; M</td>
<td>- UNICEF should adopt the principle of plausible inference and push to achieve &gt;80% access and use of latrines, soap when handwashing and compliance with the safe water chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- UNICEF need to expand support and supervision options through WSGs, (NGOs), CFCs (CBOs)</td>
<td>- Channel funds through credit institutions for community scheme development (in line with the modified RWSEP Community Development Fund model_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foster enabling environment for the private sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The innovative inventory is an important tracking</td>
<td>Take the WASH inventory and report cards to scale in all EU-UNICEF</td>
<td>Continue to support the rolling out of the WASH inventory and the WASH report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key MTE Findings</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>device and is recognised a useful resource across the board by key stakeholders interviewed</strong></td>
<td>supported woredas</td>
<td>card providing close supportive supervision to ensure high standards and good credibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Sustainability – WASH teams, WASH Coms, the case for WSGs & CFTS, Spare part supply chains, environmental challenges – drying wells and behavior change.** | - It is important that communities choose the technology that will give them the highest service level they want, afford, and can maintain.  
- Continue to focus on sustainable shallow well drilling technologies;  
- Continue to focus on sustainable, cost-effective, high impact approaches pushing for convergent rather than scattered WASH  
- Strengthen ‘self-supply’ through mapping appropriate areas  
- Place stronger emphasis on empowering communities to more fully own their water supply, their sanitation improvements and their behaviour change | - Ensure support to woredas addresses priority problems in each woreda based on the woreda’s strategic plan  
- In all training, place a stronger focus on sustainability, water safety and equitable access/use  
- Build the capacity of woreda staff to **supervise borehole drilling** e.g. in the case of WB and other WASH programs supervision is done by the region or a designated external body  
- UNICEF should ensure that the process of evaluating impact (outcomes) is integrated into the regional workplans and includes members of government and other key sector stakeholders |
| **Although capacity building is moving in the right direction there needs to be a stronger focus on inter-sectoral, multi-stakeholder planning and implementation** | - Place particular emphasis on improved, harmonised, integrated planning at Woreda level:  
- Ensure integration of cross-sectoral activities at all periods of the project cycle at woreda and community level;  
- Collaborate with NGOs with practical experience operating in the target woredas; and  
- Ensure greater integration of all WASH actors at woreda level by strengthening woreda WASH teams’ capacity to plan and implement together within a common framework (e.g. WASH Manual). | - Conform with the **national WASH implementation** procedures:  
- Engage in regional planning  
- Identify, train and support woreda support groups and community facilitation teams  
- train WASH staff on the WASH manuals  
- apply community contributions  
- provide supportive supervision |
| **The added value – dedicated, well-qualified team willing to take risks, learn lessons and take to scale e.g. self supply, CLTS and the WASH inventory** | - Apply a modified version of community led total sanitation to include a stronger focus on wider more **sustained behavior change** (focus hand washing) in line with the Task Force recommendations. | - The Community led Total Behaviour Change for Improved sanitation and hygiene which combines existing strategies within a more holistic approach needs to be scaled up with appropriate supportive supervision |
| **The time is ripe for full alignment with the WASH programme – National Programme Implementation manual** | - There was consensus among key stakeholders interviewed that with such strong national leadership and genuine donor alignment behind the development of a national WASH programme, it is essential that the EU-UNICEF project continues:  
- to work in line with UAP, PASDEP, HEP, HSDP  
- to build consensus on the national WASH manual  
- to align with WASH programme community contribution (5% cash and 5% | - In line with government strategy, UNICEF staff should be assessed on key performance indicators which actually encourage delegation of activities e.g. sustainable/localised systems for CLTS training  
- Create a smaller UNICEF team making better use of funds |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key MTE Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Short Term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Long Term</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Minimal attention to environmental issues and long term sustainability of water sources and latrines | UNICEF should work closely with Catholic Relief Services to promote Arborloos in the community and fossa alterna/skyloo ecological latrines in schools and other institutions | The EU-UNICEF project could do more to encourage regional/woreda/community efforts (including partnering with environmental focus programmes and projects) to assure sustainability of the water sources by:  
  • improving catchment protection around springs;  
  • ensuring latrines are not located near shallow wells;  
  • making efforts to improve recharge of the groundwater reserve; and by,  
  • supporting watershed management activities.  
  • Consider water for production opportunities  
The EU-UNICEF project might consider a stronger focus on ecological sanitation particularly to link with the green schools initiative. Partnership with Catholic Relief Services on the promotion of ‘arborloos’ might be considered. |
SECTION 3. INTRODUCTION

3.1 BACKGROUND TO THE PROJECT

3.1.1 Funding Agreement
In July 2006, UNICEF and the Delegation of the European Commission to Ethiopia signed a contribution agreement with the title “Accelerating Progress towards the MDGs on Water and Sanitation in Ethiopia”, with a maximum budget totalling Euro 10,797,584. This contribution is matched by an equal financial undertaking by UNICEF, the whole budget therefore amounts to Euro 21,595,169. The project period started on 25 August 2006 and will continue until 24 August 2011. It is basically aligned with UNICEF/Government of Ethiopia’s current five year action plan.

3.1.2 Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE)
In accordance with the project proposal and logical framework, a Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) has been arranged to assess what the project has achieved against agreed outputs and to guide the remainder of the project in terms of its focus, direction and staffing within the current policy and socio-economic environment. It should be emphasised that this follows the UNICEF Mid-Term Review which has already highlighted the main challenges and proposed strategic changes.

3.1.3 The WASH programme Objectives
The WASH project extends to all regions of the country. It also includes capacity building components, undertaken with the Federal Ministry of Health and Federal Ministry of Water Resources. A total of 1.4 million people in 78 Woredas are targeted for project interventions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No. of Woreda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambella</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benishangul Gumuz</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harari</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dire Dawa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromia</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall objectives centre round poverty reduction and health improvement (with particular reference to vulnerable people living in marginal conditions and People Living with HIV and AIDS). The programme also centres on promoting women’s empowerment and girl child school enrolment.

3.2 MID-TERM EVALUATION OBJECTIVE(S)

The MTE is an independent assessment of the performance of the project to date, based on the project proposal, log frame, activities and budget, and in the current policy and economic environment as this affects the WASH Sector in Ethiopia. The MTE will identify key lessons and propose practical recommendations for follow up actions.
3.2.1 **WASH Outputs**

- New water supplies and rehabilitation of existing supplies
- School WASH
- Environmental sanitation and hygiene promotion
- Capacity building
- Private Sector engagement

3.2.2 **WASH Activities**

There are a multitude of dimensions to the project. There is the conventional provision of a variety of different water supply technologies best suited to local circumstances under local management through WASH Committees. There is support for the much needed repair of broken down schemes. Sanitation and hygiene promotion has been carried out through a mixed range of promotion and communication channels and techniques which include Participatory Hygiene and Sanitation Transformation and Community Led Total Sanitation linking closely with the Health Extension Programme. School WASH combines physical infrastructure with clubs, peer influence and mixed media activities (song, dance, drama and competitions). There is a large capacity building component at all levels and a variety of approaches to engage the private sector through institutional latrine construction, hand-dug wells and drilling.

3.3 **Five Evaluation Criteria**

In line with the project proposal, the UN Evaluation Group ‘evaluation’ criteria and OECD - DAC, the MTE will focus on five evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Each is associated with a number of key evaluation questions that are to be addressed and explored.
SECTION 4. KEY INPUTS AND EMERGING ISSUES

This section reviews the three annual reports submitted to the European Union by UNICEF since the project began as well as the internal Mid-term review completed in 2009. It attempts to catalogue the extensive range of work carried out to date and detail the considerable list of recommendations to avoid ‘reinventing the wheel’ and to build on existing consensus.

4.1 INPUT REVIEW FROM ANNUAL REPORTS

4.1.1 Water Supply

- The UNICEF reports suggest that the sustainability of a community water supply depends on:
  - the sustainability of the resource itself (in Ethiopia the most common source is a shallow aquifer with a water table less than 70 metres deep BUT there is reported competition from irrigation wells),
  - the pumping rate (most wells are low yield to hand pump),
  - the quality of construction (supervision is a major concern),
  - institutional arrangements for operation and maintenance (WASH Com capacity).

This has led UNICEF to focus on drilled shallow wells managed by WASH Committees with trained caretakers and financial contributions from the community for operation, maintenance and repair.

- UNICEF introduced various cost effective approaches such as clustering/grouping of activities. There is reported effective use of UNICEF-donated water drilling equipment with the project able to charge half the market price for well-drilling, scheme rehabilitation and school water supply. However, with the escalating price of steel (and oil impacting on transport costs), the price of hand pumps, pipes, fittings and well-casings has increased and there will be increasing maintenance costs for the rigs.
- Since the second year, there has been a shift in technology emphasis from larger piped water supplies to spot sources with or without minor distribution as they have proved to be more sustainable. This approach includes self-supply and community construction management.
- Water quantity is an increasing concern as hand dug wells dry up with increasing frequency and for longer periods.
- Water quality is a key issue both in terms of turbidity, bacterial and mineral contamination (salinity, iron and fluoride)
- There are concerns over the sustainability of WASH Committees and cost recovery for operation and maintenance (O&M).

4.1.2 School WASH

- A UNICEF school WASH study of more than 2000 schools found that only 22 percent had a protected water supply in the compound and quantity was a problem. 76% of the schools had a latrine with 66% having separate facilities for girls and boys. Maintenance and cleanliness of latrines was noted as a major problem.
- EU-UNICEF supports the construction of WASH facilities and mobilises school health clubs
- It is widely accepted that poor WASH in schools impacts on learning and attendance, particularly for girls during menstruation.
- The annual reports reveal the importance of convergent inter-sectoral planning to avoid the common problem of schools being built where water supply is difficult.
- School WASH has lagged behind other project components but it is important to note that in line with UAP, community supplies take precedence and the construction manual is still pending.
4.1.3 Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion

- Substantial numbers have been persuaded to build latrines and end open defaecation through a combination of advocacy and promotion methods including PHAST but most significantly Community Led Total Sanitation. The move from open defaecation to a basic toilet represents a major change in practice but CLTS post-triggering (sustained behaviour change) is recognised as a key challenge. Ensuring successful post-triggering is recognised as the key challenge in taking CLTS to scale. UNICEF is partnering with PLAN.
- Removing the demonstration units and communal latrines, the application of CLTS plus close working with HEWs has reduced the per capita cost of delivering basic promotional packages but there will be considerable ongoing costs to ensure sustainable infrastructure and enduring behaviour change.
- Changing hand washing behaviour is recognised as a major challenge and compliance with the accepted protocol is low according to recent inventory figures. Hand-washing with soap or ash is a key result (performance measure) for the Health Extension Programme’s model household strategy and a national hand washing communication strategy is currently being developed to complement the ‘one-off’ national hand washing days (with celebrity promoters).
- Hand washing is promoted in school WASH but the extent of the multiplier effect is unknown.

4.1.4 Capacity Building

- UNICEF has supported a substantial raft of technical training (e.g. 1074 CLTS trainees in year 3 with 97% of planned training completed) mainly geared to project implementation (training of WASHCOs, Health Extension Workers, Environmental Health Workers, School Directors and Teachers); this will now be complemented by the WASH Capacity Development Fund.
- A key element of the capacity building programme has been the formation and training of localised water and sanitation committees to take management and maintenance responsibilities for schemes (and support wider hygiene and sanitation promotion). The committees have some degree of autonomy in managing (and even extending) schemes but they do not have legal status and their activities are largely unregulated. There are real concerns about longer-term sustainability.
- The high turnover of staff has necessitated repeat training and orientation on different techniques including CLTS.
- In response to increasing capacity constraints (multiple vacancies), UNICEF partnering with Cooperazione Italiana to provide complementary capacity building in Oromia, SNNPR, Gambella and Benishangul Gumuz.
- UNICEF is actively partnering with civil society. ORDA has provided substantial WASH inputs in Amhara. The Dutch organisation SNV has provided important support for capacity building with specific respect to planning at woreda level. This has reportedly led increasingly to a more participatory and decentralized annual planning process strengthened through a regular joint supervision and programme review meetings. However there is also frequent reference to the following:
  - limited absorption capacity at woreda level,
  - limited capacity of decentralized government to plan, implement and manage activities;
  - delays in channelling funds and liquidation documents through Regional BoFED
  - weaknesses in monitoring results;
  - the delayed ordering of project supplies and increases in the unit costs of some items;
  - the impact of the prevailing emergency situation.

Capacity Building Equipment
The provision of equipment is thought to increase administrative and operational capacity. Essential equipment has included vehicles, motor cycles, computers and office furniture. A key priority identified is
the need for **preventive maintenance and repair** to which should be added safe and sustainable usage. In the case of cars and motor cycles this might also include extensive **training in defensive driving**. In a study by Persson, pedestrians and passengers of commercial vehicles were found to be the most vulnerable to traffic accidents in Ethiopia with 180 deaths for every 10,000 vehicles in traffic-related accidents. That compares to the United States where about 21 people die in traffic related accidents for every 100,000 vehicles. 1:56 versus 1:4762.

**Procurement**

In the light of difficulties with overseas procurement, UNICEF is exploring local supply options.

**4.1.5 Private Sector**

- The private sector engages with drilling, hand dug well construction and institutional latrines. Three constraints are noted: the incremental nature of service improvement (particularly sanitation); the dominant role of the public sector; and, access to credit.
- UNICEF’s long experience and presence on the ground has put it in a much better position to negotiate prices/rates with partners (this is part of the comparative advantage).
- UNICEF is currently trying to encourage the Government and Enterprise Rig ‘owners’ to prepare more realistic business plans within a market based pricing structure. Work is also in progress with a number of public and private operators to improve the standard of drilling rigs and compressors.

**4.1.6 General**

**Poverty**

UNICEF observes the challenge in raising a monthly contribution for O and M in the context of Ethiopia’s seasonal, rural cash economy and the impact on household assets caused by drought or flood related crop failure and associated price rises. It is difficult to quantify the impact and this might require a dedicated study.

**Finance**

- Budget lines and activities are considered to be over-detailed reducing flexibility
- Relatively low levels of expenditure in some quarters are due to a combination of factors: delay in finalising procurement; the technology shift; low cost of drilling with UNICEF supplied rigs; low capacity of staff to absorb funding streams.
- The establishment of a new funding mechanism which routes funds through Regional Bureau of Finance and Economic Development (BoFEDs), Channel 1B has not improved the speed of expenditure flows.
- There is considerable price volatility – e.g. diesel prices (8.50 to 17 Birr + per litre)
- Additional funding streams hoped for but not coming through.

**Coordination**

There is a high level of coordination between UNICEF, federal and regional government and NGO partners in the context of planning, supervision and monitoring. The woredas are the key partners for detailed work planning and implementation although regions still retain control of drilling and pump installation.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

Given the size of Ethiopia and the scale of the project the UNICEF team is dependent upon accurate and reliable reporting from government backed up by their own field visits for verification. UNICEF has introduced an innovative inventory system which is cheap and simple to use and has been successfully applied on a pilot basis. It captures a full range of key WASH data (including schools). It employs

---

1 Persson (2007) *Road traffic accidents in Ethiopia: magnitude, causes and possible interventions*
GPS/GIS to record physical location with information on functionality and safe yield, sanitary surveillance scores and an indication of chemical water safety. It is designed to provide accurate and timely information for planning and prioritising resources. Primary data is provided by WASH committees and HEWs. It is now being finalised for national up-scaling.

### 4.1.7 Recommendations from Annual Reports

**Water Supply**
- Develop self-supply options ladder (focus on safety and role of private sector)
- Support the development a more rational, informed and regulated (more market oriented) approach to all ground water abstraction, and demand management (GoE Water Resources Development Plan).
- Supply probes for water testing in the rift valley

**Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion**
- Invest more in follow up support to CLTS (sustainability) and define (and use) measurable standards for basic and improved toilets (included in the inventory)
- Include hand washing as an indicator when verifying the status of ODF communities

**Capacity Building**
- Institutionalise preventive maintenance and repair (and training in defensive driving).
- Provide HEWs with bicycles
- Ensure that the quality of facilitation is maintained as it is scaled up, and that the Health Extension Programme has the capacity and incentives to provide the follow-up required
- Repeat training of Government staff in financial processes
- Place more focus on high quality training, linked to strengthening of training institutions (e.g. Regional Training Centres) with additional resources for Capacity Building Project
- Strengthen key WASH institutions (Woreda WASH Team and WASHCOs, Health Extension Programme, School Health Club)and implement the recently initiated complementary capacity building process

**Finance**
- Review and simplify budget lines in view of the projects changing context and needs.
- Time Fund transfer to ensure arrival at beginning of implementation ‘season’ after the rains
- Deploy UN Volunteers to strengthen financial capacity;
- Focus more on results/outcomes, use of facilities, sustainability, cost effectiveness and community management.
- Roll out the inventory system.
- Develop a CLTS manual (with wider behaviour change promotion) and ODF verification process

**Private Sector**
- Create an enabling environment for the private sector
  - Introduce supply chains for water supply items such as handpump bearings, washers, valve components and casing pipe.
  - Work with government and encourage local contracting of service delivery
  - Encourage government to reserve UNICEF supplied drilling rigs for emergency water supply, opening up opportunities for private contractors
  - Continue to advocate for the legalization of water and sanitation committees
  - Work with the World Bank to develop supply chains for water supply spares
  - Facilitate the establishment of sanitation ‘suppliers’ that can respond to an emerging market (the same applies in the context of self supply).
4.2 UNICEF – GOE MID-TERM REVIEW

The MTE team was fortunate to follow on the UNICEF Mid-Term Review which had already made a critical and well-informed review of the wider programme noting some of the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. In addition, it provided an indication of the future programme direction.

4.2.1 Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities and Threats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Skilled UNICEF WASH teams</td>
<td>• Poor integration of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WASH report cards (now linked to inventory)</td>
<td>• Scale of demand versus shortage of funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Willingness and flexibility to change/adopt strategy e.g. Youth Based media Strategy</td>
<td>• Insufficient time for liquidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Innovations – Inventory, ‘green schools’</td>
<td>• Insufficient funding density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emphasis on: low cost, sustainable, scalable solutions – e.g. CLTS, Self-Supply, Rehabilitation, focus hand washing with soap at critical times</td>
<td>• Inadequate, inappropriate indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Point sources more cost-effective</td>
<td>• UAP focus domestic coverage (sustainable use and institutional WASH being left behind)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNICEF rigs reduce costs but undermine the private sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>THREATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Align with National WASH programme (community contributions 5%+5%)</td>
<td>• Escalating cost of materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maximise potential for regional procurement</td>
<td>• Government’s willingness to adjust indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expanded fund-raising</td>
<td>• UNICEF willing and able to relax CAG rules to allow liquidation within nine, rather than six months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Special responsibility to scale up institutional WASH</td>
<td>• UNICEF willing to prioritise local capacity assessments to enable local (Regional) procurement in all Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partnerships with other donors..increased alignment</td>
<td>• Government willing to outsource major amounts of programming and funds to competent third parties including NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Thematic partnerships</td>
<td>• Government agree to the reduce activities in Dire Dawa &amp; Harar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Recommendations from the MTR and Annual Reports

- Establish a minimum WASH package (not less than $50,000 per woreda)
- Rationalise components (Dira Dawa and Harar)
- Apply WASH inventory and report cards to report results in all UNICEF WASH and UNICEF Education supported Woredas (focus institutional WASH)
- Increase liquidation period from 6 to 9 months
- Conduct procurement assessments (draw on existing studies)
- Align with WASH programme community contribution (5% cash and 5% in kind)
- Place a stronger focus on ‘self-supply’
• **Focus** affordable and appropriate technologies
• **Use** modified CLTS to focus on achieving ODF and improved hygiene
• **Increase** focus on hand washing
• **Carry out** institutional WASH inventories and **expand** WASH in schools
• **Partner** with NGOs and private sector to expand school WASH capacity
• **Roll out** capacity building in all UNICEF supported Woredas
• **Make** Woreda WASH inventory and Report Card; the establishment of a Woreda WASH Team; and implementation of a convergent Woreda WASH plan (informed by the WASH inventory and Report Card) key indicators of successful capacity building.
SECTION 5. RELEVANCE

5.1 SECTOR CONTRIBUTION – POLICY, PROGRAMMES
There is unanimous acknowledgement from Health Extension Workers at the Kebele, through woreda, zonal, regional and national WASH teams to development partners that the EU-UNICEF provides an important and significant contribution to the sector which goes beyond the important funding envelope.

5.1.1 UAP/MDGs/PASDEP/HEP
The UNICEF/EU project is widely considered by key informants to be contributing to the acceleration of progress towards the national target of Universal Access and the attainment of Millennium Development Goals. It is also thought to be closely aligned with UAP, PASDEP, HSDP, HEP and National School WASH. The UAP and PASDEP target is ambitious with an aim to provide clean water to 34.5 million people. UAP requires an average annual rural water supply coverage growth rate above 9% to meet UAP target with a financial requirement of USD 170 million a year. According to the MoWR estimate, the achieved coverage increase per year is about 6%. Thus to reach the UAP goal by 2012, coverage will need to increase by <11% each year. This is nearly a two-fold increase to the current performance.

It must be emphasised that the scale of the investment required to achieve universal access, the escalating costs and the increasing margin of difficulty in finding affordable, clean and plentiful water mean that the scale of EU-UNICEF support has to continue and expand if significant inroads are to be made into the national target.

In the Health Extension Programme (HEP), the Health Extension Workers (HEWs) are tasked to do all 16 packages noting that 7 relate to environmental health. The malaria and nutrition packages come with a budget for implementation (bed nets and supplementary feeding) thus getting more attention than hygiene and sanitation in many cases. In case of HEP, hygiene and sanitation has no special budget allocation with the other WASH programs except in EU-UNICEF support which gives to those EU-UNICEF Woredas through the Woreda health office for the implementation of CLTS. In Amhara region HEWs in WB-WSP Woredas are assisted and capacitated to do their task in hygiene and sanitation. Introduction of CLTS approach by the EU-UNICEF project and the subsequent trainings provided at different levels have played a pivotal role in implementation of the health packages, in general, and improving sanitation coverage at woreda levels, in particular.

5.2 COMPLEMENTING ROLES AND ACTIONS OF OTHER ACTORS

5.2.1 EU-UNICEF harmonisation and alignment challenges
Key issues raised by development partners emphasise UNICEF’s commitment to alignment with the national WASH programme with anticipation that UNICEF might continue to close the gap in the following areas:

5.2.2 Procurement
Expand local procurement particularly of materials which are/can be manufactured locally. Procurement of drilling contractors to do borehole drilling work, installation of casings and pumps is managed freely by the Regional bureaus while procurement of casings and pumps is done internationally by UNICEF. There is acknowledgement that although the UNICEF external procurement rules ensure quality, there is also an unacceptable time-lag in supply and a lack of flexibility. Amongst donor financed WASH program however it is UNICEF program alone that allows public enterprises, NGOs and private
contractors to participate equally in the bidding process. Particularly in SNNPR region, church based organizations and other NGOs are awarded contracts to drill UNICEF financed wells and the regional water resource development bureau also possesses rig donated by UNICEF which is mainly used to drill UNICEF financed wells. This has contributed to keeping the cost of drilling down.

- On the other hand the procurement procedure particularly for IDA/DFID and ABD financed programs is competitive bidding and restricts government owned enterprises and also non-profit organizations from participating in the bidding process.

### 5.2.3 Community Contribution

- **5 - 10% community contribution to the cost of the water scheme in cash/kind to demonstrate commitment, build ownership and prepare for operation and maintenance costs.** Evidence was found of WASH committees collecting a monthly fee, paying a caretaker and depositing money in the bank.

Community contribution for capital cost sharing is not as such a spelled out requirement for participating in EU-UNICEF program unlike ADB or WB/DFID WASH program where communities’ contribution is set as one criterion for community selection. However, as a result of the other WASH programs implementation procedure the Woreda Water Resource offices in most of the visited woredas seemed to have set this as a rule of the game for any water project. Communities have contributed both in cash and in kind particularly in fencing and supplying local construction materials. Most of the cash contribution in case of EU-UNICEF program however goes not necessarily for capital investment per se but for scheme management cost later during scheme operation.

### 5.2.4 Woreda Support Groups

- **The employment of Woreda Support Groups at woreda level and Community Facilitation Teams at Kebele taking advantage (where appropriate) of local NGOs, CBOs, consultants and of course the zone.** The Rural WASH program is financed by ADB, DFID, WB, and UNICEF (with its own, EU, Dutch and Natcom resources). UNICEF is the exception in not funding Woreda Support Groups (WSGs) or the Community Facilitation Teams (CFTs). The former assist woredas in the preparation of the 5 year strategic plans, the design of WASH facilities and capacity building. The latter (CFT teams of 3) are trained and deployed from the Woreda to mobilize the community, promote hygiene and sanitation also assists in the construction of water supply schemes. There is clearly no way that the UNICEF WASH team can provide regular Woreda or Kebele support and with new staff in position (particularly those from the technical vocational training colleges) the woredas need regular support and follow-up.

### 5.2.5 Regional Planning

- **Become part of the regional planning process not just focussed on UNICEF supported woredas in line with the policy of ‘one policy, one plan, one budget, one implementation manual and one monitoring and evaluation system.** The woredas visited all have a 5 year strategic plan outlining how the UAP will be achieved. It is understandably ambitious but then broken down into more pragmatic annual plans based on available resources. For the UNICEF program the regions prepare their five year plan at the start of the implementation period. The regions along with UNICEF invite all participating Woredas to come together at regional level for a planning session whereby the 5 years regional plan is prepared listing all scheme and ESHE activities. In case of other WASH programs however tentative 5 year plans are prepared at regional level but this gets updated regularly throughout the implementation period as more information is obtained from the Woreda. In fact, the Woredas do the planning intensively with the help of WSGs while the region does the consolidation of the plan.
5.2.6 Institutional WASH
- Complete school WASH manuals including design options. All woredas visited have an active school WASH programme with good inter-sectoral collaboration between education, health and water desks. Latrines are being constructed (using a range of design options) and HEWs link with school directors trained in CLTS approaches to form sanitation clubs and promote improved hygiene in the schools. UNICEF amongst the other WASH actors is the first and the leading donor in supporting institutional WASH. Actual allocation of budget to financing institutional WASH is a recent phenomenon for the other actors.

5.2.7 Self-Supply
- Self-Supply is primarily being promoted in Oromia region (not visited). UNICEF is actively supporting self-supply through mapping those areas (and families) most suited and able to benefit from the approach. The focus is on households and a collection of households coming together to develop their own hand-dug well. There are issues in supervising construction, ensuring water quality and ensuring wells do not dry up in the dry season.

5.2.8 Community Managed Development Fund
- It should be noted that a parallel option the Community Managed Development Fund (CDF) is being reviewed as a national model after its successful piloting by Finnida through the RWSEP programme in Amhara region. It has already been adapted as part of the World Bank sponsored programme in recognition that where communities manage the funds in construction of their own facilities there is a strong commitment to effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Results show that there are considerable cost and time savings.

5.3 UNICEF ADDED VALUE/COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE

5.3.1 A safe pair of hands
Those interviewed, particularly the sector offices, suggest that UNICEF is often selected as a funding conduit because it has a long-standing relationship, tried and tested methodologies, a reliable monitoring and accounting procedure and a reputation for getting the job done – putting the needs of women and children above anything else – a safe pair of hands.

5.3.2 A reliable funding stream
Unequivocally, the first stated EU-UNICEF advantage is the (relatively) flexible and in the case of emergencies the ability to provide immediate funding. UNICEF and ADB have been channelling funds in the past through Regional Bureau of Finance and Economic Development (BoFEDs, Channel 1B) while WB/DFID until recently was channelling through MoWR (Channel 2). It was because of the decentralization process and general directions that the Government of Ethiopia is taking that WB/DFID have also started to channel funds through Channel 1B. One of the apparent advantages of Channel 1B is supposedly in bringing together all WASH sectors: water, health and education on an equal footing. This is also the direction proposed to hasten the harmonization process whereby the Woreda in consultation with the community decides its priority and where to invest.

5.3.3 The UNICEF Family – a culture of commitment
The UNICEF team was widely praised for being dedicated, committed and inspired (enthusiastic). Part of UNICEF’s added value is the presence on the ground with (as a minimum) one dedicated water supply and one dedicated hygiene and sanitation officer in all regions. They are supported by other sectors as well as the field monitors and the CAG (Cash Advance to Government) Consultants. While the
funds are clearly important, it is inevitably the quality and commitment of the UNICEF staff which distinguishes the EU-UNICEF approach from any other and determines the level and extent of project impact. In other words, there is a basic minimum which will be achieved by the funds on their own but an exponential level of gain directly proportional to the efforts, commitment, creativity and dedication of the UNICEF team. If they are networking building local skills and capacities and extending reach then they can ‘multiply the multiples well-illustrated with the success in Tenta woreda in supporting environmental health promotion through the Environmental Health Workers and the HEWs.

5.3.4 Related UNICEF/UN personnel inputs

- There are two dedicated WASH consultants in the 8 woredas supported by Netherlands’ funding in the 4 bigger regions with a ‘spin-off’ (primarily learning what can be achieved by more funding and closer supervision!) to other UNICEF activities.
- One dedicated WASH UN Volunteer (part of the multi-sectoral support team) in areas/zones difficult to reach and prone to emergency (AWD/drought/famine)
- Additional multi-sectoral UNICEF officers in the region
- Field monitors
- CAG (Cash Advance to Government) consultants

5.3.5 Dedicated Government WASH staff,

- WASH teams and supporting NGOs private sector
- Government assigned UNICEF focal persons at regional level,
- Regional and woreda WASH teams
- Designated hygiene and sanitation promoters at woreda level.
- UNVs in Regional BoFED improving financial flows and tracking
- Zonal WASH focal person
- Kebele: the all important Health Extension Workers and WASHComs
- Para-statal - Enterprise (drilling)

- NGO partners – SNV(capacity building and planning), ORDA (water supply), NCA(drilling)
- WaterAid – (WASH), PLAN (CLTS), WSP/HIP (CLTBC for IHS), WHO and PSI (AWD)
- Private sector drillers and local artisans with skills in hand dug wells and spring capping

5.4 ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT PLANS WITH GOVERNMENT

5.4.1 5 Year Strategic planning
As noted briefly above, in most Woredas, a strategic plan has been prepared to achieve universal access for water by the year 2012. The plan is ambitious and beyond what is actually financed by the WASH program. Even for those Woredas that somehow benefit from more than one bilateral donor, the budget requirement to achieve universal access remains excessive. But a Woreda supported by EU-UNICEF (and some other donors) in addition to its 5 year strategic plan must prepare a separate 5 year plan for WASH based on the actual allocated budget. In most Woredas, WASH activities undertaken in the Woreda by the WASH program of EU-UNICEF, IDA, DFID, Finland Government and ADB or other NGO assisted programs are from amongst those activities already listed and prioritised in the original 5 years strategic plan. This appears to be unnecessary duplication.

5.4.2 National WASH programme
The national WASH program is designed to consolidate plans of three ministries/sectors: namely water, health and education. All the major investors (government, donor, NGOs and community) are supposed to have one plan, one implementation procedure and one monitoring and evaluation system. At present, the
Rural WASH program, there are 446 Woredas participating in the donor assisted program financed by ADB, DFID, IDA, Finland Government and UNICEF. The EU-UNICEF programme is part of the national WASH programme financing 78 of these Woredas.

Amongst the entire donor assisted program, it is UNICEF program that is working very much in compliance with the government assisted programs with advantages and drawbacks; the advantage mainly being in the freedom that the regions have in implementation but this also has its own drawbacks of not knowing what to do particularly at Woreda level. While ADB and IDA/DFID financed WASH programs have manuals that clearly stipulate all procedures including implementation, financial management and procurement. The EU-UNICEF project would benefit from applying the National WASH procedures and use of the Programme Implementation Manual.

In case of ADB and IDA/DFID financed WASH programs, regional bureaus cannot be implementers as well as regulators of the program. Such a rule might also be applied in the case of UNICEF supplied rigs to ensure realistic and transparent costing with a more independent system of accountability. For example, in SNNPR, the region still possesses a rig donated by UNICEF which is primarily used to drill UNICEF financed wells. This area requires further review.
## SECTION 6. EFFECTIVENESS - DELIVERY OF OUTPUTS

### 6.1 LOG FRAME ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall objectives</strong></td>
<td>• Promote sustainable development towards achieving specific MDGs and WSDP targets in Ethiopia.</td>
<td>• 4% contributed to MDGs targets of Ethiopia for water and sanitation by end of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promote sustainable access to safe water supply, sanitation and hygiene</td>
<td>• 90% of installed water supplies and constructed latrines are in good working order and in use 5 years after the project completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve health situation and decrease rate of mortality for children and HIV-affected population</td>
<td>• Mortality statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contribute to the empowerment of women by strengthening the role of women in the society as active participants and managers of water facilities and water management committees.</td>
<td>• Total and average number of women active in community WASH committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase enrolment rate in schools and reduce gender disparities in schools</td>
<td>• School enrolment &amp; retention rate increased at the end of the project up to 10% in the schools targeted by the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Specific Objective

- **Sustainable improvement in health and well-being of 1.4 million target population**
  - Sustainable access to safe drinking water closer to their homes
  - Use of basic sanitation facilities
  - Observance of improved hygiene standards.

- Proportion of non-operational schemes under 10% by the end of the project
- Time spent and distance travelled to fetch water reduced by the end of the project by 2 hours for the target population from the existing 2-4 hours per day per household
- Incidence of diarrhoea, and prevalence of trachoma and helminths reduced by 40% in the project areas by the end of the project
- There is anecdotal evidence emerging from household surveys that health and well-being is improving but this will require more systematic survey and analysis
- The inventory will provide a regular update but in areas supplied by deep wells, functionality represents a daily challenge
- In almost all the Kebeles surveyed over 80% of the households travel less than 30 minutes. It is in one of the Kebeles alone of the 10 surveyed that 15% travel over 1 hour and about 70% over 30 minutes and below 1 hour.
- Model households report significant health improvements and visits to woreda health offices showed a steady decline in WASH related illness.
- Survey result showed over 60% of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>households built latrine for health improvement and incidence of diarrhoea in many Kebeles is less than 12%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Increased access and use of safe water supply for the targeted population of 1.4 million people</td>
<td>• 1.4 million people have gained access to safe and adequate water supply by end of the project</td>
<td>• The UNICEF staff consider the project is on schedule to deliver the target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increased access and use of water supply and basic sanitation facilities provided to schools</td>
<td>• 156 schools have gained access to water supply and basic sanitation by end of the project</td>
<td>• Schools have been lagging behind as not as high a priority within UAP but they remain a key UNICEF priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1.4 million people in the project areas have access and are practicing basic sanitation and hygiene behaviour</td>
<td>• 80% of the targeted people use latrines, 50% of targeted people practice proper hygiene by end of the project</td>
<td>• The inventory will provide information on usage and work is underway to strengthen post-triggering support and prepare an independent system for verifying ODF status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Woreda and Regional teams’ capacities are enhanced in technical and managerial skills to manage WASH projects.</td>
<td>• 78 woreda WASH teams and 9 regional WASH teams have been supported by end of the project</td>
<td>• WASH teams are active in all project woredas receiving at least biannual visits by UNICEF staff and more frequent visits by the zone and the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Private actors are more involved in construction and maintenance activities</td>
<td>• first-level spare parts stores are managed by local private actors at Sani Center level</td>
<td>• A considerable amount of work is still needed to strengthen the role of the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 20 second-level spare parts stores are managed by private actors.</td>
<td>• This is work in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• artisans operate sanplats fabrication units in 156 Sani Centres</td>
<td>• Artisans have received training and are largely only in action for institutional latrine construction and hand dug well construction for communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.2 DELIVERY OF OUTPUTS

#### 6.2.1 Three and Five Year Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>5 Year Target</th>
<th>Total to date</th>
<th>% Achieved against 3 Year Targets</th>
<th>% Achieved against 5 Year Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Water Supply</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>841,700</td>
<td>710,450</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,262,534</td>
<td>1,032,239</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community training and Awareness raising (hygiene promotion)*</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,262,534</td>
<td>1,373,593</td>
<td>109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of IEC promotional materials</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>88,630</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>12,705</td>
<td>5,676</td>
<td>6,344</td>
<td>112%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Water Supply</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>114%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Latrines</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School WASH Clubs</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>106%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of teachers on H&amp;S</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>167%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP within the school compound</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Drilling</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDW Construction</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>141%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot spring Development</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>177%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravity-fed schemes &amp; distribution</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain water harvesting</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drilling of deep wells</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation of WS schemes</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>471%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply and installation of hand pumps</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table prepared by Tamene Gossa - UNICEF

#### 6.2.2 Evidence from the field

The MTE team developed a questionnaire, trained enumerators in a selection of those woredas visited and the questionnaires were administered in 300 households. The survey results showed that 93% of the households interviewed had access to an improved water source which is above the stated level of achievement while access to a latrine was 74% which is slightly less. The survey provides a rough and ready assessment with various levels of potential error from the point of data collection to the point of analysis which would account for the variance of ± 10%. However, given the time and logistical constraints, it provides some degree of corroboration of reported results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>UNICEF Stated Achievement</th>
<th>Field Observation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Water Supply</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>Household survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to latrines*</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>Household survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community training and Awareness raising (hygiene promotion)*</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH Com, Caretaker train</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Water Supply</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Limited observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Latrines</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School WASH Clubs</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Limited observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of teachers on H&amp;S</td>
<td>167%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Limited observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP within the school compound</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.2.3 Increased Water Supply

**Output:** Increased access to, and use of, safe water for target population 1.4 million

**MTE progress:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>5 yr Target</th>
<th>3 yr Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>3yr</th>
<th>5yr</th>
<th>Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Water Supply</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>841,700</td>
<td>710,450</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where EU-UNICEF support is targeted at the ‘easy-to-reach’ woredas or the areas where the hydrogeology permits relatively straightforward hand-dug wells, spring capping or shallow wells progress is reportedly on target and this was reflected in field visits. But where the hydro-geology is more challenging progress is inevitably slow and the attainment of universal accesses more challenging.

In almost all the Kebeles visited by the team during the MTE, the majority of water sources had been developed through UNICEF projects. Almost all users appreciated the cleanliness and safety of their water source. The MTE household survey showed travel distance to a protected source is less than 30 minutes for over 80% of the population and over 70% of the surveyed community use the protected source for drinking and cooking and dish washing purposes. The survey result also shows that over 60% of the communities collect about 40 litres of water per day per household. For about 20%, the amount of water collected from a protected source during the wet season is halved during the dry season as wells dry up and queuing times increase.

### 6.2.4 Increased School WASH Access and Use

**Output:** Increased access to, and use of, safe water and basic sanitation for 156 schools

In the woredas visited to date, where there is a high level of cooperation between the related sectors good progress in the provision of WASH facilities in schools has ensued with the main inhibiting factor being the availability of water. EU-UNICEF funds have been successfully deployed in the extension of several piped water schemes and rain water harvesting tanks have been deployed at some schools although there are sustainability issues particularly where water collected is not exclusively used for the school.
MTE progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>5 yr Target</th>
<th>3 yr Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>3yr</th>
<th>5yr</th>
<th>Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Water Supply</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Latrines</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School WASH Clubs</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of teachers on H&amp;S</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>167%</td>
<td>128%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP within the school compound</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However an imbalance between sanitation and water supply components in school WASH activities was observed in some of the visited Woredas. Many of the latrines constructed at the schools within the EU-UNICEF program do not seem to have hand washing facility nor are they connected to any safe water supply.

Schools represent a key opportunity for UNICEF support and the chance to exploit multiple synergies. Progress has however been slower than expected when school WASH is generally considered an area of comparative advantage.

6.3 ACCESS TO BASIC SANITATION

Output: 1.4 million have access to and are practising basic sanitation and hygiene behaviour

MTE progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>5 yr Target</th>
<th>3 yr Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>3yr</th>
<th>5yr</th>
<th>Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to latrines*</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,262,534</td>
<td>1,032,239</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sanitation access is now outpacing water supply thanks largely to a combination of inputs effectively supported by the EU-UNICEF project. In those woredas visited, the combination of dedicated woreda environmental health staff, the CLTS training and the heroic efforts of the health extension workers and their supervisors has led with the key support of influential leaders to widespread latrine construction and to a lesser extent the adoption of hygiene practices in line with the HEW environmental health packages. Innovative latrine designs witnessed included the use of a small light rigged to facilitate night access, drop-hole covers attached by string to the ceiling and hand washing facilities employing a used biro with cap. The impact in Tenta woreda was dramatic as the HEWs proudly took the team to more than 20 ‘model households’ which had ‘graduated’ through the complete set of 16 preventive health packages. Effective use of latrines still remains a challenge. Focus group discussions held at Woreda level and at community level pointed out that latrine usage lags far behind latrine construction. Except in one Kebele where 100% claimed to use the latrine they built, the survey shows that use of latrine vary from 30 to 90%. Women particularly in Amhara region cannot be seen going to a latrine, a situation made worse where a poorly constructed latrine provides limited privacy.
6.4 **CAPACITY BUILDING**

**Output:** Woreda and regional team’s capacity enhanced in technical and management skills

Capacity building placed in the context of ‘business-process-re-engineering’ is quite challenging as staff transfer is quite frequent and new staff coming in from the Technical and Vocations Training Centres are widely recognised to require considerable support. However, it was noted that the regions still retain considerable levels of responsibility for contract management on behalf of the woredas particularly for drilling. In addition, ORDA has been successfully and extensively contracted to implement schemes in Amhara. SNV have assisted with planning and training.

**MTE Progress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>5 yr Target</th>
<th>3 yr Target</th>
<th>Achieved 3yr</th>
<th>5yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community training and Awareness raising (hygiene promotion)*</td>
<td>People 1,400,000</td>
<td>1,262,534</td>
<td>1,373,593</td>
<td>109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of IEC promotional materials</td>
<td>No. 180,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>8,630</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH Com, Caretaker training</td>
<td>People 12,705</td>
<td>5,676</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>112%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The true measure of this output will not be felt until greater responsibility is delegated to the woreda WASH teams. In other donor assisted WASH programs, the capacity building component is considered as one major component of the WASH program and Woreda staff particularly are better trained, capacitated and guided through the WASH process (in most cases by Woreda Support Groups) using the different manuals prepared for program implementation. This was a commonly represented view of Woreda staff during field visits.

6.5 **ENHANCING THE ROLE OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR**

**Output:** Private actors are more involved in construction and maintenance activities

This output remains very much work in progress as there is clearly effective drilling by the government enterprise as well as some private sector drillers and locally trained artisans are effectively digging wells and capping springs but their engagement in operation and maintenance and the development of supply chains was reported to be more challenging with the woreda office still representing the first port of call for WASH Cos unable to repair breakdown. However, where the technology is relatively simple, as in the case of the Afridev pump, the two trained WASH Co members are expected to manage basic repairs. In the other WASH programs, enhancing the engagement and building the capacity of the private sector is also planned as important parts of the overall capacity building component. In the EU-UNICEF program, this has not been the case although recommendations have been made to create a more conducive environment for the private sector.

6.6 **CONSTRAINTS (BOTTLENECKS)**

6.6.1 **Integration of WASH program at all levels**

Similar to other WASH programs in EU-UNICEF program, the participating Woredas have a budget for both Health and Water sector activities. Actually in EU-UNICEF or other UNICEF financed programs the budget for WASH does not come to the Woreda as a package giving the freedom for the Woreda WASH team to decide where and on what to invest. Where the WASH budget does come as a ‘package’ to the
Woreda, there seems to be better integration of WASH at Woreda level both at the sector offices and the community level. In the community targeted for water scheme construction from the National WASH program, hygiene promotion is supposed to be carried out from the start of program implementation through the Community Facilitation Teams. In the case of EU-UNICEF woredas, it is noted that not all Kebeles receive the full WASH package. The health office may support CLTS where there are no water programs and therefore miss potential momentum and synergy. The Woreda sector WASH offices have no external driving force as in the case of other WASH programs to bring them together to sit and plan. In fact, in the woredas visited that benefit from both WB and EU-UNICEF support, it was reported that the health and water sector come together as a WASH team along with other sector offices to plan, implement and monitor WB financed WASH program. However, for the EU-UNICEF supported program, the sectors reported doing their planning and implementation independently. Moreover it was noticed even in Woredas where both WB and UNICEF finance the WASH program the Woreda still implement the program separately with no integration of even the WASH programs.

### 6.6.2 Earmarked Budget Allocation

EU-UNICEF budget are earmarked at UNICEF level for the activities in fact as per the plan designed at the start of the country program. The amount of budget transferred to the Woreda health sector is huge in comparison to water. In fact no budget as such is allocated to the Education Office but the office role is in selection of schools where latrines or water schemes are to be constructed. In case of water since over 50% of the schemes are boreholes the fund that is transferred to the Woreda water office is usually for monitoring purposes. A large sum of money is transferred for health office however the budget allocated for institutional latrines is usually reported to be inadequate without compromising what has been originally planned.

### 6.7 HOW TO IMPROVE EFFECTIVENESS

#### 6.7.1 Improve clarity of beneficiary numbers

Annual water supply and sanitation coverage statistics in the visited woredas indicate improvement in the level of service since launching of the UNICEF/EU project. However, the basis on which the project determined size of country level beneficiaries indicated in various project documents including the midterm review report of UNICEF is unclear. It was apparent that the size of country level target populations indicated in those documents was not the result of aggregation of beneficiaries in each of the 78 woredas, and this requires assessment of the approach followed by the project.

#### 6.7.2 Benchmarking

The project was not designed based on a benchmark data of service levels in each of the 78 target woredas; hence, the project doesn’t as such aim to raise the service coverage in each target woreda from a benchmark to a certain level. In the absence of specific targets at woreda levels, the project was following a budget based implementation than a target based operation. In this approach, the UNICEF/EU project yearly allocates certain amount of money to each woreda for certain activities as noted above and the woredas utilized the money accordingly. In order to improve its effectiveness, the project should consider changing the approach it is following. This necessitates clearly defining to what extent the project aims improving service levels in each woreda, and allocating the budget based on demands.

#### 6.7.3 Improve Financial Reporting Requirement:

EU’s financial reporting requirement from UNICEF is very detailed consuming time and resources but not apparently adding real value to budget monitoring or financial management. Several officers suggest
that the level of detail is appropriate for accountants it would be better if EU reports could focuses more on the activities with reported figures aggregated for different budget lines.

SECTION 7.  EFFICIENCY

7.1  CASH – VALUE FOR MONEY

7.1.1  $20 per head
The EU-UNICEF project is reported to compare favourably with both the World Bank and ADB supported efforts with an average per-capita rate of $ 20 per head. The problems of slow disbursement as reported in the MTR were not widely noted in the woredas visited because as stated above a considerable amount of the technical works were being handled at the regional level. If the express route to universal access is the national target, there is a strong case for using the most efficient channel. As the importance of drilling and more complex schemes increases with the depletion of cheaper options, the role of region and zone is being re-elevated on the grounds that the logistics are more efficiently managed at the regional level.

7.1.2  Tangible results with small investment
Achieving tangible results with small investment has been one of the salient features of the EU-UNICEF project; for example, the improvement in sanitation cover attained in the visited woredas was facilitated through the financial support the project made for the woredas to conduct trainings to the Kebele Administrators, Volunteer Community Health Promoters, and Health Extension Workers. The challenges however remain regarding its sustainability without continuous support and incentive from UNICEF since achieving the desired behavioural change requires longer intervention.

7.1.3  A possible conflict of interests
EU-UNICEF’s program allowance of NGOs and public enterprises to do drilling as well as the external procurement of pumps and casings has also brought cost of drilling somehow low particularly in comparison to the other WASH programs. In addition in case of SNNPR, the regional Water Resource Development Bureau possesses a rig received from UNICEF mostly for drilling UNICEF financed boreholes whereby UNICEF covers the required operation cost alone.

7.2  HUMAN RESOURCES

7.2.1  Spreading staff thinly
As stated above, the sheer scale of the project puts considerable pressure on UNICEF staff to provide appropriate levels of support and supervision at the different levels of implementation over a wide geographic area. As would be expected, it is reported that in the Dutch supported woredas with their dedicated consultants and increased levels of funding progress is genuinely ‘accelerated’. The demands of equity and the wide spread of relatively small levels of assistance across geographically challenging distances is clearly a challenge to human resource deployment. These factors are important inhibitors of the stated ‘added value’ of UNICEF in providing training, supervision and monitoring. There is a cut-off point where more woredas = less efficient use of resources.

7.2.2  The Special Relationship
A key ingredient of the UNICEF team is their special relationship with key individuals who are willing to go the extra mile. The project was very efficient in terms of motivating woreda staff and the community
to jointly work to improve the sanitation coverage at their woredas. Moreover, the project has made possible changing the community’s attitude towards sanitation and enthusiasm to maintain the improvement through the WASH committees/facilitators at their villages.

7.3 **SUPPLIES**

7.3.1 *Mitigating the risk of contract distortion*

Strong arguments have been made to support increased levels of local procurement but the UNICEF external procurement system reduces the opportunity for local contract distortion. It was difficult for the MTE team to assess how far external procurement procedures were creating local inefficiencies although they are reported in the MTR.

7.4 **TIME-TAKEN**

7.4.1 *“Simply - too slow!”*

Time is definitely not widely considered to be on UNICEF’s side and there is much concern among senior UNICEF WASH management about simply being ‘too slow’ in shifting the funds but then too fast in demanding liquidation within 6 months which with delays at all stages of the transfer – particularly from BoFED to Bank to woreda. The MTR has recommended that the six month allowed for liquidation be extended to 9 months.

7.4.2 *More time or better systems*

Though it has not completely impaired carrying out the project activities in the visited woredas, the time it takes at regional coordination levels to notify the allocated budget to the woredas needs to improve. Improving this gives the woredas ample time to carry out the project’s activities with quality rather than rushing to utilize the money.

7.5 **OPTIMISING THE USE OF LOCAL RESOURCES**

7.5.1 *The dilemma-cheaper rigs inhibiting local private sector*

EU-UNICEF project in as much as possible engaged drilling rigs donated by UNICEF previously to the Water Bureaus and Water Works Enterprises. Cost of drilling particularly where the Bureau’s rigs are deployed seems to be significantly low.

7.5.2 *Self-Supply*

Self-supply is only appropriate in areas where there is a suitable and sustainable water table for hand-dug wells. UNICEF is supporting the mapping of such areas.

7.5.3 *Willingness to pay*

The survey results indicate that 80% of respondents were willing to contribute to the cost of facilities and expressed their desire however to be consulted and be part of the decision making process regarding what and how much they need to contribute.
8.1 Links between health impact and behaviour change

8.1.1 Plausible inference
Assessment of the health impact of sanitation and hygiene is based on plausible inference deriving from wide sectoral acceptance of Esry’s analysis\(^2\) of 144 studies in 1991 and 1996, corroborated by Fewtrell’s expanded study\(^3\) in 2004. Their analysis suggested that when improvements in sanitation and hygiene are widely practiced (Cairncross\(^4\) suggests by more than 80% of the population) then the following health impacts can be achieved: safe excreta disposal can result in an estimated 36% reduction in diarrhoea, while hygiene promotion (adoption of safe practices) can account for an additional 48% reduction in diarrhoea. The randomised control trials of Emerson\(^5\) and Luby\(^6\) also demonstrated the importance of latrine construction and hygiene promotion in controlling fly breeding, reducing diarrhoea by 23% and trachoma by 75% while handwashing with soap was shown to reduce Acute Respiratory Infections by 50%. In other words the evidence is good that safe hygienic practice will translate into considerable health impact if widely practiced.

8.1.2 The Household survey
The household survey was designed to give an indication of project impact as 300 households represent a proportion which is too small for scientific rigor. However, the results generally confirm the established links between: latrine coverage; latrine use; soap use; and the reported occurrence of diarrhoea. This relationship is demonstrated in the graph below. Cairncross confirms that for a behaviour to have a significant impact on diarrhoea, it must be adopted by at least 80% of the community.

\[\text{Hygiene Practice Versus Diarrhea Occurrence}\]

\[\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
& Diarrhea & Use soap for HW & Latrine coverage & Latrine Use \\
\hline
Dembecha & & & & \\
Kedida & & & & \\
Gembi & & & & \\
Dembta & & & & \\
Gola & & & & \\
Limo & & & & \\
Keneke & & & & \\
Angolela & & & & \\
Tera & & & & \\
East & & & & \\
Badwacho & & & & \\
Tenta & & & & \\
Kochere & & & & \\
\hline
\end{array}\]


\(^3\) Fewtrell, L. and Colford, J.M. (2004), Water, sanitation and hygiene: Interventions and diarrhoea, a systematic review and meta-analysis, Discussion paper for the World Bank


8.1.3 The critical threshold
This critical threshold was reported for latrines, latrine use and use of soap for hand washing in East Badawacho which also reported a significantly low level of diarrhoea at 6%. These results are consistent with expectation; sanitation and hygiene access and use above 80% should translate into diarrhoea reduction. In Demba Gofa, Tenta and Kochere appear to be moving in the right direction in terms of coverage but still more focus is needed on use with diarrhoea levels reported to be around 22%. The results also support the established wisdom on the importance of achieving the critical mass of > 80% latrine access with > 80% latrine use to achieve significantly low levels of reported diarrhoea.

8.1.4 Low access and use – higher reported diarrhoea
At the other end of the spectrum with diarrhoea levels over 60% are Kedida Gamella and Libo Kemekem which both report very low levels of hand-washing with soap, limited latrine access and very poor utilization. Dembecha appears to be in the process of transition with latrine access reaching the critical threshold but with limited hand washing with soap and low use of latrines while 50% of households report recent episodes of diarrhoea. The results from these woredas add further support to the linkages between increased access to, and use of, latrines plus safer hygiene practice and reduction in diarrhoea. They make a strong case for ensuring that the full preventive health package is achieved to maximize the potential benefit which is very much a central tenet of the HEP.

8.1.5 Inconsistent results - A note of caution
Angolela Tera woreda is the odd one out. It presents an inconsistent data set: diarrhoea is reported to be low while latrine coverage is reported to be only 60% with usage at and hand washing with soap and latrine usage is reported to be low. This anomaly might suggest under reporting of diarrhoea, under stated hygienic practice or a strong selection bias of those living in lowland areas where the team was informed by the woreda health office that there was a slow uptake of key preventive behaviours. In addition, the results might mask the fact that use of soap or detergent is low but actual washing hands with water and a substitute is high and that although not all households have latrines people actually bury faeces (the first rung of the virtual ODF ladder). The results from Angolela Tera are important in sending a note of caution about drawing too much from a ‘quick and dirty’ survey and to recognize that hygiene behaviour change is an inexact science.

8.1.6 Explaining variations in soap use
The explanation for why some woredas report high levels of soap/detergent use is generally given as ‘poverty’ i.e. that soap is an unaffordable luxury but it may also reflect relationships between men and women and women’s capacity to command and control resources for hygienic purposes. This latter point has been highlighted in KABP7 studies as an important issue impacting on latrine construction where women explained that it was a high priority for them but a low priority for men. It may also be an indication of the relative level of success of health extension workers and volunteers in promoting hand washing with soap or a scouring agent. Another factor reported in KABP studies is the widespread reluctance to wash hands with soap before eating while the practice is more common after eating reportedly to remove oil and chilli from fingers.

8.1.7 Health impact related to water source
The household survey also looked at the relationship between source of water and reported levels of diarrhoea and once again undermined certain prejudices. In Kendida Gamella with its piped water system which is normally associated with improved levels of hygiene, high levels of diarrhoea (> 65% of

---

respondents) were reported. These high levels of reported diarrhoea as suggested above can be attributed to limited latrine access and use and limited use of soap for hand washing. In Demba Gofa, also a piped water scheme but with better levels of latrine access, use and hand washing with soap, reported diarrhoea levels are lower. These results are important because they once again emphasise the importance of the full WASH package and the limited value of an improved water supply on its own. The results emphasise the fact that the improved quality of water is important (particularly during AWD outbreaks) but the increased quantity is most significant and as the team learned payment for an improved source not surprisingly inhibits additional and expanded use of water for better hygiene.

The household survey results support the conventional wisdom that for latrine construction, latrine use and hand washing with soap to make an impact on diarrhoea then a critical mass of adopters must be achieved and obviously sustained. The survey also emphasises the importance of convergent action so that communities benefit from the full WASH package to maximize the benefits. Reported use is variable and the need to continue promoting improved, sustained behaviour change is a matter of some imperative. The importance of regular supportive supervision cannot be over-emphasised.

8.2 Impact Assessment

8.2.1 Report Card, Inventory and HEWs

The team noted a considerable range of impact measurement tools which centre round WASH report cards and what is now set to become a national WASH inventory and M and E system. UNICEF has worked to simplify the system and the inventory has been successfully tested in several pilot woredas. In addition, the HEWs provide regular updates on the progress of households in terms of graduation to the full 16 Preventive Health packages 7 of which cover environmental health. Achieving ODF status in kebeles and ultimately woredas is a performance indicator for staff progress towards sanitation targets.

8.2.2 Economic Impact

The survey results were not sufficiently sensitive to approximate time savings as a result of more proximate water sources or reduced queuing times so reported improvements are largely anecdotal. In focus group discussions with women and with children at water points there was a general consensus.
(particularly in areas with complex hydro-geology) that the new water point had improved and increased access with reports of more frequent bathing. Assessing the project impact on poverty is difficult to measure without quite sophisticated survey methods. The whole issue of promoting improved income generation opportunities through productive uses of water e.g. simple drip irrigation systems and the use of urine and composted excreta are being explored in Tigray and the results will inform the future direction of UNICEF WASH activities.

8.3 SERVICE LIMITATIONS AND CHALLENGES

8.3.1 Competing Demand for Limited Water Resources
In several sites visited during the field trips, there were substantial queues at water points even where fees were being charged. There can be little question that there is a high demand for safe drinking water. A major challenge in Ethiopia is the widespread ownership of livestock and the fact that in some areas people must actually compete with animals for limited water supplies.

8.3.2 Inadequate quantity and poor quality of water
With the exception of one community, all surveyed claimed that the quantity of water is not adequate to meet their needs. Increased quantity and use of water is a crucial factor in determining improved hygiene. Quality wise, no community is fully satisfied in fact about 5-40% of the communities expressed their dissatisfaction with the quality of water.

8.3.3 Water rationing
In some rural kebeles the WASH committee limited the use of protected water source for drinking and cooking purposes alone. Unprotected traditional water sources are used for other purposes to minimize the risk of getting into problem during the dry season. In this situation, it is hard to imagine how surplus supplies might be used for production.

8.4 CONTRIBUTION TO THE ADOPTION OF SAFE HYGIENE PRACTICES

8.4.1 Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS)
The work of the HEWs backed up by the CLTS approach and the community conversation has resulted in a widespread commitment to building and to a certain extent using of latrines. Amhara reports a shift from <20% three years ago to>70% today while SNNPR in consolidating high gains already made (95%) is achieving high numbers of ODF Kebeles. CLTS as an approach to improve hygiene and sanitation is well accepted and in fact, it also created a degree of competition for excellence among the different Kebeles in the Woreda. Number of Kebeles in the visited Woredas are about to celebrate ODF and their attempt should be encouraged however enough time should be given for its irreversible achievement. For how long will these Kebeles stay ODF without going back to open defecation and how to contextualize CLTS are areas that require further investigation.

8.4.2 The Safe Water Chain
On the sanitation and hygiene side, household visits and transect walks reveal that water for drinking is increasingly being stored safely with a safe system for extraction as part of the household graduation process. This is a good example of the way in which EU-UNICEF support dovetails with the national HEW programme adding value through additional access to skills and allowances. In most cases for about 50% the same container is used both to transport water from the source and to storing water at home. Drawing of water from storage container by dipping cans or cups vary from 10 to 90% from one
community to the other and mostly (about 60%) once water reaches home anybody in the family is allowed to draw water from the storage. Treating water at home vary from 10% in one community to about 88% in another community and mostly through boiling technique. About 70% wash their water container with clean water but with large proportion washing it as deemed necessary.

8.4.3 Hand washing

Hand washing behaviour remains one of the biggest challenges as there is a stronger culture for washing hands with soap and water after eating rather than before. In the households visited at community level, the majority had hand washing facilities outside latrines with available water and soap. Given the high level of pollution from animals, the close proximity and the relative intimacy hand washing with soap is the key barrier to disease transmission. This remains work in progress. Hand washing with soap at critical times represents a major challenge on several fronts: the availability of soap (ash) and water; time; commitment to accept, learn and practice the new behaviour particularly when there is such a strong tradition for washing hands after eating!

Almost all respondents both men and women of all age including infants claimed to wash their faces at least once a day. Over 80% claimed to have a bath and wash their clothes once a week. In most communities respondents reported the use of soap and to have spent over 20 Birr mostly for soap. Few respondents mention the use of other detergents such as “Endod”. Over 60% of surveyed in all communities associated hand washing with health issues.

8.4.4 The Sanitation and Hygiene Task Force

It should be noted that there has been a significant breakthrough in marrying different software approaches together through a recently established Task Force.

8.5 Strengthening the impact of investments

- Clearer stated process and output targets for UNICEF staff which includes increasing the frequency of woreda and Kebele supervision visits
- Allowing communities to manage the construction of water schemes (customising the CDF approach)
- Ensure community led VLOM is supported by appropriate supply streams of fast moving spares according to nationally agreed guidelines
- Aligning closer with the national WASH strategy at regional level around:
  - Planning
  - Community contribution
  - Local procurement
  - The use of ‘WSGs’ and CFTs’ to support the facilitation process

The improvement in service levels achieved in the target woredas can be regarded as one of the measures of impact of the project. Additionally, woreda staffs report a genuine change in attitude and commitment of the community as a demonstrable impact of the project. The Role of WASH committees in ensuring sustained operation of water schemes and monitoring of the sanitation condition of their villages was also considered important. In general, there was considerable anecdotal support behind the project’s contribution to minimize community susceptibility to diseases emanating from poor hygiene and sanitation conditions.
SECTION 9. SUSTAINABILITY

9.1 APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGIES & MANAGEMENT OF SCHEMES

9.1.1 Low Cost VLOM
The approach to water supply service provision in WASH in general is characterized by a commitment to establishing simple, low cost and community managed; operated and maintained systems. The appropriateness of technology is assessed in light of the scheme continuing to function and produce the intended benefits and offer the desired service factors. Benefits and service factors considered in evaluating sustainability of water supply schemes are in terms of quality of water, accessibility of scheme, reliability of supply and quantity of water.

9.1.2 Shallow wells – a sustainable standard
The services are in line with the national WASH strategy. EU-UNICEF schemes are mostly shallow boreholes (about 55%) fitted with hand pumps. Generally, sustaining quality of water from groundwater particularly from deeper source is more realistic and usually such water does not require treatment. The same is true of EU-UNICEF funded shallow drilled boreholes. Drilled deep boreholes are also reliable throughout the year and even during the periods of drought. In fact, in Amhara region, Woreda Water Officers stated during field visits that the EU-UNICEF’s strength to concentrate more on drilled boreholes while IDA and ADB financed programs focus on hand dug wells. In case of IDA financed program, 40% of the schemes are hand dug wells while less than 20% is shallow drilled wells. Generally, hand dug wells are the least cost option, but relatively less reliable and inadequate quantity of water. Springs are usually preferred source of water for they are relatively inexpensive and provide a good basic service.

9.1.3 WASHComs need ongoing support
The systems put in place for management of the water supply systems by the WASHComs with support from the woreda, zonal and regional WASH teams should ensure sustainability if appropriate supply chains can be established which can operate on (at the minimum) a cost recovery basis. UNICEF acknowledges that the whole area of Operation and Maintenance, supply chains for fast moving spares, the different levels of support required, the necessary supply chains and enhancing the role of the private sector is very much ‘work-in-progress’.

9.1.4 Service Charges
The water supply component will be sustainable if the well established WASH committees continue to function effectively. The collection of service charges to water users made by WASH committees at scheme level and the committees’ saving plans to finance future repair and maintenance works ensures future operation, maintenance and management of water supplies.

9.1.5 Caretakers and Community Facilitation teams
Unlike WB, DFID and ADB WASH programs, EU-UNICEF financed programs do not allocate budget to train caretakers of schemes but WASHComs. More importantly, in WB, DFID and ADB WASH programs involvement of community right from project inception is held through the Community Facilitation teams, so as to develop sense of ownership and to respond to real needs expressed through significant communities’ contribution towards the capital cost. In comparison, communities’ engagement is minimal in EU-UNICEF supported WASH Program

The EU-UNICEF project could do more to assure sustainability of the water sources; improving catchment protection around springs; ensuring latrines are not located near shallow wells; make efforts to improve recharge of the groundwater reserve; and, support watershed management activities. The
sustainability of a water source calls for changing the environment and this has not been addressed by this project.

9.2 ADOPTION OF HYGIENE PRACTICES

While Woredas report important gains in the widespread erection of the three key hygiene messages, there is much concern expressed about post-triggering in the context of CLTS and sustaining the initial enthusiasm for latrine use and sustaining the ODF status. The field work revealed considerable variation in reported latrine use from 27% in Libo Kemkem Woreda to over 70% in Tenta Woreda. The HEWs need ongoing support to provide reinforcement to consolidate commitment to the adoption of safer practices. The UNICEF team acknowledge this gap and recognise that there will need to be considerable ongoing support post-triggering and post-graduation.

9.3 STRENGTHENING SUSTAINABILITY

9.3.1 Stronger alignment and harmonisation with the National WASH programme

The UNICEF team recognise the importance of stronger alignment and harmonisation with the national WASH programme to help ‘multiply the multiples acknowledging the important gains to be made from greater cooperation and expanding partnerships such as SNV and ORDA. The key areas identified at Woreda level remain the operation and maintenance issues for water supply with enhanced community ownership, the key imperative. On the hygiene and sanitation front, the case for ongoing supportive supervision with monitoring and incentives is identified as the key priority if gains are to be sustained.

9.3.2 Stronger focus on community empowerment

The involvement of the community must start with the expressed demand for WASH activities in their locality and must continue through every stage of the project cycle including their contribution in cash and in-kind. Community management creates a strong sense of ownership and this is further enhanced when the community effectively manage or at least closely supervise the private sector in drilling, hand dug well construction or school latrine development. This refers to a wider, deeper level of ownership which goes beyond legal status. The community must be involved right from project inception with genuine community participation in planning and an investment in facilities that reflect real needs. Sustainability of scheme is very much dependant on community ownership, control and management of WASH services, including community responsibility for long-term repair and maintenance.

SECTION 10. VISIBILITY AND SYNERGY

10.1 VISIBILITY

Public communication work has been undertaken using mass media (including Radio and TV) on EU support to the Ethiopian water, sanitation and hygiene programme. Press releases were made in the local press, printed media and the UNICEF web site. Further visibility work is in progress including review and ordering of visibility stickers, posters and press conferences including ‘exposure visits’ where press crews travel to site inaugurations to cover water and sanitation success stories. The EU logo appears on vehicles as well as major infrastructure. Now moving from visibility to strategic visibility actions (e.g. global hand-washing, ODF verification and National Inventory launch. UNICEF is very good at advocacy and communication but has a very powerful presence and image which generally acts to overshadow partners.
10.2 SYNERGY

In terms of complementing other development initiatives, there was no evidence of formal inter-project links. However, the important WASH inspired support being channeled to the Health Extension Workers and their supervisors plus the combined efforts to improve education particularly for girls is known to create multiple synergies which result in multiple benefits.

10.3 EU ADDED VALUE

The EU brings its core community values which include a commitment to gender equality, community empowerment and environmental protection. These reflect an ethical commitment to equality and justice as well as a more pragmatic approach to ensure sustainability. This level of commitment to sustainable development goes beyond the supply of basic WASH services to embrace, in equilibrium, the three dimensions of: economic growth; environmental protection; and, social improvement. These are important considerations for the sector and ensure that any investment in WASH is complemented (and the benefits therefore multiplied) through other EU supported initiatives. This area of added value helps to strengthen the partnership with UNICEF which is also considering options to improve the economic impact of the investment in WASH services which might include promoting water for production and even ecological sanitation (particularly arborloos and fossa alterna).

The EU with the backing and support of its member countries brings a considerable level of collective influence which has already made a significant impact in Ethiopia through the Water Initiative which included support for the multi-stakeholder annual conferences. Cohesion is a core element of the EU ethos and this has been mobilized to promote harmonized and aligned development in line with Paris Principles. This has been translated in Ethiopia into a strong commitment to build consensus among sector partners and create momentum for a single national WASH programme which in turn is paving the way for a sector wide approach.
SECTION 11.  RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 DIRECT (SHORT TERM) RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1.1 Relevance

There was consensus among key stakeholders interviewed that with such strong national leadership and genuine donor alignment behind the development of a national WASH programme, it is essential that the EU-UNICEF project continues:

- to work in line with UAP, PASDEP, HEP, HSDP
- to build consensus on the national WASH manual
- to align with WASH programme community contribution (5% cash and 5% in kind)

11.1.2 Effectiveness

- Establish a minimum WASH package (not less than $50,000 per woreda)
- Take the WASH inventory and report cards to scale in all EU-UNICEF supported woredas.
- Maximise women’s role in monitoring and evaluation of all WASH facilities as they are the primary users of water points and can provide daily checks on functionality. Women also effectively determine hygiene standards for the family.
- carry out institutional WASH inventories and expand WASH in schools
- partner with NGOs and private sector to expand school WASH capacity
- Complete WASH in schools guidelines and manual.

11.1.3 Efficiency

- The liquidation period needs some flexibility in line with MTR suggestion of the extension to 9 months.
- Banks need to be instructed/encouraged to speed the flow of funds through the system
- It is important that communities choose the technology that will give them the highest service level they want, afford, and can maintain. For each technology options identified it is good to estimate per capita investment cost and operation and maintenance (O & M) cost; thus determining the affordability level of the community particularly for covering cost of O & M
- Continue to focus on sustainable shallow well drilling technologies;
- Continue to focus on sustainable, cost-effective, high impact approaches pushing for convergent rather than scattered WASH
- Strengthen ‘self-supply’ through mapping appropriate areas
- Apply a modified version of community led total sanitation to include a stronger focus on wider more sustained behavior change (focus hand washing) in line with the Task Force recommendations.
- Place particular emphasis on improved, harmonised, integrated planning at Woreda level:
  - Ensure integration of cross-sectoral activities at all periods of the project cycle at woreda and community level;
  - Collaborate with NGOs with practical experience operating in the target woredas; and
  - Ensure greater integration of all WASH actors at woreda level by strengthening woreda WASH teams’ capacity to plan and implement together within a common framework (e.g. WASH Manual).
- Devise means of continuation the ignition effects of CLTS approach;
11.1.4 Impact
- School WASH is clearly inextricably linked with the rights of the child and enhanced child survival and must therefore remain a key priority for EU-UNICEF
- Convergent planning and implementation for a more integrated, comprehensive WASH package must be strengthened to build the potential school/community synergies
- Integrate WASH activities in schools allocating sufficient budget for the complete infrastructure as well as the promotional activities (the clubs etc.)

11.1.5 Sustainability
- A key element of UNICEF’s role in the WASH sector is the relationships built with key actors at the different levels but it is questionable how far the limited number of staff can spread themselves to maximise the benefits of the inputs made by ensuring close and regular follow-up. To this end, UNICEF should consider expanding their work through partners acting as woreda support groups and community facilitation teams.
- The EU-UNICEF project must place stronger emphasis on empowering communities to more fully own their water supply, their sanitation improvements and their behaviour change.

11.2 Strategic (Longer Term) Recommendations

11.2.1 Relevance
- UNICEF should align more closely with the national WASH programme. This would include:
  - Adopting the revised National WASH Programme Implementation Manual
  - Working through a quality (certified and regulated) woreda support group with greater mutual accountability i.e. the woreda has more say in the contract with clear performance measures and milestones. Community Facilitation Teams might also be considered if appropriate quality can be guaranteed.
- Conform with the national WASH implementation procedures:
  - Engage in regional planning
  - Identify, train and support woreda support groups and community facilitation teams
  - train WASH staff on the WASH manuals
  - apply community contributions
  - provide supportive supervision

11.2.2 Effectiveness
- Simplify financial reporting requirements and extend the liquidation period
- Agree and set woreda target service levels in each of the EU-UNICEF operational woredas including the preparation of detailed plans for each woreda identifying all work required towards achieving the woreda targets;
- Continue to support the rolling out of the WASH inventory and the WASH report card providing close supportive supervision to ensure high standards and good credibility
- Ensure support to woredas addresses priority problems in each woreda based on the woreda’s strategic plan;
- In all training, place a stronger focus on sustainability, water safety and equitable access/use
- Build the capacity of woreda staff to supervise borehole drilling e.g. in the case of WB and other WASH programs supervision is done by the region or a designated external body
- In the case of sanitation, place a stronger focus on educating men about the negative health impact on women unable to complete ablutions during daylight hours, emphasising that the availability of a safe, private, convenient and hygienic latrine is a high priority for women on many levels.
11.2.3 Efficiency

- Channel funds through credit institutions for community scheme development (in line with the modified RWSEP Community Development Fund model)
- The inventory linked to report cards needs rolling out
- The Community led Total Behaviour Change for Improved sanitation and hygiene which combines existing strategies within a more holistic approach needs to be scaled up with appropriate supportive supervision
- In line with government strategy, UNICEF staff should be assessed on key performance indicators which actually encourage delegation of activities e.g. sustainable/localised systems for CLTS training
- Create a smaller UNICEF team making better use of funds

11.2.4 Impact

- UNICEF should support the rolling out of the WASH card and inventory at national level to ensure a cascading process of impact (output) monitoring.
- UNICEF should ensure that the process of evaluating impact (outcomes) is integrated into the regional work plans and includes members of government and other key sector stakeholders
- UNICEF should adopt the principle of plausible inference and push to achieve >80% access and use of latrines, soap when hand washing and compliance with the safe water chain

11.2.5 Sustainability

The EU-UNICEF project could do more to encourage regional/woreda/community efforts (including partnering with environmental focus programmes and projects) to assure sustainability of the water sources by:

- improving catchment protection around springs;
- ensuring latrines are not located near shallow wells;
- making efforts to improve recharge of the groundwater reserve; and by,
- supporting watershed management activities.
- Consider water for production opportunities

The EU-UNICEF project might consider a stronger focus on ecological sanitation particularly to link with the green schools initiative. Partnership with Catholic Relief Services on the promotion of ‘arborloos’ might be considered.
ANNEXES
ANNEX I
Field Level Information and Stakeholder Comments

SECTION 1: PROJECT PERFORMANCE & FIELD EVIDENCE

The MTE team conducted a survey of 300 households in 8 Woredas to collect data for the analysis and report. The survey’s results showed that 93% of the households interviewed had access to an improved water source - which is higher than UNICEF’s reported level of achievement (84%). The survey’s result for access to latrines was 74%, which is lower than UNICEF’s reported performance (82%). See Table 1.1.1 below for further details.

It should be noted that the project is being implemented in every Region of Ethiopia (excluding Addis Ababa) with activities focused in 78 Woredas. The MTE survey of 300 households was carried out in eight Woredas in two Regions (SNNPR and Amhara) – thus it is a relatively limited sample size given the large implementation coverage area. Differences between UNICEF progress report data and MTE field observations may in part be due to routine statistical variance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>UNICEF Progress Reports</th>
<th>MTE Field Observation</th>
<th>MTE information source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Water Supply</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>Household survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to latrines</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>Household survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community training and Awareness raising (hygiene promotion)</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Woreda report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH Committee, Caretaker training</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Woreda report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Water Supply</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Field observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Latrines</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Field observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School WASH Clubs</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Field observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of teachers on hygiene and sanitation</td>
<td>167%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Field observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand pump within the school compound</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>Field observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Water Supply</th>
<th>Latrine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dembecha</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedida -Gamela</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demba Gofa</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libo Kemekem</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angolela Tera</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Badewacho</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenta</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kochere</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.3 Woreda Water Supply Access by technology option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woreda</th>
<th>Piped Scheme</th>
<th>Shallow Well</th>
<th>Hand dug well with hand pump</th>
<th>On spot Spring</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dembecha</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedida -Gamela</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demba Gofa</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libo Kemekem</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angolela Tera</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Badewacho</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenta</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kochere</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION 2.1: STAKEHOLDERS COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Semunigus</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Emphasised the importance of following the Evaluation guidelines with the key headings: relevance with a strong focus on the added value; effectiveness; efficiency; impact and sustainability. Of key concern is the issue of visibility as well as how complementary and coherent the WASH project is with other EU supported projects so as to maximise potential synergies, avoid duplication and the harmonised approach. The importance of EU’s initiative in promoting the multi-stakeholder forum with government and other development partners was also discussed. The MTE team revisited EU for a final debriefing of the key MTE findings and recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Demoor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Gossa</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Strong emphasis placed on existing reports and UNICEF Mid-Term Review which have a considerable range of observations and recommendations. UNICEF will increasingly explore viability criteria and appropriate technology options such as the rope and washer pump. In addition CLTS, which has produced impressive results to date, will be scaled up across the country making universal sanitation access a distinct possibility. UNICEF will focus on the key issue of sustainable behaviour change (post-triggering) considering sustainable marketing options such as the Catholic Relief Services' Arborloos project. The development of a simple WASH inventory with data cascading from village to woreda and ultimately to the federal level is an important tool for the Regions. UNICEF’s added value includes risk-taking on project approaches which can ultimately pay off with cost effective and replicable results. For example: self supply; community-led total sanitation (CLTS) and the WASH Inventory. School WASH, although not a stated part of the Universal Action Plan, remains a key development imperative with its known impact on girl child enrolment and attendance. The Green School Initiative pioneered in India offers the further link the UNICEF Child Friendly School concept to WASH, climate change, and other sectors. Impediments to the delivery of results highlighted in annual reports and the UNICEF MTR centre on the slow delivery of funds compounded by the limited absorption capacity at woreda level. The multi-stage transfer system naturally takes time and the banks hold onto cash for their own commercial ends. Recently appointed water technicians are reported to lack experience and to some extent appropriate motivation as the UNICEF capacity building fund is limited and transport needs considerable. The MTE team will need to review funding flows at the woreda level and issues of staff motivation including transport requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Deverill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Muluneh</td>
<td>WSP/World Bank</td>
<td>Key issues raised by development partners emphasise UNICEF’s commitment to alignment with the national WASH programme with anticipation that UNICEF might continue to close the gap in the following areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Tessema</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>- Allowing local procurement particularly of materials which are/can be manufactured locally. There is acknowledgement that although the UNICEF external procurement rules ensure quality, there is also an unacceptable time-lag in supply and a lack of flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Alemseged</td>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>- 5 - 10% community contribution to the cost of the water scheme in cash/kind to demonstrate commitment, build ownership and prepare for operation and maintenance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 The Arborloo is a simple form of ecological sanitation which promotes shallow pits, portable superstructures and regular relocation of the pit. The project provides multi-coloured concrete slabs and access to tree seedlings which are planted on the abandoned pits. CRS and partners have promoted the use of 55,000 Arborloos to date in Ethiopia and plan to evaluate sustainability and potential for up-scaling. CRS Ethiopia has a formal cooperative agreement with UNICEF Ethiopia to work on water and sanitation, share experiences and implement projects jointly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>maintenance costs.</em> Evidence was found of WASH committees collecting a monthly fee, paying a caretaker and depositing money in the bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>The employment of Woreda Support Groups at woreda level and Community Facilitation Teams at Kebele taking advantage (where appropriate) of local NGOs, CSOs, consultants and of course the zone.</em> There is clearly no way that the UNICEF WASH team can provide regular woreda support and with new staff in position (particularly those from the technical vocational training colleges) the woredas need regular support and follow-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Become part of the regional planning process not just focussed on UNICEF supported woredas in line with the policy of ‘one policy, one plan, one budget, one implementation manual and one monitoring and evaluation system.</em> The woredas visited all have a 5 year strategic plan outlining how the UAP will be achieved. It is understandably ambitious but then broken down into more pragmatic annual plans based on available resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Complete school WASH manuals including design options.</em> All woredas visited have an active school WASH programme with good inter-sectoral collaboration between education, health and water desks. Latrines are being constructed (using a range of design options) and HEWs link with school directors trained in CLTS approaches to form sanitation clubs and promote improved hygiene in the schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Self-Supply is being promoted in Oromia region (not visited).</em> It should be noted that a parallel option the Community Managed Development Fund (CDF) is being reviewed as a national model after its successful piloting by Finnida through the RWSEP programme in Amhara region. It has already been adapted as part of the World Bank sponsored programme in recognition that where communities manage the funds in construction of their own facilities there is a strong commitment to effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Results show that there are considerable cost and time savings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those interviewed suggest that UNICEF is often selected as a funding conduit because it has tried and tested methodologies, a reliable monitoring and accounting procedure and a reputation for getting the job done – putting the needs of women and children above anything else – a “safe pair of hands”.

E. Karsten | FINNIDA | The CDF fund has proved to offer the cheapest method to make hand dug wells because the community have a strong investment to get the best product from the one-off payment they will receive. RWSEP reported that government staff resource wastage is approximately 10 – 15% whereas those schemes funded through the Community Development Fund managed through the Amhara Credit and Savings is less than 5! |

Government (Federal) | | UNICEF aligns with regional and woreda strategic WASH planning participating and where appropriate, helping to facilitate the process at different levels. UNICEF also align closely with the Health Extension Programme with particular reference to the 7/16 packages which focus on environmental health. Community Led Total Sanitation is being mainstreamed as a successful approach to latrine construction by Regional Governments with dramatic reported results – 70% latrine construction in Amhara and of course the much vaunted 95% in SNNPRS. |

Ato Sileshi Taye | MoH | With many villages, some Kebeles and even a woreda or two in Amhara declaring *open defaecation status* there is an assumption that latrines are being used. The government has ambitious model household graduation targets which will also reflect latrine use. The inventory has been introduced to check this indicator (among many others) and UNICEF with partners is looking into the all-important post-triggering phase of CLTS. |

The proposed MTE field visits (using enumerators) will provide an opportunity for spot checking but not robust verification. |

Although CLTS is reportedly helping to make serious in-roads into sanitation but there is continued concern about hand washing and observation of the safe water chain. The community conversation is being employed and in Amhara there is the WSP/HIP approach to promote total community led behaviour change. A task force has been
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>formed to review and harmonise different approaches to agree best practice. Hygiene will be a key focus for the Kebele, village and household visits where a combination of focus group, semi-structured interview and observations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ato Gelabo Sengogo</td>
<td>MoWR</td>
<td>Thanks to the support of EU/UNICEF, Ethiopia is making significant progress towards the higher goal of universal access although there are concerns that gains to date have been made in collection of the low hanging fruit and the overly ambitious targets might actually compromise quality. This implies that further gains will be a function of more complex hydro-geological, geophysical and socio-cultural factors intercepting to increase the level of difficulty and cost. UNICEF continues to be an important partner with government and is increasingly engaging in the sector dialogue to improve convergence with the new architecture of aid and improve sector harmonisation and alignment with the government WASH Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE</td>
<td></td>
<td>WASH in schools needs to be expanded and completion of manuals and technical drawings needs to be completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF WASH Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>Even by their own high standards UNICEF acknowledge that outputs are proving difficult to attain. Reported problems revolve around the slow transmission of funds creating time pressure on completing activities and liquidating funds within the 6 month time limit so as not jeopardise future tranches. The regions also report that part of the problem is the slow onward transmission of the banks because they are short of cash. It is not clear how this slow transmission impacts on the delivery of improved water supplies and sanitation services in targeted Woredas as the MTR report suggests that regions are close to attaining targets. In the annual report it is noted that the actual cost of shallow-drilling is less than the provisional unit-rate estimate largely because UNICEF has used a cost-effective approach such as clustering of drilling activities and entering an agreement with regional partners for using UNICEF-donated rigs. This is less than the market price. Furthermore, the overall cost of pipes has decreased considerably due largely to using other cost-effective options which use fewer number pipes. This significant saving is reinvested to develop more on-spot water supply schemes such as hand dug wells and shallow wells.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoFED, Bureau of Water, Bureau of Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>In AWASSA the BoFED UN Account Manager suggested moving to a one year rather than a six month cycle. UNICEF has also been in negotiation with Government to improve funding streams and direct transfers to woredas are currently on trial. It should be noted that in Amhara, there were suggestions that while woredas should continue to plan and prioritise WASH, drilling contracts were better managed at the regional level under zonal and woreda supervision. According to reports and feedback at the regional level, the performance of WASH Committees is a significant indicator of community demand but also a function of how well the committee is trained and ultimately supervised. Not surprisingly the performance will also be a key determinant of scheme functionality. Interviews with WASH Committees will be an important element of the Kebele and village visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Truneh T. Ayelu</td>
<td>SNV</td>
<td>In the Dutch supported woredas UNICEF have been able to employ consultants to support activities and in addition use SNV to build capacity which has (reportedly) contributed greatly to WASH prioritisation and performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 2.2: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

Addis Ababa
1. UNICEF WASH Team Addis – Paul Deveril, Tamene Gossa,
2. European Commission – Alemayehu Semunigus Expert RDFSS
3. WSP – Belete Muluneh and World Bank – Ato Abere
4. UNICEF Regional WASH Teams (Annual Retreat)
5. UNICEF Education and Health Teams
6. Plan International – Dr. Dereje
7. SNV – D. Truneh Portfolio Coordinator
8. MoH – Ato Sileshi
9. MoW – Ato Gelabo
10. MoEducation
11. World Bank
12. WaterAid

Awassa
1. UNICEF Team – Ato Getachew and Ato Amare
2. Regional Health Bureau:
   o Mehu Benedetos – Disease Prevention officer
   o Solomon Gebre - (as above)
   o Gizachew Kebede (Bureau Deputy head)
   o Meka Metekia (Disease Prevention officer)
3. Regional Water Bureau
   o Head
   o WASH Coordinator
4. Regional Education Bureau
   o Tadesse Wolde – REB Plan process Owner
5. Regional Bureau of Finance and Economic Development
   o Bureau Head - Berigure Bancha Bagaje
   o Deputy head – Akilulu
   o Zemenu Gebre
6. SNV
   o Zinash Tbegayo – WASH Adviser

Bahir Dar
1. UNICEF WASH Team
   o Ato Haimonot and Ato Takelle
2. Regional Water Bureau
   o UNICEF WASH focal person - Ato Getenet
3. Regional Health Bureau
   o (Deputy Bureau Head) Mulusew Lijalem
4. Regional Bureau of Finance and Economic Development
   o Desalegne Berhane – Multi-Lateral Cooperation Officer
5. Regional Education Bureau
   o (Quality Control) Tamagn Ashemati Hailu
6. O.R.D.A.
   o (Director of Water Resources Development Programme) - Ato Uneto –
   o R.W.S.E.P. (Team Leader) Ellis Karsten
7. SNV
   o (WASH Adviser) Teklemariam Ayelu
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SECTION 1. MATTERS ARISING

a. RELEVANCE
- Mutual alignment in the National WASH Implementation Manual including planning
- Project relevance ‘to the community’ should be reviewed and emphasised in the Mid-Term Evaluation report

b. EFFECTIVENESS
- The report should investigate further the link between:
  - Coverage VS use of toilets VS soap VS occurrence of diarrhoea.
  - Woreda survey results and recommendations in the five criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact & sustainability)
- The report should:
  - Investigate why soap/detergent use is high in some Woredas and low in others?
  - Provide an analysis of (i) efficiency of usage in visited Woredas and (ii) impact in terms of the use of facilities
  - Emphasise the limited scope of the household survey and visits made

c. RECOMMENDATIONS
The report should:
- Differentiate/categorize recommendations (with time frame and responsibility) by:
  - Specific recommendations that apply for the remaining project period (project level recommendations), considering additional points from this discussion guide
  - Strategic recommendations for future bilateral collaboration
  - Review the recommendation for watershed management in the light of existing project scope and capacity

SECTION 2: ATTENDEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Participating Institution</th>
<th>No. of participant</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UNICEF (Front Office)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ted Chaiban &amp; Viviane Van Steirteghem</td>
<td>Attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UNICEF WASH (AAO)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Paul Deverill, Tamene Gossa, Meaza Kebede, Inge Wicherink, Seblewongel Tekola, Kazumi Inden</td>
<td>Attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UNICEF (APST)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Amare Workiye, Takele Hunde, Dawit Haile, Getachew Haile Michael, Haimanot Assefa, Kulule Mekonen</td>
<td>Attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EU Delegation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alemayehu Semunigus + Asnake Abera</td>
<td>Attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Government (Federal)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ayalew Jifar, MOE Agash Asmamaw, MoWR,</td>
<td>MoWR &amp; MoE attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Government (Regions)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dagnew Aweke, Amhara BOH Getnet Kassahun, Amhara WRB Tegagn Terefe, SNNPR WRB Wassie Shiferaw, SNNPR BOH</td>
<td>Attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Guliit Birhane (WaterAid), Daniel Tiruneh (SNV)</td>
<td>Attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Consulting Team</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Simon Bibby, Yemarshet Yemane, Yalew Yemane and Ashenafi Seifu</td>
<td>Attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3: SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS

a. RELEVANCE

i. Alignment with the national WASH programme
- The key to EU-UNICEF project alignment with the national WASH programme is in building consensus around the best approaches to be applied within a common framework reflected in a harmonised manual. It is noted that there is ongoing work to review and improve the national WASH programme implementation manual which is aiming to blend best practice.
- It was noted that different donors appear to have planning periods different which will need to be addressed if a key principle of ‘one plan, one budget, one evaluation’ is to be observed.

ii. Alignment with the Health Extension Programme
- Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS), promoted through partnership with PLAN has proved to be highly relevant to the Health Extension Programme and an important tool for Health Extension Workers. This success has been further strengthened by the harmonisation of the CLTS approach with the Hygiene Improvement Programme/Water and Sanitation Programme work on ‘total behaviour change’ currently work in progress by the national task force. It was agreed that the CLTS and Hygiene approach provided a good opportunity to multiply the multiples.

iii. EU-UNICEF added value
- It was reported that in SNNPR, the Region is taking EU-UNICEF ideas to scale in particular
  - Cost effective interventions like using plastic pipes not Galvanised Steel.
  - Conducting joint monitoring

iv. Relevance to target group
- It was suggested that the most critical level of project relevance is ‘to the community’ and it was felt that this should be reviewed and emphasised in the Mid-Term Evaluation report.

v. Making Recommendations Relevant
- It was suggested that the list of recommendations should be reclassified according to those which have direct relevance to the next two years of the EU-RR supported project and those which have a more strategic significance such as the harmonisation of the PIM.
- It was also suggested that the report should link the results from the woreda level survey to the different project outputs as a form of output triangulation and verification.
- It was also suggested that the recommendations should have a viable time frame with ascribed responsibilities.

vi. Improving Efficiency
- It was suggested that the woreda WASH teams need to be further strengthened particularly to plan, work and monitor together. It was suggested that the WASH teams could be further capacitated by the following changes:
  - Increased focus (advocacy) on the woreda administrator (and other key influential leaders at the woreda level) to build and ensure support for WASH.
  - The water offices need to develop the capacity to manage and monitor contracts particularly for the deep well complex. Simple monitoring of borehole depth and alignment can be affected using a weight and a roughly calibrated length of string as a depth measure and a plum line. This example was taken from the WES chief’s experience in India where one of the sub-district water officers would visit the sites of drilled wells to check the stated standard of work carried out by contractors.
  - Money should be increasingly transferred to the woreda as the region still has top – down control although the value of clustering drilling work is acknowledged in bringing economies of scale.
  - The woreda WASH team need be made aware that they can access cascading technical expertise from region, zone and NGOs. It was noted that zones successfully support the Woredas in both Amhara and SNNP but empowerment is key. It was noted in
one of the KII that a knock on effect of the EU-UNICEF project not using the woreda support groups (WSGs) was the shortage of work forcing often the better WSGs to seek employment opportunities elsewhere.

vii. **Contract Flexibility**

- It was noted that there will need to be a budget for the inventory and expanded WASH team development and support—this exposes the constraining aspect of 50:50 contract which makes it difficult to change funding priorities if not included in the original proposal as in the case of moving out of building communal latrines found to be not effective.

viii. **Partnership – relevance and sustainability**

There was discussion about the partnerships between SNV and PLAN and it was noted that there is a sharing of risk taking e.g. with SNV in ensuring the sustainability of capacity developed specifically WASH management at woreda and community level and with PLAN through CLTS in building sustainability of behaviour change capacity.

b. **Effectiveness**

i. **Noted in SNNPR:**

- The problem of ensuring equity where fund distribution is based on population dilutes the effectiveness of funding with the suggestion that it might be necessary to decrease the number of woredas to increase impact.
- It will be difficult to apply the minimum WASH package.

ii. **Bottlenecks facing WASH in Pastoralist areas:**

- Water for pastoralists is not currently prioritized as the animal demand far outstrips human making provision more of a livestock than a human issue.
- Remote areas are very challenging needing a wide range of technology options e.g. sand dams, rock catchments, earth dams.

The regions decide the criteria for allocation of funds on the basis of equity but it should be noted that there is “No equity in not doing anything”. School WASH is a costly package so it’s difficult to spread too thinly.

It was noted that where there has been EU-UNICEF intervention there is genuine shift in staff moral and performance which is a big support to business process re-engineering. There has also been a notable change in the regional bureau.

c. **Efficiency**

i. **The Case for Expanded support through woredas**

There was a general consensus that implementation through woredas is more effective than the region with general agreement that woredas can manage direct transfers having the capacity for most activities particularly hand-dug wells but not drilling. It was agreed that woredas can manage contracts but that there is a case for continuing regional management to cluster drilling and to minimise transit time and maximise the drilling.

ii. **The threat from insisting on 5% upfront**

It was suggested that 5% could reduce efficiency of service delivery as witnessed in the WB supported woredas where communities raise money but then have to wait their turn. It was generally agreed that the 5% cash contribution was particularly appropriate for operation and maintenance post construction.
iii. **Supply Chains**  
It was noted that there are serious supply chain bottlenecks in remote woredas.

iv. **Slow Cash transfer and liquidation**  
It was noted that time is a serious constraint with the cash transfer system slow at different stages including the bank holding onto funds and not informing woredas of the arrival. Liquidation is therefore challenging. UNICEF staff spending a lot of time on administration, particularly accounts.

v. **CLTS – an efficient use of resources**  
It was noted that the UNICEF/CLTS/HEP alignment has been efficient because the systems are in place to support the process.

vi. **Minimising bureaucracy**  
It was agreed that there was bureaucracy at the Woreda level and that the number of steps should be minimised as the woreda has its own priorities which might be at odds with UNICEF. It was noted that ORDA/German Agro action are slow (not so efficient) but effective and that these are the efficiently traded-offs.

vii. **Efficiency through economies of scale**  
It was suggested that the piped schemes in Kedida Gamela had been efficient in terms of economies of scale but that in some places there were huge distances between schemes. There was also concern that some schemes are not fully utilised and therefore neither and efficient not an effective use of resources.

d. **IMPACT**

i. **Inventory**  
It was reported that the inventory provides a good picture of both functionality and use.

ii. **MTE verification**  
There was discussion about household survey and in particular reported use of latrines and the team explained that the enumerators after administering the questionnaire were tasked to visit the facilities to verify the stated usage.

iii. **Health Indicators**  
- It was noted that health improvement is difficult to measure and therefore much better to use the proxy behaviour indicators of facility use and hygiene practice. It was agreed that CLTS brings about change but the impact of that change will be a function of the strength of hygiene behaviour change.  
- It was reported that in areas where the project had been working there had not been any incidence of Acute Watery Diarrhoea outbreak. It was suggested that absence of AWD could be a useful indicator.

e. **SUSTAINABILITY**

i. **Definition**  
The issue of defining sustainability was discussed. It was agreed that sustaining the process was crucial which would be a function of government ownership of the process.

ii. **CLTS post-triggering – sustaining latrine use and ODF status**  
It was recognised that with CLTS there is a risk of defaulting from ODF status making it a real challenge to maintain levels.

iii. **Key factors in maximising sustainability**  
- proper planning, empowered community
- expressed demand with appropriate technical options
- high quality construction
- Well-trained committed WASH committees equipped with the necessary skills to manage the scheme and conduct appropriate operation and maintenance – The issue of WASH-Co legal status was discussed as well as how to provide sustainable incentives. The idea of a WASH Co federation was discussed with suggestions of institutionalising options - WASH Co of the month awards – institutionalisation. The inventory requires inputs from the WASHComs and these will be an important indicator of WASH Co sustainability.
- It was noted that WASHComs either run by or dominated by women are most likely to work. E.g. Multi village management by women – E.g. Dalocha WASHCO. Women’s capacity to manage There is considerable prestige in WASH Co leadership
- It was recognised that WASH Co selection criteria are important and how little was known about the reasons for WASH Co drop out and therefore how to avoid it. Important to be clear about WASH Co’s responsibility not just about paying the guard.
- Regular Woreda WASH follow up – supportive supervision is essential

iv. **Limited scheme life**

It was noted that the cost of scheme replacement is not factored into the process or consideration of options for upgrading so that households can move up the ladder to better standards of service. It was emphasised that a pump designed for less than 500 people but which is supplying many more can lead to over-use and breakdowns.

v. **Groundwater**

It was noted that increasing extraction (population increase being a factor) has a long term impact on ground water - emphasising the importance of managing water allocations (integrated water resource management) including regulating extraction. These issues should be addressed in the WASH PIM.

vi. **Visibility impacting on sustainability**

Concern was raised about the issue of visibility in the context of ownership - where a sticker is put on the pump, people may not feel it belongs to them and reduce their commitment to operation, maintenance and repair.
### Annex III

**Action Plan for MTE Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Summary of MTE Findings</th>
<th>Source of observation or finding</th>
<th>Action to be taken</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Responsible body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Increase Woreda absorptive capacity</td>
<td>MTE Report</td>
<td>Establish woreda WASH Team</td>
<td>Work in progress</td>
<td>WASH Sector Ministries + Bureaus supported by Development Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Implementation efficiency of private sector</td>
<td>MTE Report</td>
<td>Establish a minimum WASH package (not less than $50,000 per woreda)</td>
<td>Additional fund raising will continue in 2010 to augment EU+RR Woreda allocations</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Increase efficiency of fund transfer and liquidation</td>
<td>MTE Report; Workshop discussion record</td>
<td>Undertake Regional capacity mapping for local procurement in an effort to decentralize procurement</td>
<td>Capacity mapping in all Regions before end 2010</td>
<td>UNICEF to support study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure WASH POs develop FACE request with counterparts before submission</td>
<td>Introduce practice during EFY 2003 AWP preparation and request</td>
<td>UNICEF + Regional Counterparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Successful women’s empowerment</td>
<td>MTE Report</td>
<td>Maximize women’s role in WASHCOs with special guidance provided to Woredas</td>
<td>Work in progress; will reinforce effort starting 2010</td>
<td>Sector Bureaus supported by UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Slow progress of School WASH</td>
<td>MTE Report, Workshop discussion record</td>
<td>a. Get more funding for School WASH</td>
<td>a. Work in progress</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Carry out institutional WASH inventories and expand WASH in schools</td>
<td>b. To be undertaken with national roll-out in 2010</td>
<td>Government with support of development partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Partner with NGOs and private sector to expand school WASH capacity</td>
<td>c. On going</td>
<td>Government supported by UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Complete WASH in schools guidelines and manual</td>
<td>d. Guideline completed; dissemination to follow in May-June 2010</td>
<td>UNICEF in close consultation with sector Ministries/Bureaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low private sector development</td>
<td>MTE Report, Workshop discussion record</td>
<td>a. Maximize the use of local private sector to support implementation by linking with the CDF approach</td>
<td>a. Work in progress to start implementing in late 2010</td>
<td>Government supported by UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Consider moving towards a phased approach to community water supply involving the private sector as a facilitator (WSG model)</td>
<td>b. Long term plan; will consider inclusion in the new Country Programme</td>
<td>Government in EU-UNICEF supported Woredas, supported by UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Slow funding streams.</td>
<td>MTE Report</td>
<td>a. Establish a formal tariff model based on actual cost for different levels of service and technology</td>
<td>a. Beginning 2011</td>
<td>Government with support from UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Consider introduction of the CDF approach as a means to ensure sustainable community WASH management.</td>
<td>b. Work in progress to start implementing in late 2010</td>
<td>UNICEF to support piloting in selected project woredas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Summary of MTE Findings</td>
<td>Source of observation or finding</td>
<td>Action to be taken</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Responsible body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>WASH inventory is an important tracking device and useful resource</td>
<td>MTE Report; Workshop discussion record</td>
<td>Take the WASH inventory and report cards to scale in all EU-UNICEF supported Woredas</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
<td>Government with support of UNICEF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7   | Sustainability – (WASHCOs, supply chains, environmental challenges)                     | MTE Report, Workshop discussion record | a. Continue to advocate for the legalization of WASHCOs  
b. Formalize the roles and responsibilities of WASHCOs linked to tariff structures  
c. Reinforce existing mechanisms to offer CWS the level of service and technology linked to capital + recurrent costs  
d. Work with government to establish supply chain with the engagement of the private sector  
e. Develop more environmentally sustainable options including Ecosan and water conservation | All beginning from May 2010 through end 2011 | UNICEF on advocacy  
Government supported by UNICEF  
Government supported by UNICEF  
UNICEF along with other development partners  
Government supported by UNICEF |
| 8   | The added value – take to scale innovative approaches (CLTS, self supply)              | MTE Report, Workshop discussion record | a. Continue to scale up CLTS with a system to independently verify ODF Kebeles and report back  
b. Roll-out Hand Washing strategy linking to Task Force Recommendations  
c. Establish self supply benchmarks to help set up measurable indicators for quantifying the number of people having access to safe water supply/ recognized as contributing to the UAP target. | a. Work in progress  
b. On going  
c. On going | UNICEF to support scale up + independent verification  
Government supported by UNICEF  
UNICEF in supporting the study + advocating to Government on enhanced recognition + applying standards |
| 9   | Alignment with the WASH programme – National PIM                                      | MTE Report, Workshop discussion record | Continue to support harmonized process focusing on new PASDEP (II); a rationalized PIM and revised Programme aligned with PASDEP | Work in progress          | UNICEF                                               |
### Major changes during project implementation; Reasons for changes; and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Budget for the action</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Planned amount (2007-2009)</th>
<th>Achieved in 3 years</th>
<th>% achieved</th>
<th>Main reason(s) for the observed change &amp; Recommendations</th>
<th>Previously Reported to EC (Yes/No)</th>
<th>If reported, when?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community training and Awareness raising (hygiene promotion)*</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>1,262,534</td>
<td>1,373,593</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>Significantly higher no. of people have been trained than planned due to the introduction &amp; scaling up of the CLTS approach in all the Regions. This approach is resulting in more beneficiary numbers than if implemented through conventional method. This approach will be important throughout the remaining project period.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Year 3 technical report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>WASHCOs, Caretakers training</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>5,676</td>
<td>6,344</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>WASHCO training forms an integral component of Community Training. It is reported separately to illustrate Government’s emphasis to reinforce longer term sustainability of community managed WASH facilities. The trainings included re-training of former as well as training of newly established WASHCOs. Due to emphasis on Community &amp; WASHCOs Training combined, the total expenditure is about 67.5% of 5 year allocation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Year 3 technical report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>School Water Supply</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>The total No. of school WS is higher than planned due to change in focus to do more on school WASH. Unit cost of school WS is higher than planned due to global price increases. The three years expenditure is 100.5% of the 5 year allocation. Discussion with EU is suggested to agree on future course.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Year 2 and Year 3 technical reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>School WASH Clubs</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>The number of school WASH clubs (established &amp; trained) has increased significantly in the 3rd year due to increased recognition by government of their contribution to sustainability of WASH facilities in schools. The total expenditure so far is about 178% of 5 year allocation. The need for budget adjustment is suggested in the 3rd technical report</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Year 3 technical report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Training of teachers on H&amp;S</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>167%</td>
<td>Overall, more school teachers were trained than planned. EU-UNICEF financial analysis (Aug. 2006-Dec. 2009) shows UNICEF is over budget (335.4%). However, the 5 year allocation for this activity was relatively small – €14,280. UNICEF should discussion with EU on future course.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Year 2 and Year 3 technical reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Budget for the action</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Planned amount (2007-2009)</td>
<td>Achieved in 3 years</td>
<td>% achieved</td>
<td>Main reason(s) for the observed change &amp; Recommendations</td>
<td>Previously Reported to EC (Yes/No)</td>
<td>If reported, when?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>HDW Construction</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>141%</td>
<td>a) Actual unit rate is higher than planned for the last two consecutive years because of global economic crisis; b) total no. of HDWs constructed higher than planned due to shift to low technology option (as result of field investigations). In terms of financial utilization, 3-year expenditure is 46% of 5 year allocation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Year 2 and Year 3 technical reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spot spring Development</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>177%</td>
<td>Actual unit rate was generally lower than planned in the two years this activity was implemented. Counterparts chose springs over other water sources based on detailed investigations. Financial expenditure is about 16% of 5 year allocation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Year 2 and Year 3 technical reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of WS schemes</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>471%</td>
<td>No. of rehabilitated/maintained water schemes is considerably higher than planned due to government direction to bring down the proportion of non-functional water schemes. As a result, the three year expenditure is 118% of 5 year allocation. Discussion with EU is needed on future course.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Year one through Year 3 technical reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Supply and installation of hand pumps</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>Generally, the total no. of HPs procured in three years is slightly higher than planned. The unit cost of hand pumps has continued to increase as a result of the global economic crisis. Total 3 year expenditure is about 104% of 5 year allocation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Year one through Year 3 technical reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>