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WSUP’s citywide surveys

- Bangladesh
  - Dhaka
- Kenya
  - Nakuru
- Zambia
  - Lusaka
- Mozambique
  - Maputo
- Madagascar
  - Antananarivo
  - Mahajanga
  - Toliara
WSUP’s citywide surveys

- Baseline surveys within **WSUP’s Business Plan 2016-2020**
- End-line in 2019/2020
- Strong understanding of **water and sanitation service levels**
- Estimate proportion of people in **JMP ladder categories**
- Mainly focused in **low-income areas** across the 7 cities
- **600 to 1,200 households** per city
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Methodology I

- **mWater** online data collection tool

- Questionnaire with **over 100 closed-ended** questions
  - Water, sanitation, FSM, menstrual hygiene management, handwashing and poverty likelihood assessment

- **Third party data** for estimations of safely managed services
  - Key informant interviews with city council, utilities and regulators
  - Water quality testing
  - Literature reviews
Methodology II

- **Systematic spatial sampling** (very accurate maps of low-income communities required)
- 1,210 households
- 11 enumeration areas with **110 households** each
  - 9 groupings of low-income communities
  - 1 middle-income community
  - 1 high-income community
- **Not-proportional** to population size (accurate population data is not always available)
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Nakuru

2,046,395 (population projection for 2017)
Population growth: 4.5% per annum
50% of the population lives in low income communities

Key overall results for low-income communities in Nakuru:

- 91.3% basic water services
- 61.21% limited sanitation services
- 19.8% basic handwashing services
- 80% have access to piped water on premises
- 39.89% connected to sewer system
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Sanitation service ladders by low-income area
Sanitation service ladder by likelihood of poverty
Usage arrangement for sanitation facilities

Main usage arrangement

- Communal off premises
- Communal on premises
- Household toilet
- Public facility

Graph showing the percentage of people using different sanitation facilities based on the likelihood of poverty.
Main user interface

- Bucket latrine
- Flush/pour flush
- Improved pit latrine
- Linear (Unimproved pit latrine)
- Expon. (Flush/pour flush)
- Expon. (Improved pit latrine)

### Communal off premises
- Unimproved pit latrine: 18.54%
- Improved pit latrine: 41.36%
- Household toilet: 40.1%

### Communal on premises
- Unimproved pit latrine: 7.273%
- Improved pit latrine: 51.97%
- Household toilet: 51.97%

### Household toilet
- Unimproved pit latrine: 4.322%
- Improved pit latrine: 77.29%
- Household toilet: 77.29%
Number of households sharing communal sanitation facilities

- Viwanda Menengai
- Viwanda London
- Bondeni Kivumbini
- Free Area Kiratina
- Free Area Free Area
- Bondeni Baharini
- Rhoda
- Katembwo

% people using shared sanitation facilities on premises

Number of people sharing the facilities

Communal on premises

Number of households sharing communal facilities
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Drinking water service ladders

88.2% covered by NAWASSCO
Drinking water service ladders by likelihood of poverty
Drinking water services: daily and weekly water supply

63% experience problems during the dry season
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How can the WASH sector get better at “tracking inequalities”?

- Overall aggregates are useful for global monitoring of progress
- There are dramatic differences in quality of service within those considered “poor”
- Further disaggregation of data is required
- Need to identify key indicators to monitor inequalities within low-income areas
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