

# **Methodology for the reporting of small scale rural water and sanitation programmes' outputs**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The lack of access to safe water and basic sanitation in developing countries remains one of the biggest obstacles to foster human development. Improving access to these basic services has been present in the international agenda since the 70's, being reinforced with the Target 10 from Millennium Development Goals (UN,2000), and more recently, by the declaration by United Nations of the period 2005-2015 as the Water Decade for Action (UN, 2004)

International water and sanitation sector has been recently analyzed (Jiménez, 2007). One of the points identified is that political situation in many developing countries is oriented to decentralization and devolution of responsibilities to local institutions and final users, mainly in the rural areas. International aid programmes have been normally designed and implemented from an up-bottom approach, while local institutions and final users have been traditionally targeted by NGOs projects. This fact gives such projects some qualities that justify the interest of describing them:

- a. They can provide grass root data for the sector, in terms of:
  - Practical difficulties to implement national policies
  - Real time and costs required for implementation
  - Definition of appropriate level of services
  - Adaptation of strategies to different local contexts
- b. They can serve as pilot projects to develop new approaches in the sector.

Moreover, they can be quantitatively important, since they amount up to 20% of total sector expenditure in some African countries (Mehta et al, 2005). Thus, analyzing these NGO's approaches is an important task for the sector in many countries. However, it is difficult since NGO's projects are usually off the national budget, and implemented by hundreds of different actors; normally no adequate reporting to sector's institutions in the country has taken place, thus making the inclusion of results and lessons learned impossible for the sector.

This work focuses in providing a basic common framework for reporting these rural water and sanitation projects. The proposal is based on the accumulated experience of the NGO's sector. Some categories as those proposed by ODCE to classify ODA water programmes are used (ODCE, 2006). The tool does not aim to serve for evaluating purposes, but to provide simple basic data that can help having an overview about scopes, methodologies, level of services and costs of the different NGO's programmes. Extension of such reporting tool would facilitate the integration of small scale programmes into national's and donor's sector information, thus deepening in those considered more interesting. An example of its possible use is given comparing two water and sanitation programmes implemented by the Spanish NGO Ingeniería Sin Fronteras in Tanzania and El Salvador.

## **2. METHODOLOGY**

The methodology proposed to analyze NGO's rural W&S programmes includes both context and program's information. Regarding the context, it is important to provide a brief description of the programme: objectives and methodology as well as some

relevant background information from the country and region of implementation. An example of relevant information to be provided is listed in Table 1.

COUNTRY GENERAL INFORMATION	ECONOMICAL INFORMATION
Human Development Index	% GDP needed for W&S MDG
Gross Domestic Product	%GDP dedicated to Water and Sanitation
% Rural population	SECTOR
% access to water	Sector strategy: main features
% access to sanitation	Annual reports on the sector
LEGISLATION	Analysis of institutions in place
Main features of Water Policy	Private sector & other agents participation
Main features of Sanitation Policy	SPECIFIC RELEVANT INFORMATION ABOUT THE AREA OF INTERVENTION
Roles and responsibilities of main actors	Geographical, institutional, social, etc...

**Table 1:** List of relevant background information.

When describing the programme itself, the aim is to standardize as much as possible the programme's components, in order to provide a comparable picture of different interventions. It is proposed to:

- a. Split all the programme activities into 14 subcomponents.
- b. Describe level of service of the programme for each of the subcomponents (if included in the project).
- c. Quantify outputs and beneficiaries for each component.

Table 2 provides the division in components proposed for rural water and sanitation programmes. Once this data is available, two immediate analyses can be done:

- a. Compare costs per beneficiary and level of service with international standards available.
- b. Analyze strategy of intervention and program's focus compared to the national situation.

Some subcomponents have not been split in options for kind of technology or activity, since possibilities might be wide and some programmes can provide useful new approaches to them.

Besides, comparative analysis, in terms of methodology, main goals, and costs per unit can be made among different programmes in the same or different countries.

An example of the use of the tool and its usefulness is provided in the following section.

COMPONENT	KIND OF TECHNOLOGY/ACTIVITY	LEVEL OF SERVICE	OUTPUTS	BENEFITED POPULATION	COSTS
WATER	Rainwater	Number people per water point & Maximum distance to water point	Number of facilities under each category	Number of beneficiaries under each category	cost per type of technology / activity
	Spring Protection				
	Shallow well+ Handpump				
	Borehole+Handpump				
	Motorised Pump				
	Motorised Scheme				
	Gravity Scheme				
Others (specify)					
PUBLIC SANITATION	Pit latrine with slab	number of users per facility	Number of facilities under each category	Number of beneficiaries under each category	cost per type of technology / activity
	VIP Latrine				
	Ecological Sanitation				
	Pour-Flush latrine				
	Connection to public sewer or septic tank				
	Others (specify)				

PRIVATE SANITATION	Pit latrine with slab	Number of people/latrine & maximum distance to latrine	Number of facilities under each category	Number of beneficiaries under each category	cost per type of technology / activity
	VIP Latrine				
	Ecological Sanitation				
	Pour-Flush latrine				
	Connection to public sewer or septic tank				
Others (specify)					
ENVIRONMENTAL SANITATION	Garbage disposal	number users/facility & maximum distance to facility	Number of facilities under each category	Number of beneficiaries under each category	cost per type of technology / activity
	Grey water filters				
	Water handling facilities				
	Improved cooking facilities				
	Others (specify)				
HYGIENE PROMOTION	Mass campaigns	Number beneficiaries/hygiene promoter	Number of sessions of each type received per family	Number of beneficiaries under each category	cost per type of technology / activity
	Groups sessions				
	Family training				
	Continued promotion				
	Others (specify)				
SERVICES MANAGEMENT	Technical training for O&M	Entities trained, organized, legalized and/or months of regular functioning supported	Number of water/sanitation entities under each type	Number of beneficiaries under each category	cost per type of technology / activity
	Managerial training				
	Management entity trained and organized				
	Management entity trained, organized and legalized				
	Continued support to Management entity				
Others (specify)					
PLANNING	Local W&S plans	W&S plans redacted, budgeted, approved and/or incorporated into national plans	Number of villages/districts with W&S plan	Number of beneficiaries under each category	cost per type of technology / activity
	Districtal, Regional W&S plans				
	Others (specify)				
ENVIRONMENT & WATER RESOURCES	Awareness	Specify	Number people & area covered by actions	Number of beneficiaries under each category	cost per type of technology / activity
	Situation assesment				
	Protection measures				
	Regeneration Measures				
	Others				
INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT	Specify	Specify	Specify	Number of beneficiaries under each category	cost per type of technology / activity
CAPACITY BUILDING	Specify	Specify	Specify	Number of beneficiaries under each category	cost per type of technology / activity
GENDER	Specify	Specify	Specify	Number of beneficiaries under each category	cost per type of technology/acti vity
HIV/AIDS	Specify	Specify	Specify	Number of beneficiaries under each category	cost per type of technology / activity
PRO-POOR/EQUITY	Specify	Specify	Specify	Number of beneficiaries under each category	Cost per type of technology / activity
PARTICIPATION	Specify	Specify	Specify	Number of beneficiaries under each category	Cost per type of technology / activity

**Table 2:** Detailed description of rural W&S programme into subcomponents

### **3. CASE STUDY: ISF IN TANZANIA AND EL SALVADOR**

The poster provides an example of how the methodology proposed can be implemented in two very different contexts and programmes, executed by the Spanish NGO Ingeniería Sin Fronteras (ISF) in Tanzania and El Salvador.

### **4. CONCLUSIONS**

Political situation in many developing countries is oriented to decentralization and devolution of responsibilities to local institutions and final users, mainly in the rural areas. International aid programmes have been normally designed and implemented from an up-bottom approach, while local institutions and final users have been directly targeted by NGO's projects. These interventions feed the sector with grass root information, show policies' implementation difficulties and might suggest new approaches. Hence, a significant level of detail is necessary when analyzing them. This paper has proposed a simple way to report these projects and their expected results. A broader use of it would determine the improvement of the tool and boost its usefulness. Two examples of water and sanitation programmes in rural areas of Tanzania and El Salvador have been analyzed and compared as a case study. It shows how this kind of tool can help to interpret different implementation strategies, compare levels of service provided in different contexts, as well as analyze cost's differences per region.

Water and sanitation sector is plenty of NGO's actions that have been quite unknown up to date. Information about components, costs and level of service are insufficiently described. Nowadays, a new culture of informing and reporting is taking place in developing actions. This opportunity has to be seized to develop a standard way of informing actions (such as what ODCE database hosts for Official Development Assistance programmes) that can facilitate analysis, and therefore, improvements both in policy orientations and in implementation strategies.

### **5. REFERENCES**

Jiménez A. & Pérez-Foguet A., 2007: International investment in the water sector: last decade evolution and perspectives. XIII World Water Congress; International Water Resources Association. September 2008. Accepted for publication.

Mehta M, Fugelsnes T, Virjee K, 2005: Financing the Millennium Development Goals for Water and Sanitation: What Will it Take? Water Resources Development, Vol. 21, No. 2, 239–252, June 2005

OECD. 2006 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development: Development Statistics.

Portal [www.oecd.org/topicstatsportal/0,2647,en\\_2825\\_495602\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/topicstatsportal/0,2647,en_2825_495602_1_1_1_1_1,00.html). Last visit August 2006.

United Nations, 2000: Resolution A/55/L.2, "United Nations Millennium Declaration", 18 September 2000.

United Nations, 2004; United Nations declaration 58/217.

United Nations Development Program, 2005: Human Development Report, 2005.  
[www.undp.org/](http://www.undp.org/) Last Visit August 2006.

Water and Sanitation Program, 2006: Getting Africa on track to meet the MDGs on water and sanitation. [www.wsp.org](http://www.wsp.org) . December 2006.