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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
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
Usage arrangement for sanitation facilities

Main usage arrangement

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

Chart showing the percentage of people using different sanitation arrangements based on the likelihood of poverty.
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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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