**charity: water MAP Framework Results**

Post-Implementation Monitoring YEAR

Partner Country

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Executive Summary has the highest-level summary of the results of the Post Implementation Monitoring evaluation.

Introduction

* PARNTER conducted a water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) evaluation of [NUMBER] communities that had previously been served by charity: water grants between [YEAR] and [YEAR] in the [REGION/LOCATION] of [COUNTRY]. This included [NUMBER] charity: water funded water points (% of TYPE and % of TYPE).
* In [MONTH, YEAR], surveys were conducted at communities, water points, and households. Water point samples were tested for *E. coli*.

Results

* **Drinking water access** was… fill in short summary (5 sentences max)
* **Drinking water quality** was …. fill in short summary (5 sentences max)
* **WASH Management**… fill in short summary (5 sentences max)

Conclusions

* Bullet 1
* Bullet 2
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1. INTRODUCTION

[Fill in short description of the historical work that the program has implemented with charity: water funding, including a table or description of the years funded, approximate number of projects and type of projects, and dollars invested]

[Fill in some brief information about the methodology used overall. Here is an example that can be edited:

PARTNER conducted a water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) evaluation of communities that had been previously served by charity: water funding from [YEAR] – [YEAR] in the [REGION] of [COUNTRY]. These projects include those that were constructed or rehabilitated by [PARTNER] with charity: water funding. The methodology for the evaluation followed the Post-Implementation Monitoring (PIM) methods of the MAP Framework.]

2. METHODS

2.1 Survey Methods

**Site Selection**

charity: water selected sites randomly and provided them to [PARTNER]. Sites were selected by simple random sampling from the database of projects implemented by [PARTNER] with charity: water funding between 1-10 years prior.

**Survey Methods**

[Fill in methods used, such as the different surveys random household selection method. Here is an example that can be edited to match what was done:

In each community, enumerators conducted one community survey with a community leader or water committee member. They then conducted a water point survey at one water point funded by charity: water within that community, and collected water samples for water quality analysis. Enumerators then surveyed six households in each community that were intended daily water users of the surveyed water point. Household were selected either by simple random sampling with a random number generator from a list of households provided by a water committee member (if available), or by semi-random sampling by spinning a bottle on the ground to indicate direction, and interviewing households in that direction, selected by skipping a set number of households. Household surveys were performed preferentially with female heads of household after respondents provided informed consent. ]

2.2 Water Quality Test Methods

[Fill in the sampling and water testing methods used. Here is an example that can be edited:

Enumerators collected water samples directly from each surveyed water point if water was available. Microbiological testing on samples from water points was performed with the Aquagenx Compartment Bag Test most probable number (MPN) technique. Enumerators collected water point samples directly from the water point. Samples were processed on site, and carried in a cooler to a field location where they were incubated in an incubator at 35 degC for 24 hours.]

2.3 Data Analysis

[Fill in brief description of who did data cleaning and analysis, and what software was used.]

3. RESULTS

3.1 General Survey Results

Visited Sites and Completed Surveys

[Fill in Text about how many sites were visited and how many surveys were done. Include any description of any difficulty in locating the selected sites]

Demographics and Overall Characteristics

[Fill in summary statistics about some of the following relevant information: survey respondents, community population, water point types surveyed, household family sizes and respondent gender and age, and any other relevant general information]

3.2 Community WASH Program Results

Program indicators for community WASH services are presented together in Table 1. Indicators are also presented thematically in the subsequent sections, grouped as: 1) water access 2) water quality, and 3) WASH management indicators.

Table 1: Program indicators for community WASH services

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **WATER ACCESS** |  |
| **Survey** | **Indicator** | **N** |  |  |
| Household | N (%) of households reporting their primary water point is an improved1 source | # | # | (%) |
| N (%) of households with basic service (using an improved primary water point within 30 minutes collection) | # | # | (%) |
| N (%) of households reporting their primary water point is reliable (has no seasonal shortages, and shutdowns are communicated) | # | # | (%) |
| Median (range) per capita volume of water collected by households (L/person/day) | # | # | (# - #) |
| Median (range) household water collection time per trip (minutes)2 | # | # | (# - #) |
| N (%) of households reporting the charity: water funded water point as their primary water point | # | # | (%) |
| Water point | Median (range) number of users per water point | # | # | (#) |
| Median (range) reported time to repair last water point breakdown (days) | # | # | (#) |
| N (%) water points with water available on the day of visit | # | # | (#%) |
| N (%) water points fully functional on the day of visit3  | # | # | (#%) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **WATER QUALITY** |  |
| **Survey** | **Indicator** | **N** | **n** | **(%)** |
| Water point | N (%) of water points with low diarrheal disease risk water (*E. coli* <10 MPN/100mL) | # | # | (#%) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **WASH MANAGEMENT** |  |
| **Survey** | **Indicator** | **N** | **n** | **(%)** |
| Community | N (%) of communities with an operational WASH committee or Private Operator4 | # | # | (#%) |
| N (%) of communities where WASH committees report having financial savings | # | # | (#%) |

Notes:

1 Improved water points as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program

2  Water collection time includes round-trip walking time, plus queueing time for one trip to collect water.

3 Fully functional is defined as providing sufficient quantity of water (20 L in 5 minutes), with no breakdowns or dry periods reported in the previous 14 days.

4 An operational WASH committee or Private Operator is defined as one with a basic level for three indices: administration (has a responsible member and has met within six months, or has vendors designated for each water point), finance (collects user fees), and maintenance (knowledge of someone available for water system repair).

3.2.1. Water Access

Water Access: Source Type and Users Indicators

The median number of people per water point was X (range: X – X,000 people, n=x).

Overall, X% of households reported their primary water point was an improved source, and X% of households reported having basic service, or an improved water point within 30 minutes’ collection time.

In total, X% of households reported that the charity: water funded water point was their primary water source (n=X).

Additional Source Type and Users Information

Text and graphs

Water Access: Collection Time and Quantity Indicators

The median total time households reported spending to collect water from their primary source was X minutes (range: X minutes – X hours, n=X), including walking and waiting time.

Households reported collecting an average of X liters per person per day (range: X – X L/person, n=X).

Additional Collection and Quantity Information

Text and graphs

Water Access: Reliability and Functionality Indicators

Overall, X% of households reported that their primary water source is reliable, which is defined as a source that does not experience seasonal dryness and that any management shutdowns are communicated.

Of the X water points visited, X% had water available at the time the survey was done, and X% were fully functional. Water point functionality categories are defined below.

Of X water points reported to have been broken within the past year (or longer ago), the median time to repair was X days (range: X days – X years).

The water point functionality definition used by charity: water for this monitoring effort is defined below in Table 2. This was adapted from the USAID / Sanitation and Water for All Draft Standards for Monitoring Functionality of Communal Water Points, which was intended to be developed as industry standard definition.

Table 2: Functionality definition

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Functionality** **Category** | **Definition** |
| Abandoned | Broken down for >1 year |
| Not Functional | Not providing water today, but has been functional within previous 12 months |
| Partially functional 2 | Delivers insufficient quantity (<20L within 5 min), but no downtime in the last 14 days |
| Partially functional 1 | Delivers sufficient quantity (20L within 5 min), but downtime experienced in the last 14 days |
| Fully Functional | Delivers sufficient quantity (20L within 5 min) and no downtime in the last 14 days |

Additional Reliability and Functionality Information

Text and graphs

Water Access Results Summary

* Bullet 1
* Bullet 2

3.2.2 Water Quality

Water Point Water Quality Indicators

Of X water point samples tested for *E. coli*, X% had undetectable *E. coli* (<1 MPN/100 mL), X% were categorized as low risk (1 – 10 MPN/100 mL), X% were categorized as medium risk (11 – 100 MPN/100 mL), and X% were categorized as high risk with >100 MPN/100 mL *E. coli*.

Additional Water Quality Information

Text and graphs

Water Quality Summary

* Bullet 1
* Bullet 2

3.2.5 WASH Management

WASH Management Indicators

Overall, X% of communities reportedly had a WASH committee, and X% of communities had operational WASH committees.

Overall, X% of communities had a WASH committee that reported having financial savings.

Additional WASH Management Information

Text and graphs

Administrative management components

Text

Maintenance components

Text

Financial management components

Text

WASH Management Summary

* Bullet 1
* Bullet 2

4. RESULTS SUMMARY

This summary section includes summarized results about each category of program indicators.

4.1 Water Access

Drinking water access was \_\_\_\_\_\_ in these communities.

* Bullet 1
* Bullet 2

4.2 Water Quality

Drinking water quality was \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ in the charity: water funded water points.

* Bullet 1
* Bullet 2

4.3 WASH Management

WASH management in these communities was \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

* Bullet 1
* Bullet 2

5. CONCLUSIONS

Text