

## THE EQUITABLE ACCESS SCORECARD

Supporting policy processes to achieve the human right to  
water and sanitation

### SYNTHESIS SCORECARD REPORT

#### FIRST DRAFT

This is the first draft of the Synthesis Scorecard Report. The Synthesis Scorecard Report will be the key deliverable of the Ad-Hoc Expert Group. This draft will be discussed in the second meeting of the Ad-Hoc Expert Group, to be held in Paris on 15-16 May 2013.

The report presents a self-assessment tool designed to support countries in the pan-European region to establish a baseline and track their progress in achieving equitable access to water and sanitation. This tool is being developed in the context of the implementation of the Protocol on Water and Health to the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes.

This first draft of the Synthesis Scorecard Report builds on the third draft of the Scorecard, developed after the discussions held at the first meeting of the Ad-Hoc Expert Group in September 2012, as well as on the experiences from testing the draft Scorecard in France (Greater Paris urban area), Portugal and Ukraine in January-March 2013.

Sections 2, 3, and 4 are new. (Section 2 is based on the Executive Summary of the “No One Left Behind” publication). The major changes to the scorecard are highlighted in yellow.

Please send any written comments by 24 May 2013 to:

Chantal Demilecamps (UNECE Secretariat): [chantal.demilecamps@unece.org](mailto:chantal.demilecamps@unece.org)

Roberto Martín-Hurtado (consultant): [roberto\\_martin@hotmail.com](mailto:roberto_martin@hotmail.com)

## Table of contents

1. INTRODUCTION .....	4
<b>2. EQUITABLE ACCESS TO WATER AND SANITATION</b> .....	5
The challenge of ensuring equitable access.....	5
International obligations to achieve equitable access.....	6
Steering governance frameworks to ensure equitable access .....	6
Reducing geographical disparities.....	7
Ensuring access for vulnerable and marginalized groups .....	7
Keeping water and sanitation affordable for all .....	8
<b>3. HOW TO USE THE SCORECARD</b> .....	10
Strategic Guidance – Organising a self-assessment exercise and communicating the results	10
Practical Guidance – Notes for filling the scorecard .....	12
Glossary of key terms.....	14
<b>4. COUNTRY EXPERIENCES IN USING THE SCORECARD</b> .....	18
France (greater Paris urban area) .....	18
Portugal.....	19
Ukraine .....	20
5. THE SCORECARD.....	23
Country/Region Profile.....	23
Section 1. Steering governance frameworks to deliver equitable access to water and sanitation.....	24
Area 1.1 Strategic framework for achieving equitable access .....	25
Area 1.2 Sector financial policies .....	26
Area 1.3 Rights and duties of users and other right-holders .....	28
Section 2. Reducing geographical disparities .....	29
Quantitative information on geographical disparities .....	30
Area 2.1 Public policies to reduce access disparities between geographical areas.....	31
Area 2.2 Public policies to reduce price disparities between geographical areas .....	33
Area 2.3 Geographical allocation of external support for the sector .....	34
Section 3. Ensuring access for vulnerable and marginalized groups .....	35
Quantitative information on vulnerable and marginalised groups .....	36
Area 3.1 Public policies to address the needs of vulnerable and marginalised groups.....	37
Area 3.2 Persons with special physical needs .....	39
<b>Area 3.3 Users of health facilities</b> .....	40

Area 3.4 Users of educational facilities.....	41
Area 3.5 Users of retirement homes.....	42
Area 3.6 Users of prison facilities and refugee camps.....	44
Area 3.7 Persons without a fixed or stable residence.....	45
Area 3.8 Persons living in housing without water and sanitation.....	46
Area 3.9 Persons without access to water and sanitation in their workplaces.....	48
Section 4. Keeping water and sanitation affordable for all .....	49
Quantitative information on affordability .....	50
Area 4.1 Public policies to ensure affordability .....	51
Area 4.2 Tariff measures .....	52
Area 4.3 Social protection measures .....	53
Summary Sheet .....	54

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Access to water and sanitation has been recognised as a human right by the United Nations General Assembly and the Human Rights Council. This means that ensuring access to water and sanitation for all is a legal binding obligation and that progressive steps have to be taken primarily by States to fulfil that obligation. In order to comply with this obligation, special attention needs to be paid at an early stage to ensure that access to water and sanitation is equitable for all members of the population.

In the pan-European region, around 110 million people do not have access to safe drinking water and sanitation. The Parties to the UNECE/WHO-EURO Protocol on Water and Health have committed to ensure equitable access to water and sanitation. In 2012, the Working Group on Water and Health launched the publication “No One Left Behind”, which presents policy options and good practices to ensure equitable access to water and sanitation, and agreed to develop a tool to support countries in their efforts to monitor progress.

This document aims to support the implementation of policies and practices to uphold the human right to water and sanitation under the principle of “progressive realization”. Its specific objective is to support governments (and other stakeholders) in establishing a baseline, tracking progress, and prompting discussions on further actions to be taken in order to achieve equitable access to water and sanitation.

The overall message of the “No One Left Behind” publication was that we have at our disposal the policy tools to ensure that strong advances towards universal access to water and sanitation are not made at the expense of putting at the end of the “access queue” those populations that require special attention. This document presents an analytical tool to help governments and other stakeholders to establish to what extent those policy tools are being deployed. It also presents guidance on how to use the analytical tool, based on the experience of three piloting exercises carried out in France (Greater Paris urban area), Portugal and Ukraine.

The tool takes the form of a scorecard. The scorecard has been designed as a self-assessment tool to be used both at the national and local (regional or city) levels. The scorecard does not aim to provide a fully comprehensive assessment of the extent to which water and sanitation is equitable in a country/region/city. Rather it focuses on selected issues and indicators that together could provide a solid (but not perfect) overview of the situation at different time points, and thus allow the tool to accomplish its specific aim.

Achieving equitable access and keeping access equitable is contingent on a well-functioning water and sanitation sector. The scorecard, however, only focuses on the issues directly related to equitable access outcomes and not on the overall functioning of the water and sanitation sector. The scorecard does not focus either on other circumstances that may impinge on access to equitable access and sanitation, such as water resources governance.

## 2. EQUITABLE ACCESS TO WATER AND SANITATION

Access to water and sanitation has been recognized as a human right by the UN General Assembly and Human Rights Council. This means that ensuring access to water and sanitation for all is a legal obligation. And in order to comply with the obligation of achieving water and sanitation for all, special attention needs to be paid at an early stage to ensure that access to water and sanitation is equitable for all members of the population. The publication “No One Left Behind” distinguished three key dimensions in the concept of equitable access to water and sanitation: geographical differences in service provided, discrimination or exclusion in access to services by vulnerable and marginalized groups, and financial affordability by users. The strong linkages between the provision of water supply services and the provision of sanitation services demand a holistic approach to promoting equitable access to water and sanitation.

In the pan-European region, the Parties to the UNECE/WHO-Europe Protocol on Water and Health have committed to ensure equitable access to safe drinking water supply and adequate sanitation, through accession to or ratification of the Protocol. There are currently important differences among countries of the pan-European region as regards ensuring equitable access to water and sanitation – this is the result of differences between countries in terms of availability of water resources, socio-economic development, historic levels of access, and public policies.

### The challenge of ensuring equitable access

Specific approaches are needed to redress inequities in access to water and sanitation. A person may lack access to water and sanitation simply because there is no access to safe water and sanitation in the community. Sometimes this is due to the degradation of water resources (scarcity, pollution), but more commonly to lack of or poor management of water and sanitation infrastructures. A community may have access to safe water and sanitation, but those services are not adapted to the particular needs of certain groups (e.g. disabled people), those services are not adequately available in the certain institutions that those groups rely on (e.g. schools, prisons, refugee camps) or certain groups (e.g. ethnic minorities, illegal settlers) may be denied access to water and sanitation due to unintended or intended discrimination practices. Finally, a person may have access but cannot afford to pay the water and sanitation bill without curtailing consumption of other basic goods and services.

Four contextual challenges frame current inequities to access in the pan-European region:

- **Water resources availability.** The degradation of the quality of water resources implies that many towns and villages that rely on local water sources do not have access to safe water, while water scarcity can deprive some towns and villages from access altogether. Polluted water can be treated to make it suitable for drinking purposes and freshwater can be brought over long distances, but these technical solutions can entail great expense that may render water and sanitation unaffordable.
- **Urban-rural gap.** Rural areas in the pan-European region have significantly lower levels of access to water and sanitation services than urban areas and may face higher water tariffs.

- People belonging to **vulnerable or marginalized groups** do not enjoy the same levels of access to water and sanitation than the rest of society. The situation differs across groups, such as persons with special physical needs (such as the disabled or the sick), those who rely on public facilities (such as travellers or the homeless), users of institutional facilities provided by institutions (such as hospitals, schools, prisons or refugee camps) or those living in non-sanitary housing.
- **Affordability** is a growing concern for all countries. For the poorest countries, either a large part of the population is devoting an important share of their income to pay for water and sanitation services, or they will be facing this situation as tariffs might increase to ensure financial sustainability. In EU countries, more stringent water quality objectives and progress towards full cost recovery also means that paying for water and sanitation services becomes a real concern for lower income families.

### International obligations to achieve equitable access

The human right to water and sanitation entitles everyone to water and sanitation which is available, accessible, affordable, acceptable and safe (UN General Assembly resolution 64/292, UN Human Rights Council resolution A/HRC/RES/15/9). As any other human right, a fundamental principle is non-discrimination, which opens space for positive discrimination measures to guarantee *de facto* equity. This principle can be used as justification to provide “first access” before improving the conditions of access for those that already have it.

The Protocol on Water and Health provides a sound framework for the translation of the human right to water and sanitation into practice, in particular through the setting of specific targets and target dates. In addition to other key components of the human right to water such as access to information, public participation and accountability provisions, the Protocol specifically commits its Parties to promote equitable access to water and sanitation.

Each country has the obligation to provide access to water and sanitation to all. Thus the brunt of the financial costs is to be borne primarily by national and local budgets. At the same time, both in relation to the application of human rights and the implementation of the Protocol, the international community acknowledge a legal obligation of assistance and cooperation.

Significant financial resources are already being devoted by the international community to improve access to water and sanitation, but there is the need to enhance the contribution of those resources to achieving equitable access.

### Steering governance frameworks to ensure equitable access

The realization of the right to water and sanitation requires political commitment and a long term vision of reaching those who do not yet have access. In many cases, current national and local water governance frameworks are failing to deliver equitable access for the following reasons: broader governance frameworks may limit or undermine efforts in the water sector; weak water governance and management results in poor sector performance, and current water governance frameworks are often “equity blind”.

Yet, good water governance and management can go a long way towards achieving equitable access objectives – examples include transparency and access to information, inclusive participation of stakeholders in decision-making, incentives for operators to improve efficiencies and keep costs down, and accountability and redress mechanisms effectively accessible to all people.

That is unlikely to be enough, however. Applying an “equitable access lens” will speed up progress. This does not necessarily require setting up new legal and institutional mechanisms and processes, since many existing mechanisms can be used to promote equitable access. It does require, however, a results-oriented action plan building on country situation analysis and context-specific equity indicators.

All water and sanitation stakeholders need to be engaged and roles and responsibilities identified and allocated. Water users must participate as key actors and not only beneficiaries. Transparency, access to information, education and participatory mechanism must be institutionalised to ensure equitable and sustainable outcomes, but the participation of the members of vulnerable and marginalized groups constitutes a real challenge in all countries and must be subject to great attention. Water operators need to be more responsive to delivering equitable access, and local government and civil society organisations need to play a greater role.

## **Reducing geographical disparities**

The levels of service received by users in different geographical areas within the same country can be very different. According to the UNICEF/WHO Joint Monitoring Programme, access to improved water and sanitation solutions in rural areas in the pan-European region are 10 percent points lower than those for urban areas. Rural households are many times more likely to lack access to pipe water at home than urban households. Access and price gaps between geographical areas can be attributed to underlying cost structures but also to political influence and decisions.

Reducing access gaps requires political, financial and technical efforts. International cooperation can play an important role in closing access gaps, by focusing support on the areas that each country has identified as lagging behind. Importantly, geographical disparities in access are not just a water policy issue, but also a regional policy issue.

Public policies have a fundamental role to play in reducing price disparities between geographical areas by: (i) targeting investment programmes and subsidies to areas with higher costs of service, (ii) enabling cross-subsidisation from high-income low-cost areas to low-income high-cost areas, and (iii) promoting efficiency and rational prices through sector organization reform and the use of information tools such as benchmarking and tariff reference values.

## **Ensuring access for vulnerable and marginalized groups**

Water and sanitation for all will not be achieved without paying particular attention to the needs of vulnerable and marginalised groups. Human rights principles highlight the need to

actively design water and sanitation policies that prioritise and address the needs of vulnerable and marginalised groups, rather than treating all persons as facing identical challenges in accessing safe water and improved sanitation. Water and sanitation for vulnerable and marginalised groups is often a social exclusion issue not just a water issue.

There are many vulnerable and marginalised groups, each with their own needs and facing different barriers to achieve equitable access, and thus requiring differentiated solutions. It is important for policy-makers and implementers to dedicate time and resources to identifying vulnerable and marginalised groups, to reviewing whether they are being included, and to ensuring that their particular needs are being taken into account.

In many cases, adequate solutions require an integrated response combining policies and ensuring collaboration across public agencies. Ensuring access to water and sanitation for vulnerable and marginalised groups requires targeted financial resources, but those are in many cases not massive in comparison with a country's water and sanitation budget – in a sense, it requires mostly increased awareness and specific focus among policy makers and technical staff.

### **Keeping water and sanitation affordable for all**

To achieve equitable access to water and sanitation, it is also necessary to ensure that the bill paid for water and sanitation services is affordable. In Western European countries, increases in water and sanitation costs (due primarily to higher wastewater treatment requirements) have been and will continue to be reflected on water and sanitation bills. In Eastern European countries, where water prices have been traditionally low, the water bill is likely to increase. Affordability is thus a common and increasing concern in the pan-European region, although with differences among countries, and requires adopting a long-term strategy in each country.

Affordability concerns are not merely linked with tariff levels; they are actually driven by five sets of variables: the income level and income distribution in a given country or area, the cost of provision in any given country or area, the subsidy policies in place, the tariff policies in place, and the individual behaviour of users. Compliance with national affordability indicators is not enough to ensure that the groups of low income people in each country have affordable access - specific policies need to be developed to that end. Affordability is not just a water issue; it is a social protection issue that requires incorporating water and sanitation aspects within social policy discussions.

There are many policy options available to deal with affordability concerns, both in-tariff and out-of-tariff. Criteria to select them should include their effectiveness in reaching the target groups and their demands in terms of administrative capacity and costs. Relying only on tariff design is not enough to ensure affordability: social tariffs and social protection measures are required. The adoption of social tariffs and social protection measures requires the existence of a "social policy infrastructure". The options to address affordability concerns will demand financing from other water users or from tax-payers. User-financed systems are under increasing pressure and may be reaching their limits in some cases. And water governance

matters in terms of policy options – for example: fragmentation of service provision in many service areas – limits the scope for cross-subsidies between users.

### 3. HOW TO USE THE SCORECARD

#### Strategic Guidance – Organising a self-assessment exercise and communicating the results

The scorecard presented in this document has been conceived as a tool to support the progressive realisation of the human rights to water and sanitation by supporting the inclusion of equitable access dimensions in existing policy processes. This section provides guidance on how to carry out a self-assessment exercise that uses the scorecard as a supporting analytical tool. The guidance is based on the experience of the three pilot exercises. However, this guidance should not be understood as a “straitjacket”. Countries need to organise the self-assessment exercise taking into account their objectives, constraints and opportunities.

**1. Identify the objectives of the self-assessment exercise.** In principle, a self-assessment exercise can have multiple objectives. Most often the primary objective will be to influence an existing policy process. The policy process being targeted will have an influence in the timing of the self-assessment exercise, as well as on the outputs of the exercise. There may be additional (secondary) objectives and it is worth identifying them in order to inform the design of the self-assessment exercise. Examples of secondary objectives include: achieve a better understanding of the situation and challenges, identify information and policy gaps, raise awareness among traditional and non-traditional stakeholders, identify relevant stakeholders and create links with them, identify opportunities for better coordination between complementary policy measures.

**2. Take the necessary time, but not more.** The pilot exercises were developed in around six months, but one lesson is that a more realistic timeframe will be one year. Key milestones could include: the organisation of a launching workshop (month 2), the completion of a report with the preliminary findings (month 7), the organisation of a “findings” workshop to discuss the findings (month 8), and the organisation of a policy event to present a publication (month 11). It is thus necessary to identify when is the right time to provide input to the policy process that the self-assessment intends to influence, and work backwards the timing of the self-assessment exercise.

**3. Put together a balanced “self-assessment core team”.** It is highly preferable that the leading organisation of the self-assessment is a government agency with a mandate. Even if the leading organisation is very competent, it is unlikely to have in-house the broad diversity of expertise necessary to complete the self-assessment. A more balanced core team may be achieved by partnering with other organisations that have complementary expertise and contacts (for example in the areas of social issues) or by contracting out to experts the preparation of specific chapters of the self-assessment exercise. In any case, it is advisable to develop terms of reference for the core team members, including responsibilities for analysis and the development of recommendations.

**4. Ensure continuous multi-stakeholder involvement.** This is important both to increase the quality of the product and its potential impact. A first category of stakeholders is represented by the different government ministries and agencies that have an influence on equitable access outcomes. They can be asked, through formal channels, to fill the relevant sections of

the scorecard. Indeed, the scorecard has been designed to make this possible. A second category of stakeholders is represented by civil society organisations (CSOs). It is advisable to develop a structured approach to gather inputs from CSOs -- CSOs working on social issues have relevant input to provide but they may not see the usefulness of taking part in the self-evaluation exercise. One option is to have as part of the core "self-assessment team" one organisation with good contacts among CSOs that can take the lead in gathering their input.

**5. Plan the workshops carefully.** In order to ensure the early involvement of the different stakeholders, a half-day "launch workshop" explaining the rationale, objectives, process and expected outcomes of the self-assessment exercise. The launching workshop can be useful in identifying additional stakeholders that should be involved in the self-assessment exercise. (For practical reasons, the half-day workshop could be immediately followed by another half-day working session of the self-assessment core team.). It is critical to organise a "findings workshop" to present interim results, gather additional information, identify reform options and discuss possible recommendations. Such a workshop could take place over 2 days (or 1 day with parallel working sessions) in order to provide enough time for discussion and allow all stakeholders to intervene meaningfully. The different topics could be presented by the experts that have led the preparation of the different chapters/sections of the document under discussion. It is important that the workshop is perceived as a technical event where stakeholders can feel "safe" when voicing their concerns and opinions.

**6. Use the results of the scorecard for strategic evaluation and priority-setting.** The scorecard is a useful tool to develop a rather comprehensive overview of existing policy measures to address inequities in access to water and sanitation. This means that it is particularly strong as an aid to set priorities, in terms of filling information and policy gaps. This also means that it is rather time-consuming to produce, and as a consequence it is not recommended as an annual monitoring tool. The tool is not designed to evaluate individual policy measures -- rather, evaluations of existing policy measures would be necessary to support the scorecard assessment. The results of the self-assessment exercise can be used to identify which individual measures should be prioritised for follow up as well as for future evaluation of progress in their implementation. It is suggested that the cycle of self-evaluation should mirror that of the policy process that it tries to influence -- for example, the preparation of 5-year strategic plans for the water and sanitation sector.

**7. Present the results in attractive formats.** The scorecard is fundamentally a tool to gather, organise and evaluate existing information. It includes a "summary sheet" to facilitate the communication of the results. The "summary sheet" is useful to identify, at a high level of aggregation, areas of action that lag behind. However, the scorecard by itself is not a good communication tool to reach a non-specialised audience.. It is thus recommended to elaborate a "situational analysis" of about 10 pages that summarises the main findings of the scorecard, provides examples of progress, identifies priority areas for urgent action, and suggests specific recommendations. An even shorter "policy summary" of less than four pages would be a useful communication to try to reach top government officials and for communicating the results to the public through the mass media.

**8. Use the results to track progress, not to compare with others.** The tool has been designed to help a country (or region) to track its own progress towards equitable access. The tool has not been designed to establish comparisons between countries (or regions), as the pan-European region includes countries (or regions) with very different levels of socio-economic development and organization of the water and sanitation sector. Analysts wishing to establish those comparisons are encouraged to use the context data offered in the Country/Region Profile in order to identify suitable countries/regions peers for comparison.

## Practical Guidance – Notes for filling the scorecard

**Background information.** Background information on equitable access issues can be found in the UNECE/WHO publication “No One Left Behind”. The introduction to each section of the scorecard indicates the relevant section in the “No One Left Behind” publication that relates to each Area of Action.

**Glossary.** The next section of this document presents a short glossary to define key concepts used throughout the scorecard. It is worth highlighting two issues:

In this document, the expression “access to water and sanitation” includes four of the five dimensions that define the human rights to water and sanitation: *availability*, *accessibility*, *acceptability*, and *quality/safety*. It does not include *affordability* because that dimension is addressed specifically in section 4 of the scorecard.

This document refers to the expression “equitable access to water and sanitation”, since this is the wording in the Protocol on Water and Health. Some experts favor the expression “equality and non-discrimination”. While there are some differences of connotation, those two expressions can be considered equivalent from a practical perspective.

**Structure of the tool.** The tool includes a brief country profile (which focuses on quantitative data to help put in context the results) as well as four sections addressing broad themes. The four thematic sections are further subdivided in areas of action – which focus on the actions taken to improve equitable access.

**Quantitative information.** To the extent possible, the source of quantitative information should be official statistics. When information on financial resources is requested (and if your country does not use the Euro as official currency), please express the answer both in Euros and in the official currency.

### Scoring methodology.

- Progress under each Area of Action is measured through qualitative questions. The number of questions varies between 2 and 6.
- Each question requires one answer. (There are four possible answers: *No / To a little extent / To a large extent / Yes*). The table below provides guidance on how to interpret each possible answer. Respondents are encouraged to spread the responses along the four possible scores, in order to avoid clustering all the responses in the “To a little extent” and “To a large extent” categories.
- Each answer has to be justified. In order to justify the answer, respondents can use quantitative or qualitative information from legal documents, guidance documents,

analytical reports, surveys, or similar sources. In order to provide the justification, respondents are encouraged to use as much space as needed.

- The reliability of each answer has to be self-evaluated (see below).
- One summary score has to be calculated for each Area of Action. This score has to be calculated taking into account the score for each question as well as the number of questions under each Area of Action. Only answers with a HIGH or MEDIUM degree of reliability should be considered when calculating the summary score.
- The summary score has to be reproduced in the summary sheet.

SCORE	INTERPRETATION
No	No or very little evidence supporting a positive answer is available, neither at national nor local level.
To a little extent	There is some limited information at local level supporting a positive answer. There is some limited information at national level partly supporting a positive answer.
To a large extent	There is extensive information at the local level and some at the national level supporting a positive answer.
Yes	There is enough evidence available at national level fully supporting a positive answer
<b>Note:</b> The terms “information” and “evidence” in this table must be interpreted as any relevant qualitative or quantitative information underpinning the response to a question	

**Reliability assessment methodology.** The tool asks to self-evaluate the reliability associated to each of the answers provided. It is not the reliability of the data that has to be evaluated. Rather, it is the reliability of the process of gathering and reporting the data that has to be evaluated.

- There are three possible levels of reliability: High (Very Reliable), Medium (Reliable), Low (Unreliable).
- The criteria to be considered for assigning a degree of reliability are: procedures, traceability, and validation.
- The table below provides guidance on how to assign a level of reliability, according to those criteria.
- The aggregate level of reliability for each Area of Action will be determined as follows:
  - HIGH – if all the answers in the Area of Action are classified as HIGH
  - MEDIUM – if no answer is classified as LOW and at least one answer is classified as MEDIUM
  - LOW --- if at least one answer is classified as LOW
- The aggregate level of reliability for each Area of Action has to be reproduced in the summary sheet.

HIGH: Very reliable	MEDIUM: Reliable	LOW: Unreliable
There is a coherent and easily	Responsibilities for data	Responsibilities for data

<p>accessible set of documents that identifies responsibilities for data gathering, treatment and quality control.</p> <p>The data can be traced to a formal source that is accessible to any interested person.</p> <p>The data have been formally validated.</p>	<p>gathering, treatment and quality control have been identified.</p> <p>The data can be traced to a source.</p> <p>The data have been validated.</p>	<p>gathering, treatment and quality control have not been identified.</p> <p>Not all the data can be traced to a source.</p> <p>Not all the data have been validated.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> The term “data” in this table must be interpreted as any relevant qualitative or quantitative information underpinning the response to a question</p>		

**Non-relevant questions.** Not all questions within each area of action are equally relevant to all countries/regions in the pan-European region. If those responsible for filling the scorecard part consider that a particular question is not relevant, they are encouraged to justify why that is the case.

**Summary sheet.** The summary scores for the 18 areas of action are presented in a summary sheet at the end of the document. The summary sheet can help to identify the areas of action where the country (or region) is lagging behind, as well as areas where the information available is particularly unreliable.

## Glossary of key terms

**Access to water and sanitation.** In this document access to water and sanitation refers to effective access to the services irrespective of whether access is ensured through connections to public networks or through private solutions. As used in this document, “access to water and sanitation” includes four of the five dimensions that are required under the human rights to water and sanitation: *availability, accessibility, acceptability, and quality/safety*. It does not include *affordability* because that dimension is addressed specifically in section 4 of the scorecard.

**Accountability.** In a human rights context, accountability encompasses monitoring mechanisms and remedies. For the rights to water and to sanitation to be realized, service providers and public officials must be accountable to users. Promoting accountability involves, inter alia, developing effective monitoring bodies and processes; devising sound indicators for assessing progress, affordability, and the fair and equitable distribution of water and sanitation resources according to needs; creating reliable, accessible and effective judicial and administrative complaints mechanisms that allow individuals to air and satisfactorily redress their grievances; and promoting good governance.

**Affordability.** Access to sanitation and water facilities and services must be accessible at a price that is affordable for all people. Paying for services, including construction, cleaning, emptying and maintenance of facilities, as well as treatment and disposal of faecal matter, must not limit people’s capacity to acquire other basic goods and services, including food,

housing, health and education guaranteed by other human rights. Accordingly, affordability can be estimated by considering the financial means that have to be reserved for the fulfillment of other basic needs and purposes and the means that are available to pay for water and sanitation services.

**Development partners.** In a development co-operation context, it refers to the range of partners that support a government from a transition or developing country to design and implement its development agenda. Those partners include bilateral development co-operation agencies (e.g. the Swedish International Development Agency), international financial institutions (e.g. the World Bank), international technical co-operation institutions (e.g. UNECE) and international non-governmental organizations (e.g. Global Water Partnership).

**Drinking water.** Water which is used, or intended to be available for use, by humans for drinking, cooking, food preparation, personal hygiene or similar purposes (see also [Safe Drinking Water](#)).

**Equitable access to water and sanitation.** In the context of this document, it refers to a situation defined by access outcomes that are similar for all people irrespective of where they live, whether they belong to vulnerable or marginalized groups, while their associated costs remain affordable for all users.

**GDP.** It stands for Gross Domestic Product. It represents an indicator of the size of an economy measured through the value of the goods and services produced. In this document, it should be indicated whether GDP data provided is expressed in nominal (current year) terms or in real terms (after correcting for inflation).

**Institutionalised persons.** It refers to those people that are in prison, whether they have received a final sentence or not.

**Lowest quintile, lowest decile.** The distribution of income or wealth in a country is usually analysed by dividing the population in five or ten groups according to their level of income or wealth. When the number of groups is five each group represents a “quintile”; when the number of groups is ten, each group represents a “decile”. The “lowest quintile” refers to the group with the lowest income or wealth, when society is divided in five groups. The “lowest decile” refers to the group with the lowest income or wealth, when society is divided in ten groups.

**Non-discrimination.** Non-discrimination is central to human rights. Discrimination on prohibited grounds including race, colour, sex, age, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, physical or mental disability, health status or any other civil, political, social or other status must be avoided, both in law and in practice.

**Peri-urban areas.** Areas that are adjoining to urban areas, located between the suburbs and the countryside.

**Poverty line.** Value that indicates the minimum level of income of an individual that is considered adequate. Official poverty lines definitions and values vary from country to country.

**Progressive realization.** States must take measures towards the progressive realization of the rights to water and sanitation. This requires concrete and targeted steps to the maximum of their available resources. States are required to move towards the goal of full realization as expeditiously and effectively as possible, within the framework of international cooperation and assistance, where needed. Certain aspects of these rights are immediate obligations, including the requirement to guarantee them without discrimination.

**Progressive tariff systems.** It refers to tariff systems where the tariff per cubic meter increases with volume consumed – it is usually articulated by defining three or more blocks of water consumption and applying a different tariff to each block.

**Public financial resources.** Financial resources supplied by governments (whether national, regional or local). The origin of the funds is mostly general taxation (e.g. income or VAT tax) but also includes other sources, such as the provision of services by government departments (e.g. licensing charges) and borrowing (e.g. issuing government bonds).

**Remedial actions.** In this document, actions taken to correct a situation where the human rights to water and sanitation were not respected. Victims of human rights violations are entitled to adequate reparation, including restitution, compensation, satisfaction and/or guarantees of non-repetition. States have to provide accessible, affordable, timely and effective remedies. While administrative remedies will be adequate in many cases, a right of judicial appeal as a last resort is often appropriate and sometimes indispensable.

**Right-holders.** In the context of the human rights to water and sanitation, it refers to every person. The difference with “water and sanitation users” is that some people do not have access to water and sanitation, and thus they cannot be considered users, but they are right-holders because they hold the right to get access.

**Safe drinking water.** Safe drinking water is water with microbial, chemical and physical characteristics that meet WHO guidelines or national standards on drinking water quality.

**Sanitation** means the collection, transport, treatment and disposal or reuse of human excreta or domestic waste water, whether through collective systems or by installations serving a single household or undertaking. States must ensure without discrimination that everyone has physical and economic access to sanitation, in all spheres of life, which is safe, hygienic, secure, socially and culturally acceptable, provides privacy and ensures dignity. Depending on the culture, acceptability can often require privacy, as well as separate facilities for women and men in public places, and for girls and boys in schools. Facilities will need to accommodate common hygiene practices in specific cultures, such as for anal and genital cleansing. And women’s toilets need to accommodate menstruation needs.

**Self-service.** Situation in which households provide themselves the service for water and sanitation, often because they live in areas where there is no service provider.

**Service providers.** Public or private institution that operate water supply and/or sanitation systems.

**Social tariffs.** Tariffs that include a discount for certain individuals or households due to their social characteristics (such as age, certified disability, or number of persons in the household)

**Tariff reference values.** In some countries, central authorities overseeing the water and sanitation sector have published “tariff reference values” to provide a reference on what is the expected level that water and sanitation tariffs should reach. They provide useful information to customers as well as to water and sanitation service providers, without infringing in the allocation of tariff-setting responsibilities (which usually remains at the local level).

**Vulnerable and marginalized groups.** Groups composed of individuals that have a particularly hard time exercising their rights to water and sanitation as a result of living in vulnerable situations, or suffering discrimination or stigma (or a combination of those factors). Groups and individuals who have been identified as potentially vulnerable or marginalized include, inter alia, women, children, inhabitants of (remote) rural and deprived urban areas as well as other people living in poverty, refugees and internally displaced persons, minority groups (such as Roma people), indigenous groups, nomadic and traveller communities, elderly people, persons living with disabilities, persons living with HIV/AIDS or affected by other health conditions, people living in water scarce-regions and sanitation workers amongst others. In the process of identifying groups and individuals who are disadvantaged, States need to survey the population based on these grounds and investigate further when they find that certain groups are discriminated against. In the context of this document, vulnerable and marginalised groups include (among others) the homeless, nomads, the disabled, school children, hospitalized patients, people living in prisons and refugee camps, and people without secure tenure. While gender issues related to access to water and sanitation must be taken into consideration to ensure equitable access, this document does not treat women as a vulnerable or marginalized group on its own.

## 4. COUNTRY EXPERIENCES IN USING THE SCORECARD

### France (greater Paris urban area)

Over the last decade, the city of Paris has paid special attention at issues related to equitable access to water and sanitation. Many of the measures undertaken in this period are reflected in the publication “No One Left Behind”. The city of Paris considered that the piloting of the scorecard could help them to assess critically where they stand and what more could be done, and thus volunteered to be one of the pilot exercises.

The city of Paris covers a population of about 2.2 million people and is the centre of a metropolitan area that exceeds 10 million inhabitants (with a GDP per capita above EUR 48,000 in 2011) For this reason, early on in the process the city of Paris considered that it would be more meaningful to undertake the pilot exercise at a regional scale. Accordingly, they engaged the Ile de France Water Union (SEDIF – which provides water for 149 municipalities and more than 4.3 million people through its operator Veolia Eau d ‘Ile de France) as well as the wastewater treatment interdepartmental authority for the greater Paris urban area (SIAAP – which services 180 municipalities) in addition to the city of Paris operator Eau de Paris. As a consequence, the region for the study does not correspond to the administrative region of Ile-de-France, rather it corresponds with the combined service areas of the three institutions (city of Paris, SEDIF and SIAAP). The combined budget for water and sanitation services exceeds EUR 2.1 billion. In January 2013, the three institutions produced a first draft of the scorecard.

The self assessment exercise included three phases. First, Paris, SEDIF and SIAAP searched for the information to justify the scores and filled the scorecard, but did not assign scores. Secondly, a stakeholder workshop was organised on 18-19 February 2013 to discuss the evidence and assign scores. Finally, a revised version of the scorecard, incorporating the workshop feedback, together with a situational analysis and a critical assessment of the self-evaluation process was produced in April 2013.

The process of initial data gathering helped the three institutions (city of Paris, SEDIF and SIAAP) to realise that there are some important data gaps, in particular regarding vulnerable and marginalised groups. Before the study, it was understood that the main problem is not access to the service but affordability (avoid disconnection for people who cannot pay for the service), and thus many of the measures in place are aimed at addressing this problem. The area of study is highly urbanised and does not display major disparities in access between geographical areas. In the course of the study, however, it became evident that an important (and often overlooked) problem is that of access of vulnerable and marginalised groups.

The stakeholder workshop helped stakeholders to bring to the table and share with others their knowledge of existing measures and remaining challenges. This included the challenges faced by communities settled in camps without regular access to water and sanitation, or that of poor workers that cannot afford a permanent residence. It was thought that the 2-day technical workshop gave enough time to discuss the issues at the right level of depth, allowing

time for all stakeholders to voice their opinions in a non-threatening environment -- this is important because access to water and sanitation is a highly political issue in France.

The tool and the pilot exercise were judged positively by all stakeholders. The outcome is a first self-assessment and quite detailed overview on access to water and sanitation. The assessment has allowed identifying shortcomings, and will provide an opportunity to define priority actions to address them. The self-assessment exercise proved to be time-consuming but worthwhile. It is not recommended to use the tool for regular monitoring and reporting.

Given the range of relevant stakeholders, the process needs to be participatory. The study team considered that it was useful to have a first phase where a core team completed the questionnaire. One additional phase that could be introduced is a period for bilateral meetings with stakeholders, soon after the self-assessment has been launched. A stakeholder workshop to share and discuss the results would still be necessary.

One of the benefits of the process has been the contacts made between the technical community (water and sanitation agencies and service providers) and the social affairs community. This has enriched the assessment. Perhaps more importantly, the consolidated list of contacts will be an important asset in the process of defining and implementing specific measures to ensure equitable access to water and sanitation. It was recommended that the final version of the tool includes an annex listing the experts and institutions involved in the assessment.

As regards next steps, one of the possible options is to use the results of the self-assessment as an input to the formulation of the next generation of National/Regional Plans for Health and Environment.

## Portugal

Over the last two decades, Portugal has gone through a process of reform of the water and sanitation sector. This included the creation of water regulator (Water and Waste Services Regulation Authority - ERSAR), which has limited powers but growing influence. The implementation of the right to water and sanitation is a concern for ERSAR, and they have been since 2011 a main contributor to the work on equitable access to water and sanitation carried out within the Protocol framework. Many of the relevant measures undertaken by Portugal are reflected in the publication "No One Left Behind". ERSAR considered that the piloting of the scorecard could help them to find ways to better integrate the right to water and sanitation within the new strategic plan for the Portuguese water and sanitation sector, which will be drafted during 2013.

Portugal is a country with just over 10 million inhabitants and with an average per capita income of about EUR 16,000 per year. In Portugal, access to water and sanitation is considered universal since the population has access to either public or private solutions. Since water and sanitation services are a municipal responsibility, the aggregation of information at the national level is challenging, and this has an impact on the formulation of national policies.

The self-evaluation exercise was completed in four phases. First, ERSAR requested other relevant government agencies to fill the relevant parts of the scorecard in January 2013.

Secondly, ERSAR proceed to compile and complete the justification and the scoring. Thirdly, ERSAR organised a one-day stakeholder workshop on 25 February to discuss the results. Finally, ERSAR prepared a revised version of the scorecard, together with a situational analysis derived from the scorecard results, and a critical assessment of the self-evaluation process.

Overall, the Portuguese team endorsed the tool and the need for an inclusive self-evaluation process. They consider that the draft scorecard is very complete and detailed on all aspects related to water and sanitation. At the same time, its level of detail makes filling it a time-consuming exercise. It may be thus appropriate to carry out such an exercise every time that a new strategic plan for the water and sanitation sector is going to be prepared, but not more often than that.

The self-evaluation process has highlighted the need to improve the collection of sound and audited information regarding access to water and sanitation services by vulnerable and marginalised groups. It has also highlighted the need to improve the collection of information at the national level regarding investments and financing to implement water and sanitation policies.

The process of identifying and reaching out to stakeholders has proven a challenge. ERSAR had good contacts with the “technical” stakeholders (in particular water and sanitation service providers), but was much less familiar with those dealing with social issues. At the stakeholder workshop, the presence of government agencies in charge of social affairs and social protection helped sector actors to learn about social measures in place. However, many non-traditional actors (particular non-government ones) that had been invited did not attend and those that attended were not very active. After the workshop ERSAR made additional efforts to reach out to those stakeholders. Raising awareness among traditional stakeholders (such as service providers) also represented an important effort.

The self-evaluation process has brought many benefits to ERSAR. ERSAR has now a better understanding of the issues – including information gaps, possible improvements in laws and regulations, and the difficulties faced by stakeholders working on the “social side”. Awareness of the issues has been raised among water sector stakeholders. ERSAR has collected useful input for the revision of the national strategic plan for the water sector. ERSAR is now better able to identify the right partners to develop initiatives in the area of equitable access to water and sanitation.

The self-evaluation process will likely prompt specific initiatives to address equitable access issues. ERSAR is considering setting the ground for an informal network of stakeholders from the water sector and from the field of human rights and social policies. ERSAR may develop a recommendation for operators on good practices in ensuring the human right to water and sanitation. Relevant government bodies may also develop recommendations on good practices in relevant social policy areas (such as workplace, schools, and health facilities)

## Ukraine

The Ukrainian environmental NGO “MAMA-86” has been working on water and sanitation issues for more than two decades, and has been an active participant in national and

international debates about improving access for all. They saw the pilot exercise as a possibility to increase the knowledge base and to raise the profile of equitable access issues in Ukraine. They approached the State Sanitary and Epidemiological Service (SSES), which received the proposal favourably, and together they requested financial support to carry out the pilot exercise. In addition to the main pilot exercise at the national level, "MAMA-86" decided to also test the approach at the local level through their branch in the city of Sevastopol (the results of the Sevastopol exercise are not included in this document).

Ukraine has a population of about 45 million inhabitants and a GDP per capita of less than EUR 2,600 in 2011. Over 24% of the population are below the national poverty line. Close to 70% of the population live in urban areas. Public financial resources spent in the water and sanitation sector in 2012 were about EUR 10 million. Ukraine has been party to the Protocol on Water and Health since 2003.

The self assessment exercise included three phases. First, SSES officially requested several government agencies to provide information. In parallel, MAMA-86 identified a handful of national experts and commissioned them to prepare answers for their areas of expertise. The work of the experts included an initial team meeting led by MAMA-86 and SSES to ensure that the experts understood the nature of the exercise and to clarify how to approach the task. Secondly, a stakeholder workshop was organised on 1 March 2013 to discuss the draft responses to the scorecard. Part of the one-day workshop was organised around parallel working groups dedicated to the different sections of the score card, which allowed for in-depth discussions. During the workshop misunderstanding where clarified and some scores corrected. Finally, a revised version of the scorecard, incorporating the workshop feedback, together with a situational analysis and a critical assessment of the self-evaluation process was produced in April 2013. The results are summarised in the next sections.

Overall, the expert team endorsed the methodology of self-evaluation. It considered that the topic was innovative and highly-relevant, and that the methodology was clear and adequate. They provided suggestions on how to improve the tool.

The process has worked reasonably well, but could be improved. The lead organization needs to be as clear as possible on who is expected to provide the information and who is to be consulted. An initial workshop to launch the process could help secure more involvement of government officials. A workshop to discuss the preliminary results would still be needed.

The process has been driven by an NGO, with full support from a government agency as well as financial support from UNECE to coordinate the pilot exercise, and with input from national experts. This has proven useful in terms of testing the methodology and raising the profile of the issues among academic experts and some government officials. In term of next steps, the team recommended next to communicate the results of the self-assessment to top government officials and to encourage them to develop specific proposals. Another recommended action was to publicise the results through mass media.

The self-evaluation results can influence a number of existing programmes. The State Sanitary and Epidemiological Service will look into how the results can influence the attention paid to sanitation issues. MAMA-86 organised a press conference on World Water Day 2013 to share

the outcomes and raise awareness on this problem in Ukraine. MAMA-86 will use the results to inform their decade-old WASH and WASH-for-schools campaigns. The baseline study will be helpful to design possible projects. More broadly, the results could be used to lobby the government to provide fresh funding for the State Targeted Social Programme on priority measures to provided centralized water supply to the rural settlements supplied by transported water, as well as for approval of the draft State Programme on Sanitation. The results could influence as well the support of international development agencies for the water and sanitation sector by clarifying priority areas of action to address gaps in access to water and sanitation.

## 5. THE SCORECARD

### Country/Region Profile

<b>Socio-economic and sector data</b>			
	<b>2011 or latest available year (please indicate)</b>	<b>2006 (please choose another baseline year if it fits better with your national/regional processes)</b>	<b>Source (please use official statistics wherever possible)</b>
Population (inhabitants)			
Extension (km <sup>2</sup> )			
GDP per capita (EUR/person)			
% of population below national poverty line			
<b>% of population unemployed</b>			
% of population living in urban areas			
% of population living in peri-urban areas (ONLY if this category is relevant in your country/region)			
% of population living in rural areas			
Renewable freshwater resources (million m <sup>3</sup> per capita)			
% of population <u>without</u> access to safe drinking water			
% of population <u>without</u> access to wastewater collection			
% of population <u>without</u> access to wastewater treatment (any level)			
Public financial resources <u>spent</u> on the water and sanitation sector			
Public financial resources <u>spent</u> in ensuring equitable access to water and sanitation			
<b>International obligations on water and sanitation</b>			
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Is the country party to 1966 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)?			
Is the country party to the 1999 Protocol on Water and Health?			

## Section 1. Steering governance frameworks to deliver equitable access to water and sanitation

<b>Areas of action</b>	<b>Relevant section in the “No One Left Behind” document</b>
1.1 There is a strategic framework for achieving equitable access to water and sanitation	Section 3.1 Section 3.4
1.2 Sector financial policies contribute to achieving and maintaining equitable access	Section 3.1 Section 2.3
1.3 Users and right-holders can exercise their rights and are aware of their duties	Section 3.2

<b>Area 1.1 Strategic framework for achieving equitable access</b>				
<b>Rationale.</b> Although progress is achieved through individual initiatives, a strategic framework is needed to ensure that the whole water and sanitation sector (and the whole public administration more generally) contributes to achieving equitable access.				
	<b>No</b>	<b>To a limited extent</b>	<b>To a large extent</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>1.1.1 There is a strategic plan in place to ensure equitable access to water and sanitation</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>1.1.2 Equitable access targets have been set</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>1.1.3 Responsibilities for achieving equitable access have been identified and allocated</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>1.1.4 There are mechanisms in place to enable discussion and coordination by competent authorities</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>1.1.5 The country/region/city has assessed the equity of access to water and sanitation</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>Please calculate the score for Area 1.1</b> Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____ Divide the number of total points by 5 ____				
<b>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered</b> (please mark one option) High ____ Medium ____ Low ____				

<b>Area 1.2 Sector financial policies</b>				
<b>Rationale.</b> Financial resources will have to be spent to implement the initiatives needed to achieve the equitable access targets. At the same time, the overall policies steering sector revenue and expenditures may have large positive and negative impacts on achieving equitable access. In some countries, sector financing is dependent to a large extent on development partner support and there is scope to increase the contribution of this support to achieving equitable access.				
	<b>No</b>	<b>To a limited extent</b>	<b>To a large extent</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>1.2.1 The amount of financial resources needed to achieve equitable access to water and sanitation has been estimated</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>1.2.2 The sources of funding to achieve equitable access to water and sanitation have been identified</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>1.2.3 Financing strategies for the water and sanitation sector take equity issues into account</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>1.2.4 There are mechanisms in place to induce service providers to implement investment plans that favor providing access to those right-holders that lack it</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>1.2.5 The national/regional/city government monitors and publicly reports financial resource allocation</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				

<b>1.2.6 International financial support for the water and sanitation sector takes equity issues into account</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<p><b>Please calculate the score for Area 1.2</b>  Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____  Divide the number of total points by 6 ____</p>				
<p><b>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered</b> (please mark one option) High ____ Medium ____ Low ____</p>				

<b>Area 1.3 Rights and duties of users and other right-holders</b>				
<b>Rationale.</b> Water and sanitation users and right-holders should not be considered merely the beneficiaries of access to water and sanitation. They have roles to play in demanding, shaping, and maintaining equitable access to water and sanitation.				
	<b>No</b>	<b>To a limited extent</b>	<b>To a large extent</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>1.3.1 There are mechanisms in place to ensure that right-holders know their rights and obligations as well as how to access relevant information</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)  <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)  <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>1.3.2 There are mechanisms in place to allow right-holders to participate in the decision-making process concerning the level and quality of access that they receive</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)  <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)  <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>1.3.3 There are mechanisms in place to allow right-holders to seek redress and enforce remedial actions</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)  <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)  <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>1.3.4 There are mechanisms in place to allow right-holders to keep responsible authorities accountable</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)  <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)  <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>Please calculate the score for Area 1.3</b> Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____ Divide the number of total points by 4 ____				
<b>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered</b> (please mark one option) High ____ Medium ____ Low ____				

## Section 2. Reducing geographical disparities

<b>Areas of action</b>	<b>Relevant section in the “No One Left Behind” document</b>
2.1 Public policies to reduce access disparities between geographical areas	Section 4.1
2.2 Public policies to reduce price disparities between geographical areas	Section 4.2
2.3 Geographical allocation of external support for the sector	Section 2.3

## Quantitative information on geographical disparities

Provide the official definition of rural, urban and (if applicable) peri-urban areas in your country/region			
	2011 or closest year (please indicate)	2006 or closest year (please indicate)	Source (please indicate whether this is an official source)
Rate of access to water in urban areas (%)			
Rate of access to water in peri-urban areas (%) (ONLY if this category is relevant in your country/region)			
Rate of access to water in rural areas (%)			
Rate of access to sanitation in urban areas (%)			
Rate of access to sanitation in peri-urban areas (%) (ONLY if this category is relevant in your country/region)			
Rate of access to sanitation in rural areas (%)			
Public financial resources spent in reducing geographical disparities in access to water and sanitation (million EUR)			
Public financial resources spent in reducing geographical disparities in access to water and sanitation (EUR per capita)			
Public financial resources spent in reducing geographical disparities in access to water and sanitation (% of public budget spent on water and sanitation)			

## Area 2.1 Public policies to reduce access disparities between geographical areas

**Rationale.** Public policies play a major role in reducing disparities in access between geographical areas, and in particular in increasing access in rural areas. The disparities include those related to physical access and those related to the quality of the service.

	No	To a limited extent	To a large extent	Yes
<b>2.1.1 There is a public policy for reducing disparities between urban, peri-urban, and rural areas</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>2.1.2 Integrated approaches have been adopted to support the delivery of water and sanitation services in rural areas, informal settlements and slums</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>2.1.3 There are mechanisms in place to support the implementation of appropriate technical solutions for service delivery in rural, informal settlements and slums</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>2.1.4 There are mechanisms in place to support the implementation of appropriate technical solutions for self-provision of services by households in areas where there is no service provider</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>2.1.5 Sector policies mobilize sufficient financial resources to reduce the access gap in rural and peri-urban areas according to the established targets</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				

**Please calculate the score for Area 2.1**

1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) \_\_\_\_\_
2. Divide the number of total points by 5 \_\_\_\_\_

**Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered** (please mark one option) High \_\_\_\_ Medium \_\_\_\_ Low\_\_\_\_

<b>Area 2.2 Public policies to reduce price disparities between geographical areas</b>				
<b>Rationale.</b> Some geographical areas face higher prices than others. This may be due to higher levels of service, higher cost of service provision (e.g. due to expensive access to clean water sources, or to low density of population), less efficient provision of services (e.g. poor maintenance leading to higher cost, or too many staff per connection), or uneven distribution of public subsidies. Public policies can play a major role in reducing price disparities between geographical areas.				
	<b>No</b>	<b>To a limited extent</b>	<b>To a large extent</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>2.2.1 There are mechanisms in place to track prices as well as cost of provision of water and sanitation services</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)				
<b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)				
<b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>2.2.2 Price benchmarking tools (such as affordability indicators or tariff reference values) have been introduced</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)				
<b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)				
<b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>2.2.3 Public subsidies are targeted to those areas that face higher costs of service provision (not just higher prices)</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)				
<b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)				
<b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>2.2.4 The sector is organized to enable cross-subsidization between localities with high-cost and low-cost of service provision</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)				
<b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)				
<b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>Please calculate the score for Area 2.2</b> Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____ Divide the number of total points by 4 ____				
<b>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered</b> (please mark one option) High ____ Medium ____ Low ____				

<b>Area 2.3 Geographical allocation of external support for the sector</b>				
<b>Rationale.</b> In some countries, development partners (donor countries) are key providers of funding for water and sanitation infrastructure. There is often scope to reallocate the funding to accelerate access in geographical areas that lag behind.				
	<b>No</b>	<b>To a limited extent</b>	<b>To a large extent</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>2.3.1 Public authorities have identified in the sector plan the areas that are lagging behind plan and require external support</b>				
Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)				
Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)				
Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>2.3.2 There is international financial support to increase access in geographical areas that lag behind (as identified in the sector plan)</b>				
Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)				
Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)				
Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>Please calculate the score for Area 2.3</b> Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____ Divide the number of total points by 2 ____				
<b>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered</b> (please mark one option) High ____ Medium ____ Low ____				

### Section 3. Ensuring access for vulnerable and marginalized groups

Areas of action	Relevant section in the “No One Left Behind” document
3.1 Public policies to address the needs of vulnerable and marginalised groups	Section 5.1
3.2 Persons with special physical needs	Section 5.2
3.3 Users of health care facilities	Section 5.3
3.4 Users of educational facilities	Section 5.4
3.5 Users of retirement homes	Section 5.5
3.6 Users of prisons and refugee camps	Not discussed
3.7 Persons without a fixed and stable residence	Section 5.4
3.8 Persons living in housing without water and sanitation	Section 5.5
3.9 Persons without access to water and sanitation in their workplaces	Not discussed

## Quantitative information on vulnerable and marginalised groups

Please, provide the official definition of vulnerable and marginalized groups in your country/region/city			
	2011 or closest year (please indicate)	2006 or closest year (please indicate)	Source (please indicate whether this is an official source)
Rate of access to water in the country/region/city (%)			
Rate of access to water by the poorest fifth of the population (%)			
Rate of access to sanitation in the country/region/city (%)			
Rate of access to sanitation by the poorest fifth of the population (%)			
Percentage of water and sanitation facilities open to the public that are accessible to people with disabilities			
Percentage of schools that have sufficient and adequate water and sanitation services			
Percentage of hospitals that have sufficient and adequate water and sanitation services			
Percentage of prisons that have sufficient and adequate water and sanitation services			
Percentage of persons without a fixed residence that have access to water and sanitation through public facilities			
Number of people lacking access to water at home (while living in neighbourhoods where access is available)			
Number of people lacking access to sewer at home (while living in neighbourhoods where access is available)			
Public financial resources spent in ensuring access to water and sanitation by vulnerable and marginalized groups (million EUR)			
Public financial resources spent in ensuring access to water and sanitation by vulnerable and marginalized groups (EUR per capita)			

## Area 3.1 Public policies to address the needs of vulnerable and marginalised groups

**Rationale.** There are many vulnerable and marginalized groups, each with their own needs and facing different barriers to achieve equitable access, and thus requiring different solutions. Public policies, both in the water and sanitation sector and in other sectors, can play a major role in ensuring access. An integrated policy response needs to be articulated.

	No	To a limited extent	To a large extent	Yes
<b>3.1.1 There is a water and sanitation policy recognizing the special and differentiated needs of vulnerable and marginalized groups</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.1.2 Relevant policies in other sectors (e.g. social inclusion, social protection, education, health, prisons, housing) includes their role in ensuring access to water and sanitation by vulnerable and marginalize groups.</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.1.3 There are mechanisms in place to identify (in a participatory manner) and address the water and sanitation needs of vulnerable and marginalized groups</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.1.4 Public budgets provide specific funding to address the water and sanitation needs of vulnerable and marginalized groups</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				

<b>3.1.5 Integrated approaches (involving different administrations) have been adopted to support the delivery of water and sanitation services for vulnerable and marginalized groups</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<p><b>Please calculate the score for Area 3.1</b>  Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____  Divide the number of total points by 5 ____</p>				
<p><b>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered</b> (please mark one option) High ____ Medium ____ Low ____</p>				

<b>Area 3.2 Persons with special physical needs</b>				
<b>Rationale.</b> Many disabled, sick, and elderly people face problems in accessing water supply and sanitation services because of their specific physical needs.				
	<b>No</b>	<b>To a limited extent</b>	<b>To a large extent</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>3.2.1 There is data on levels of access to water and sanitation by persons with special physical needs</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>3.2.2 There is a public policy to ensure access to water and sanitation by persons with special physical needs</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>3.2.3 There is specific public funding to support access to water and sanitation by persons with special physical needs (such as for adapting home facilities)</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>3.2.4 There are technical standards that ensure the establishment of facilities accessible to persons with special physical needs</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>Please calculate the score for Area 3.2</b> Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____ Divide the number of total points by 4 ____				
<b>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered</b> (please mark one option) High ____ Medium ____ Low ____				

### Area 3.3 Users of health facilities

**Rationale.** Many people spend all or a significant part of their time in institutional facilities (which include kindergartens, schools, health facilities, retirement homes, prisons, and refugee camps), and they cannot secure independent access to water and sanitation.

	No	To a limited extent	To a large extent	Yes
<b>3.3.1 There is data on levels of access to water and sanitation in health facilities</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.3.2 There is a public policy to ensure access to water and sanitation by users of health facilities</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.3.3 There is specific public funding to support access to water and sanitation by users of health facilities</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.3.4 Health facilities have relevant complaint mechanisms in place</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.3.5 Health facilities have separate toilets for males and females as well as adequate facilities for menstrual hygiene management</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<p><b>Please calculate the score for Area 3.3</b>            Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____            Divide the number of total points by 5 ____</p>				
<p><b>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered</b> (please mark one option) High ____ Medium ____ Low ____</p>				

### Area 3.4 Users of educational facilities

**Rationale.** Many people spend all or a significant part of their time in institutional facilities (which include kindergartens, schools, health facilities, retirement homes, prisons, and refugee camps), and they cannot secure independent access to water and sanitation.

	No	To a limited extent	To a large extent	Yes
<b>3.4.1 There is data on levels of access to water and sanitation in educational facilities</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.4.2 There is a public policy to ensure access to water and sanitation by users of educational facilities</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.4.3 There is specific public funding to support access to water and sanitation by users of educational facilities</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.4.4 Educational facilities have relevant complaint mechanisms in place</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.4.5 Educational facilities have separate toilets for males and females as well as adequate facilities for menstrual hygiene management</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<p><b>Please calculate the score for Area 3.4</b>            Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____            Divide the number of total points by 5 ____</p>				
<p><b>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered</b> (please mark one option) High ____ Medium ____ Low ____</p>				

### Area 3.5 Users of retirement homes

**Rationale.** Many people spend all or a significant part of their time in institutional facilities (which include kindergartens, schools, health facilities, retirement homes, prisons, and refugee camps), and they cannot secure independent access to water and sanitation.

	No	To a limited extent	To a large extent	Yes
<b>3.5.1 There is data on levels of access to water and sanitation in retirement homes</b>				

**Score justification** (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

**Means of verification used:** (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

**Reliability of the response:** (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

<b>3.5.2 There is a public policy to ensure access to water and sanitation by users of retirement homes</b>				
---	--	--	--	--

**Score justification** (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

**Means of verification used:** (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

**Reliability of the response:** (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

<b>3.5.3 There is specific public funding to support access to water and sanitation by users of retirement homes</b>				
--	--	--	--	--

**Score justification** (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

**Means of verification used:** (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

**Reliability of the response:** (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

<b>3.5.4 Retirement homes have relevant complaint mechanisms in place</b>				
---	--	--	--	--

**Score justification** (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

**Means of verification used:** (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

**Reliability of the response:** (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

<b>3.5.5 Retirement homes have separate toilets for males and females</b>				
---	--	--	--	--

**Score justification** (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

**Means of verification used:** (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

**Reliability of the response:** (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

**Please calculate the score for Area 3.5**

Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) \_\_\_\_

Divide the number of total points by 5 \_\_\_\_

**Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered** (please mark one option) High \_\_\_ Medium \_\_\_ Low \_\_\_

### Area 3.6 Users of prison facilities and refugee camps

**Rationale.** Many people spend all or a significant part of their time in institutional facilities (which include kindergartens, schools, health facilities, retirement homes, prisons, and refugee camps), and they cannot secure independent access to water and sanitation.

	No	To a limited extent	To a large extent	Yes
<b>3.6.1 There is data on levels of access to water and sanitation in prison facilities</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.6.2 There is a public policy to ensure access to water and sanitation by persons institutionalized in prison facilities</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.6.3 There is specific public funding to support access to water and sanitation by persons institutionalized in prison facilities</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.6.4 Prison facilities have relevant complaint mechanisms in place</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.6.5 Prison facilities have separate toilets for males and females as well as adequate facilities for menstrual hygiene management</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<p><b>Please calculate the score for Area 3.6</b>            Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____            Divide the number of total points by 5 ____</p>				
<p><b>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered</b> (please mark one option) High ____ Medium ____ Low ____</p>				

### Area 3.7 Persons without a fixed **or stable** residence

**Rationale.** A number of people lack access to water and sanitation services not because their locality is not served or because they cannot afford them, but because they have no fixed dwelling to be connected to the water and sanitation networks. They include homeless persons, travelers, and nomadic communities. (The challenge of settlements of ethnic minorities is considered under area 3.5)

	No	To a limited extent	To a large extent	Yes
<b>3.7.1 There is data on levels of access to water and sanitation by persons without a fixed residence</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.7.2 There is a public policy to ensure access to water and sanitation by persons without a fixed residence</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.7.3 There is specific public funding to support access to water and sanitation by persons without a fixed residence</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<p><b>Please calculate the score for Area 3.7</b>            Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____            Divide the number of total points by 3 ____</p>				
<p><b>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered</b> (please mark one option) High ____ Medium ____ Low ____</p>				

### Area 3.8 Persons living in housing without water and sanitation

**Rationale.** People belonging to vulnerable and marginalized groups often live in housing without basic water and sanitation, even if they are located in neighborhoods/localities with access. The causes include situations of illegal tenure, low quality of rented accommodation, squatting, as well as discrimination of ethnic minorities. (The challenge of full localities without access is considered under area 2.1)

	No	To a limited extent	To a large extent	Yes
<b>3.8.1 There is data on lack of access to water and sanitation by households living in neighborhoods with access</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.8.2 There is a public policy to address the lack of access to water and sanitation by households living in neighborhoods with access</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.8.3 There is specific public funding to support access to water and sanitation by households living in neighborhoods with access</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.8.4 There is an official diagnostic of the problem and a characterization of the different situations (e.g. illegal tenure, ethnic discrimination, low quality of rented accommodation)</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>3.8.5 There are integrated programmes (involving different government departments) to address the symptoms and causes of the lack of access</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				

**Please calculate the score for Area 3.8**

1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) \_\_\_\_\_
2. Divide the number of total points by 5 \_\_\_\_\_

**Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered** (please mark one option) High \_\_\_\_ Medium \_\_\_\_ Low\_\_\_\_

<b>Area 3.9 Persons without access to water and sanitation in their workplaces</b>				
<b>Rationale.</b> While many people spend most of their time in their workplaces, there are many cases of workplaces without adequate access to water and sanitation.				
	<b>No</b>	<b>To a limited extent</b>	<b>To a large extent</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>3.9.1 There is data on lack of access to water and sanitation by workers in their workplaces</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)  <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)  <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>3.9.2 There is a public policy to address the lack of access to water and sanitation by workers in their workplaces</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)  <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)  <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>3.9.3 There is specific public funding to support access to water and sanitation by workers in their workplaces</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)  <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)  <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>Please calculate the score for Area 3.9</b> 1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____ 2. Divide the number of total points by 3 ____				
<b>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered</b> (please mark one option) High ____ Medium ____ Low ____				

## Section 4. Keeping water and sanitation affordable for all

<b>Areas of action</b>	<b>Relevant section in the “No One Left Behind” document</b>
4.1 Public policies to ensure affordability of water and sanitation services	Section 6.1
4.2 Tariff system	Section 6.2
4.3 Social protection measures	Section 6.3

## Quantitative information on affordability

Please, provide the official definition of affordability (and/or target) in your country/region/city			
	2011 or closest previous year (please indicate)	2006 or closest previous year (please indicate)	Source (please indicate whether this is an official source)
Amount of the average water and sanitation bill in the country/region/city (Euros/year)			
Amount of the water and sanitation bill in the country/region/city for households in the lowest wealth or income group (please specify whether this refers to lowest quintile, lowest decile, or people under the national poverty line) (Euros/year)			
Average disposable household income (or expenditure) (Euros/year)			
Average household income (or expenditure) for households in the lowest wealth or income group (please specify whether this refers to lowest quintile, lowest decile, or people under the national poverty line) (Euros/year)			
Public financial resources spent in ensuring affordability of the water and sanitation bill (million EUR)			
Public financial resources spent in ensuring affordability of the water and sanitation bill (EUR per capita)			
Public financial resources spent in ensuring affordability of the water and sanitation bill (% of public budget for water and sanitation)			

<b>Area 4.1 Public policies to ensure affordability</b>				
<b>Rationale.</b> The water and sanitation bill (including wastewater treatment charges) may represent a high financial burden, particularly for the poorest households. Affordability is a common and increasing concern. However, in many cases, national local policies do not address this issue.				
	<b>No</b>	<b>To a limited extent</b>	<b>To a large extent</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>4.1.1 There is data on affordability of water and sanitation services</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)  <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)  <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>4.1.2 Water and sanitation policy includes affordable access as one of its objectives</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)  <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)  <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>4.1.3 Social policy addresses affordability of water and sanitation services</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)  <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)  <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>4.1.4 There is a policy to address affordability of self-provided water and sanitation services</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)  <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)  <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>4.1.5 There is specific public funding to address affordability concerns</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)  <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)  <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>Please calculate the score for Area 4.1</b> Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____ Divide the number of total points by 5 ____				
<b>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered</b> (please mark one option) High ___ Medium ___ Low___				

<b>Area 4.2 Tariff measures</b>				
<b>Rationale.</b> Tariff design offers several options to address affordability issues, such as through progressive tariff systems or through social tariffs. Preferential tariffs are mostly financed by higher tariffs on other users.				
	<b>No</b>	<b>To a limited extent</b>	<b>To a large extent</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>4.2.1 The public authorities have analyzed different options to address affordability issues through tariff measures</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)  <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)  <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>4.2.2 Tariff measures have been included in a strategy to address affordability issues</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)  <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)  <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>4.2.3 Tariff measures to address affordability issues have been implemented</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)  <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)  <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>4.2.4 Tariff measures implemented to address affordability issues contribute to the financial sustainability of service provisions</b>				
<b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)  <b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)  <b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)				
<b>Please calculate the score for Area 4.2</b> Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____ Divide the number of total points by 4 ____				
<b>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered</b> (please mark one option) High ____ Medium ____ Low ____				

### Area 4.3 Social protection measures

**Rationale.** Social protection measures offer several options to address affordability issues without modifying the design of existing water and sanitation tariffs. They can be aimed at avoiding non-payment of water bills (preventative) or at paying water debts (curative). They are mostly financed by general (local, regional or national) taxes.

	No	To a limited extent	To a large extent	Yes
<b>4.3.1 The public authorities have analyzed the impacts of different alternatives to address affordability issues through social protection measures</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>4.3.2 Social protection measures have been included in a strategy to address affordability issues</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<b>4.3.3 Social protection measures to address affordability issues have been implemented</b>				
<p><b>Score justification</b> (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p><b>Means of verification used:</b> (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p><b>Reliability of the response:</b> (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p>				
<p><b>Please calculate the score for Area 4.3</b>            Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____            Divide the number of total points by 3 ____</p>				
<p><b>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered</b> (please mark one option) High ____ Medium ____ Low ____</p>				

## Summary Sheet

Section	Area of action	Score	Reliability
Steering governance frameworks to deliver equitable access to water and sanitation	1.1 Strategic framework for achieving equitable access		
	1.2 Sector financial policies		
	1.3 Rights and duties of users and right-holders		
Reducing geographical disparities	2.1 Public policies to reduce access disparities between geographical areas		
	2.2 Public policies to reduce price disparities between geographical areas		
	2.3 Geographical allocation of external support		
Ensuring access for vulnerable and marginalised groups	3.1 Public policies to address the needs of vulnerable and marginalised groups		
	3.2 Persons with special physical needs		
	3.3 Users of health facilities		
	3.4 Users of educational facilities		
	3.5 Users of retirement homes		
	3.6 Users of prisons and refugee camps		
	3.7 Persons without a fixed or stable residence		
	3.8 Persons living in housing without water and sanitation		
	3.9 Persons without access to water and sanitation in their workplaces		
Keeping water and sanitation affordable for all	4.1 Public policies to ensure affordability		
	4.2 Tariff system		
	4.3 Social protection measures		

## **ANNEX. SUMMARY OF THE SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE GREATER PARIS URBAN AREA**

### **STEERING GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORKS TO DELIVER EQUITABLE ACCESS TO WATER AND SANITATION**

At the national level, the right to water was introduced by the 2006 Law on Water. While France does not have a specific strategic plan to ensure equitable access, the national health and environment plan and the water development and management masterplans (SDAGE) provide the planning framework for ensuring safe and affordable access to water. In France, measures to ensure the right to water include preventative and remedial aid measures. By law, up to 0.5% of the budget of the service providers can be allocated to fund remedial measures – through the social solidarity fund (FSL). The National Water Committee provides a coordination forum for stakeholders and published in 2012 a guide on best practices implemented in France to ensure access to water and sanitation to disadvantaged people.

At the sub-national level, the city of Paris has included in the performance contract with Eau de Paris (the service provider) the objective of the ensuring access to water and sanitation by disadvantaged people and has specified that at least 0.4% of its revenue must be spent on solidarity measures.. NGOs (such as Obusass, France Libertés and the Fondation Abbé Pierre) have developed awareness-raising actions. The financial resources needed to ensure that water is affordable for all through preventive measures have been estimated -- at EUR 50-110 million. Information and participation of right holders and their representative are ensured by consultative commissions on local utilities, which include local environmental and consumers CSOs. Paris and SEDIF have social advisers who inform households of available financial aids. Paris has an Ombudsman that processes complaints about municipal water and sanitation services.

### **REDUCING GEOGRAPHICAL DISPARITIES**

The area of study is highly urbanised and does not display major disparities in access between geographical areas. Nevertheless, the stakeholder consultation led the pilot team to lower the rate of access from 100% to 99% to acknowledge that some categories of population face problems in connecting to the service. There are no public policies in place to support the delivery of water and sanitation to slums and informal settlements in Ile-de-France. At the same time, there are significant price differences between Paris and the SEDIF and SIAAP areas. There is information about water and sanitation prices, but there is no tool to know the cost of service provision and compare it to the price paid by the consumer. Inside the SEDIF and SIAAP areas there is some cross-subsidisation between localities with different costs of provision.

### **ENSURING ACCESS FOR VULNERABLE AND MARGINALISED GROUPS**

There are no reliable statistics on access to water and sanitation by vulnerable and marginalised groups. At national level, a working group under the National Water Committee has discussed access to water by marginalised and vulnerable groups. But there is no specific plan to deal with all marginalised and vulnerable groups. At national level, 60% of homeless

people do not have regular access to water points -- Paris provides free-of-charge public water fountains, toilets and showers to facilitate access by the homeless, and public toilets and new public fountains are wheelchair-accessible. There are public subsidies to adapt private facilities. Technical standards guarantee that institutional facilities have separate toilets for male and females, as well as adequate facilities for menstrual hygiene management. Some reports indicate that toilets are often a problem in schools, with bad hygiene conditions and lack of separation of toilets for boys and girls lead to many children not using school toilet -- Paris has created a working group and defined an investment plan to address this issue. Access to water and sanitation in prisons is recognised as poor -- a four-year plan was launched in 2010 to address poor hygiene conditions in prisons. Implementation of a law to ensure access by travelling communities (by building halting sites) is well behind schedule. Paris has in place a no-disconnection policy to ensure access by squatters and illegal tenants. The national regulations to provide workers with gender-segregated water and sanitation facilities in the work place are enforced.

#### **KEEPING WATER AFFORDABLE FOR ALL**

About 2 million people in France spend more than 3% of their household budget in water and sanitation services. Most people in the greater Paris urban area spend 1.5-2%, but for some households it reaches 6%. In the last two years, national laws have made possible the introduction of social tariffs. The predominance of collective housing without individual meters constrains the use of tariff measures to address affordability concerns. Affordable access is one of the objective included in the performance contract between the city of Paris and its service provider Eau de Paris. SEDIF has a solidarity program to help people pay their water bill, and the public-private partnership with Veolia Eau d'Ile de France requires that 1% of its revenue must go this program. Paris and SIAAP together provide over EUR 800,000 to the housing solidarity fund (FSL). Paris subsidises the installation of water and energy saving equipment in social housing which could lead to a 15% decrease in the water and energy bills.