

APPENDIX A - GLOSSARY

Accountability

In this context, accountability refers to the ability of local people to be able to monitor service provision and demand improvements where necessary.

Allocation

This refers to the *intent* of a government or donor to fund certain activities or programmes.

Capital investments

Expenditure on fixed assets – these are the hardware investment costs, of pumps, pipes, latrines, etc.

Capital (preventive) maintenance

The full depreciated replacement costs – which are rarely taken into account in investment decisions.

Commitment

A firm written obligation by a government or official agency, backed by the appropriation or availability of the necessary funds, to provide resources of a specified amount, under specified financial terms and conditions and for specified purposes, for the benefit of the recipient country.

Direct support costs

These are the software costs (training, facilitation, community mobilization, hygiene education, etc.) associated with the implementation of hardware.

Disbursements

Disbursements reflect the execution of projects or programmes and the real transfer of funds. Disbursements record the actual transfer of financial resources, goods and services. As a project or programme is usually not realized in a year, there is no direct relation between the level of commitment and the level of disbursement during one period.

Improved Drinking-water Supply

Includes sources that, by the nature of their construction or through active intervention, are protected from outside contamination, particularly faecal matter. These include piped water in a dwelling, plot or yard, and other improved sources including public taps or standpipes, tube wells or boreholes, protected dug wells, protected springs and rainwater collection.

Improved sanitation

Facilities that ensure hygienic separation of human excreta from human contact. They include: (a) a flush or pour-flush toilet or latrine to a piped sewer system, a septic tank or a pit latrine; (b) a ventilated improved pit latrine; (c) a pit latrine with slab; (d) a composting toilet.

Indirect support costs

These are the costs that fall outside the direct implementation of a system, but which are needed at higher levels of scale, such as training of district staff, development of water resources management plans, etc.

Operating & minor maintenance expenditures

These are the annual operation and maintenance costs, such as the cost of diesel or electricity for pumping, the cost of operational staff, or the cost of small replacements – usually required to be paid by beneficiaries either through tariffs or user fees.

Untied aid

Development aid that is freely available to buy goods and services from all countries, and that is not restricted to the procurement of goods and services from the donor country (“tied aid”).

APPENDIX B - COUNTRY RESPONSES TO SANITATION QUESTIONNAIRE

DATA STATISTIC	Ghana	Kazakhstan	Madagascar	Mongolia	Nepal	Uganda	Viet Nam
Overview							
Service level	Low	Medium	Low	Medium	Low	Low	Medium
Human resources capacity	Medium	Medium	High	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium
Institutional capacity	High	Medium	Low	Low	High	Medium	Medium
Financial system capacity	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Medium
Coverage							
- Data year	2006	2006	2005	2006-08	NA	2007	2007
- Urban (%)	82.6	95.0	68.3	21.3	80.0	59.0	89.5
- Rural (%)	45.3	25.0-30.0	46.7	5.3	40.0	63.0	51.0-55.8
- Coverage definition related to JMP?	No	Yes	Yes	Not Entirely	Yes	Yes	Yes
- Primary schools (%)	---	---	---	---	40	69:1 ^a	11.7
- Secondary schools (%)	---	25	---	---	40	---	11.7
- Hospitals (%)	---	60	---	---	90	---	NA
- Health-care centres (%)	---	100	---	---	95	---	36.6
- Includes child faeces in definition (Yes/No)?	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
- Provision policy for public facilities	Yes-low imp	Yes-high imp	Yes-low imp	Yes-low imp	No	Yes-high imp	Yes-high imp
- Provision policy for workplace	Yes-high imp	Yes-high imp	Yes-low imp	Yes-low imp	No	Yes-low imp	Yes- imp varies
- Service-level monitoring system	Medium	None	Medium	Low	Medium	Low	High or very high
- Hygiene education programme	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
- Proportion of population with sewerage (%)	2	60	0.02	28.2	< 3.0	7	60
- sewerage treatment							
a) Fully treated (%)	5	10	0	---	5	---	---
b) Partially treated (%)	10	20	0	---	10	---	Yes
c) Untreated prior to discharge (%)	85	70	100	---	85	---	---
MDG achievement							
- 1990 coverage (JMP % urban / % rural)	11 / 3	97 / 96	15 / 6	21 / 5	36 / 6	27 / 29	61 / 21
- 2006 coverage (JMP % urban / % rural)	15 / 6	97 / 98	18 / 10	64 / 31	45 / 24	29 / 34	88 / 56
- Current coverage (country-reported)	83 / 45	95 / 30	68 / 47	21 / 5	80 / 40	--- / 59	90 / 56
- 2015 MDG target (% urban / % rural)	56 / 52	99 / 98	58 / 53	---	68 / 53	64 / 65	76 / 61
- year MDG will be reached	2020	---	2012	---	2013	2015	2020
Policy and institutions							
- Delineation of responsibility and coordination	Medium	Very high	Medium	Medium	High	Medium	Very high
- Division of roles	Medium	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	High
- National hygiene and sanitation plan	In process	Full	Full	Partial	Partial	Partial	Partial
- Civil society participation	Medium	None	Medium	Medium	High	High	Medium
- Sector review process	Contained	Sector specific	Sector specific	Contained	Sector specific	Contained	Contained
- sanitation and hygiene recognized in PRSP?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

--- indicates that no data available

^a ratio of children to latrines^b Official development assistance^c World Health Statistics (WHO, 2008)

DATA STATISTIC	Ghana	Kazakhstan	Madagascar	Mongolia	Nepal	Uganda	Viet Nam
Human resources							
- Civil servants	---	Enough	Not enough	Barely enough	Enough	Not enough	Barely enough
- Local government staff	---	Enough	Not enough	Not enough	Barely enough	Barely enough	Barely enough
- Local private sector	Not enough	Not enough	Barely enough	Barely enough	Not enough	Enough	Barely enough
- Engineers or technicians	Not enough	Not enough	Enough	Barely enough	Barely enough	Enough	Barely enough
- Hygiene extension workers	Barely enough	---	Barely enough	Barely enough	Barely enough	Barely enough	Barely enough
Funding sources (all amounts in US\$ million)							* rural
- External funding	---	---	12.2	82.2	3.8	---	23.6
- Households	---	---	10% of invest	---	---	---	38.3
- Internal government	---	---	3.0	6.1	3.8	---	26.6
- Internal private Sector	---	---	9.7	---	---	---	9.0
- Total (known)	---	---	24.8	92.6	7.6	---	97.5
Sanitation expenditures (% of known)							
- Capital investment	---	---	80	20	25	---	---
- Capital maintenance	---	---	---	30	0	---	---
- Operation and maintenance	---	---	---	20	5	---	---
- Direct support	---	---	10	20	50	---	---
- Indirect support	---	---	10	10	20	---	---
- Total	---	---	100	100	100	---	---
Sector expenditures							
- Sanitation (% of government expenditure)	---	---	0.76	---	0.3	---	---
- Expenditure on urban areas (%)	---	---	20	80	60	---	84 ^b
- Expenditure on rural areas (%)	---	---	80	20	40	---	16 ^b
- Sector spending efficiency (%)	---	100	50	85	90	---	---
- Funding transparency (% in budgets)	---	Over 80%	50-80%	50-80%	50-80%	< 50%	Over 80%
- Expenditure on low-income population (%)	---	---	80	---	40	---	---
Sustainability survey performed							
- Technical / Financial / Environmental / Institutional	No / No / No / No	--- / --- / Yes / Yes	No / No / No / No	Yes / Yes / Yes / Yes	Yes / Yes / Yes / Yes	Yes / Yes / No / Yes	Yes / Yes / Yes / Yes
Related country statistics							
- Low-income groups as a percentage of total population	28	---	85	36	31	38	18
- Primary school attendance rate ^c	64	89.5	93	91.5	79	81.2	93.5
- Incidence (%) of diarrhoeal morbidity, children < 5yrs ^c	1.5	0.42	0.19	0.61	1.21	2.3	0.18
Country respondent ministries	MLGRDE EHD MWRWH	Ministry of Health	Ministry of Energy and Mines	MCUD / Nat'l Center for Construction, UDPU	MPPW/DWSS	MWE (Water Sector Div.) MWE (Policy & Planning)	Adm. Tech. Infra, MoC Dept. Water Res., MARD

APPENDIX C - COUNTRY RESPONSES TO WATER SUPPLY QUESTIONNAIRE

DATA STATISTIC	Ghana	Kazakhstan	Madagascar	Mongolia	Nepal	Uganda	Viet Nam
Overview							
Service level	Low	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium
Human resources capacity	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
Institutional capacity	High	Medium	Medium	Low	High	High	Medium
Financial system capacity	Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Medium	Medium
Coverage (country-reported)							
- Data year	2006	2006	2007	2006/2007	---	2006/2007	2007
- Urban (%)	57.0	95.0	57.3	30.5	85.0	56.0	70.0
- Rural (%)	52.8	25.0 to 30.0	35.0	8.7	74.0	63.0	60.0
- Service level monitoring system	Medium	Medium	Very High	Low	Medium	Very High	Very High
MDG achievement							
- 1990 coverage (JMP % urban / % rural)	86 / 39	99 / 91	80 / 27	97 / 21	97 / 70	78 / 39	87 / 43
- 2006 coverage (JMP % urban / % rural)	90 / 71	99 / 91	76 / 36	90 / 48	94 / 88	90 / 60	98 / 90
- Current Coverage (country-reported)	57 / 53	95 / 30	57 / 35	31 / 9	85 / 74	56 / 63	70 / 60
- 2015 MDG target (% urban / % rural)	93 / 71	100 / 96	90 / 64	99 / 61	99 / 85	89 / 71	94 / 72
- Country target level (% urban / % rural)	---	---	100 / 77	---	---	(2012) 65 / 65	---
- year MDG will be reached	2015-2017	2010	2012	---	2007	2015	2020
Policy and institutions							
- Delineation of responsibility and coordination	High	Medium	High	Medium	Medium	Very high	High
- Division of roles	High	High	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium to high
- Decentralization	Some	---	Some	Some	Some	Full	Some
- National drinking-water strategy or plan	Yes-high imp	Yes-high imp	Yes-high imp	Partial strategy	Partial strategy	Yes-high imp	Yes-high Imp
- National drinking-water standards	Yes-WHO	Yes-WHO	Yes-not WHO	Yes-WHO	Yes-WHO	Yes-not WHO	Yes-WHO
- Civil society participation	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	High	Medium
- Sector review process	High	High	Very high	Medium	Low	Very high	Low
- Safe drinking-water recognised in PRSP?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Human resources							
- Civil servants	Barely enough	Enough	Not enough	Barely enough	Enough	Barely enough	Barely enough
- Local government staff	Barely enough	Not enough	Not enough	Not enough	Barely enough	Not enough	Barely enough
- Local private Sector	Barely enough	Not enough	Barely enough	Barely enough	Barely enough	Enough	Not enough
- Engineers or technicians	Barely enough	Not enough	Enough	Barely enough	Enough	Enough	Not enough
- Extension workers	Enough	---	Barely enough	Barely enough	Enough	Barely enough	Not enough
Funding sources (all amounts in US\$ million)							
- External funding	88.1	---	23.5	82.2	56.9	44.7	83.8
- Households	---	---	10% of investment	---	11.1	---	---
- Internal government	3.9	---	12.6	6.1	16.0	34.6	16.5
- Internal private Sector	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
- Total (known)	92.1	---	36.2	92.6	84.0	79.3	160.0

--- indicates that no data available

DATA STATISTIC	Ghana	Kazakhstan	Madagascar	Mongolia	Nepal	Uganda	Viet Nam
Expenditure breakdown (% of known expenditures)							
- Capital investment	* 89	---	80	20	65	60	---
- Capital maintenance	* included above	---	---	30	5	---	---
- Operation and maintenance	---	---	---	20	10	10	---
- Direct support	1	---	10	20	10	10	---
- Indirect support	9	---	10	10	10	20	---
- Total	100	---	100	100	100	100	---
Sector expenditures							
- Drinking-water (% of government expenditure)	1.23	---	1.81	---	2.85	2.6	0.6 GDP
- Monitoring (%)	5.76	---	---	---	< 1	5	---
- Urban areas (%)	62.8	20-25	80	80	20	60	---
- Rural areas (%)	37.2	75-80	20	20	80	40	---
- Percent of funds spent in period in which allocated	100	---	62	85	> 80	85	---
- Funding transparency (% in budgets)	50 to 80%	< 50 %	50 to 80%	50 to 80%	Over 80%	Over 80%	Over 80%
- Expenditure on low income population (%)	62.8	---	20	---	44	40	---
Sustainability survey performed							
- Technical / Financial / Environmental / Institutional	Yes / Yes / Yes / Yes	--- / --- / Yes / Yes	Yes / Yes / Yes / Yes	Yes / Yes / Yes / Yes	Yes / Yes / Yes / Yes	Yes / Yes / Yes / Yes	Yes / Yes / Yes / Yes
Related country statistics							
- Low-income groups as a percentage of total population	28	---	85	36	31	35	18
- Primary school attendance rate ^a	64	89.5	93	91.5	79	81.2	93.5
- Incidence (%) of diarrhoeal morbidity, children < 5 yrs ^a	1.5	0.42	0.19	0.61	1.21	2.3	0.18
Country respondent ministries	MWRWH Ghana Water Co. LtdMLGRDE, EHDCCommunity Water and Sanitation Agency	Committee of state sanitary-and- epidemiologic supervision of Ministry of Health	Ministry of Energy and Mines	Ministry of Construction & Urban Development / Nat'l Center for Construction, Urban Development and Public Utilities	Ministry of Physical Planning and Works, Dept. of Water Supply and Sewerage	Ministry of Water & Environment (Water Sector Liaison and Policy & Planning Division)	Ministry of Construction Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development

^aWorld Health Statistics (WHO, 2008)

APPENDIX D - DONOR RESPONSES TO EXTERNAL SUPPORT AGENCY QUESTIONNAIRE

There were 25 external support agencies that responded to the ESA questionnaire, including: Austria, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF), Czech Republic, Denmark, European Commission (EC), Finland, France, French Red Cross (France RC), Germany, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, UNICEF, UN University (UNU), WaterAid, WHO, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and the French department of Val de Marne.

DATA STATISTIC	Austria	BMGF ^a	Czech Re-public	Denmark	European Commission	Finland	France	French Red Cross	Germany	Greece	Ireland	Japan	Latvia	Luxembourg
Commitments^b														
Data year	2007	2007	2007	2008	2006	2006	2007	---	2007	2005	2008	2006	---	2008
Sanitation and hygiene (grants and loans)	5.08	5.95	0.91	110.89	78.00	11.11	---	---	76.57	---	---	630.68	---	24.33
Water supply (grants and loans)	9.70	18.82	1.62	443.73	173.86	20.32	---	---	150.14	---	---	545.39	---	84.59
Sanitation, hygiene and water emergencies (grants and loans)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	111.50	0.00	57.98	---	0.00	---	---	---	---	0.00
Integrated water resources management (grants and loans)	0.43	0.00	0.40	38.08	8.15	5.90	90.35	---	0.00	---	---	---	---	26.24
Total (grants and loans)	19.19	24.78	2.93	592.70	371.52	37.25	---	---	226.70	0.52	25.25	1,206.23	---	135.16
Disbursements^b														
Data year	2007	2007	2008	2008	2006	---	2007	---	2007	2005	2007	2006	2007	2007
Sanitation and hygiene (grants and loans)	4.99	10.40	1.68	45.76	104.74	---	---	---	85.42	---	---	---	0.02	2.22
Water supply (grants and loans)	8.46	12.17	1.32	110.24	190.05	---	---	---	102.51	---	---	---	0.05	7.47
Sanitation, hygiene and water emergencies (grants and loans)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	91.55	---	---	---	0.00	---	3.99	---	0.00	0.00
Integrated water resources management (grants and loans)	0.47	0.00	0.32	7.86	50.56	---	---	---	0.00	---	0.54	---	0.00	2.34
Total (grants and loans)	15.81	22.57	3.32	163.86	436.90	---	---	---	187.93	0.52	19.74	1,011.08	0.06	12.02
Duration of support (% of commitments)														
Sanitation < 3 years	76	12	100	---	10	19	5	60	5	100	40	1	---	1.4
Sanitation > 3 years	24	88	0	---	90	81	95	40	95	0	60	99	---	98.6
Water < 3 years	51	0	100	10	10	10	5	60	5	56	40	13	---	0.5
Water > 3 years	49	100	0	90	90	90	95	40	95	44	60	87	---	99.5
Intended allocations^b														
Data year	---	---	2009	2009	2007	2009	---	---	---	2009	2009	---	---	2009
Sanitation and hygiene (grants and loans)	---	---	0.00	114.22	555.49	2.49	---	---	---	0.23	---	---	---	3.54
Water supply (grants and loans)	---	---	1.03	454.16	405.67	3.12	---	---	---	0.23	---	---	---	17.55
Sanitation, hygiene and water emergencies (grants and loans)	---	---	0.00	0.00	75.52	0.00	---	---	---	0.00	0.00	---	---	0.00
Integrated water resources management (grants and loans)	---	---	0.00	38.08	241.78	1.71	---	---	---	0.55	0.62	---	---	7.07
Total (grants and loans)	---	---	1.03	606.46	1 278.47	5.77	---	---	---	1.01	19.92	---	---	28.16

--- indicates that no data available

^aThe Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

^b all amounts in US\$ millions

DATA STATISTIC	Austria	BMGF ^a	Czech Re-public	Denmark	European Commission	Finland	France	French Red Cross	Germany	Greece	Ireland	Japan	Latvia	Luxembourg
Aid not channelled through NGO or multilateral organization														
Sanitation and hygiene	4.32	5.95	0.91	110.89	64.10	3.82	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	22.05
Water supply	9.33	18.82	0.94	443.73	142.88	4.58	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	82.24
Total (sanitation and water)	13.65	24.78	1.85	554.62	206.99	8.40	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	104.28
Aid channels (% of funds)														
Budget support	0	---	---	0	0	0	0	---	0	---	0	---	---	0
Sector support	0	---	---	40	76	0	10	---	15	---	60	---	---	0
Projects	100	---	---	5	24	100	90	---	85	---	40	---	---	100
Sanitation and hygiene aid breakdown^b														
Capital investment	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1 117.17	---	---	---	---	---
Capital maintenance	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	493.24	---	---	---	---	---
Operation and maintenance	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.00	---	---	---	---	---
Total infrastructure support	3.98	---	---	89.38	62.40	---	216.74	---	1 610.42	---	---	---	---	---
Direct support	0.02	---	---	---	15.60	---	16.26	---	30.08	---	---	---	---	---
Indirect support	0.03	---	---	---	---	---	5.01	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Water supply aid breakdown^b														
Capital investment	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	907.89	---	---	---	---	---
Capital maintenance	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	902.62	---	---	---	---	---
Operation and maintenance	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.00	---	---	---	---	---
Total infrastructure support	8.63	---	---	16.98	139.09	---	189.64	---	1 810.50	---	---	---	---	---
Direct support	0.39	---	---	---	34.77	---	20.32	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Indirect support	0.16	---	---	---	---	---	5.96	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Alignment, coordination, harmonization														
Coordinated with recipient country programmes (%)	45	0	80	---	82	100	---	---	---	50	80	---	25	100
Proportion of aid to sanitation, hygiene and water that is untied (%)	48.6	100	---	100	100	100	100	---	---	100	100	---	---	100

DATA STATISTIC	Netherlands	Portugal	Spain	Sweden	United Kingdom	UNICEF	UNU	WaterAid	WHO	FAO	Val de Marne
Commitments^a											
Data year	2008	2008	2006	2008	2006	2007	2007	---	2007	2006	2007 (avg)
Sanitation and hygiene (grants and loans)	---	---	---	30.90	---	89.00	0.11	---	1.57	0	0.08
Water supply (grants and loans)	---	---	---	16.45	---	144.00	0.05	---	2.08	4.99	0.49
Sanitation, hygiene and water emergencies (grants and loans)	---	---	---	0.00	---	142.00	0.00	---	---	0	0
Integrated water resources management (grants and loans)	606.59	---	10.03	30.49	---	9.00	2.79	---	---	0	0
Total (grants and loans)	1 761.78	1.80	30.03	79.55	108.67	242.00	2.95	---	3.65	4.99	0.57
Disbursements^a											
Data year	2007	2005	2008	---	2006	2007	---	2007	2007	2006	2007 (avg)
Sanitation and hygiene (grants and loans)	---	---	---	---	---	89.00	---	11.05	1.57	0	0
Water supply (grants and loans)	---	---	---	---	---	144.00	---	43.78	2.08	0	0.03
Sanitation, hygiene and water emergencies (grants and loans)	---	---	---	---	---	142.00	---	0.00	0.00	0	0
Integrated water resources management (grants and loans)	85.41	---	---	---	---	9.00	---	0.00	---	42.39	0
Total (grants and loans)	286.62	1.50	10.52	---	179.43	242.00	---	54.82	3.65	42.39	0.03
Duration of support (% of commitments)											
Sanitation < 3 years	0	95	75	10	10	14	---	---	---	---	14
Sanitation > 3 years	100	5	25	90	90	86	---	---	---	---	86
Water < 3 years	0	95	75	10	10	14	---	---	---	30	67
Water > 3 years	100	5	25	90	90	86	---	---	---	70	33
Intended allocations^a											
Data year	2009	---	2009	2009	---	---	---	---	---	---	2009
Sanitation and hygiene (grants and loans)	199.87	---	10.52	29.57	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.19
Water supply (grants and loans)	0.00	---	0.00	17.78	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.37
Sanitation, hygiene and water emergencies (grants and loans)	0.00	---	0.00	0.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Integrated water resources management (grants and loans)	120.25	---	0.00	49.93	---	---	---	---	---	---	0
Total (grants and loans)	368.57	---	10.52	97.28	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.56

--- No data available

^a all amounts in US\$ millions

DATA STATISTIC	Nether-lands	Portugal	Spain	Sweden	United Kingdom	UNICEF	UNU	WaterAid	WHO	FAO	Val de Marne
Aid not channelled through NGO or multilateral organization											
Sanitation and hygiene	---	---	---	9.80	---	89.00	0.11	---	1.57	---	0.08
Water supply	---	---	---	6.15	---	144.00	0.05	---	2.08	---	0.49
Total (sanitation and water)	895.45	---	---	15.95	---	233.00	0.16	---	3.65	---	0.57
Aid channels (% of funds)											
Budget support	0	---	0	0	11	---	---	---	0	---	0
Sector support	15	---	0	100	0	---	---	---	0	---	0
Projects	75	---	100	0	89	---	---	---	100	---	100
Sanitation and hygiene aid breakdown^a											
Capital investment	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Capital maintenance	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Operation and maintenance	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total infrastructure support	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.08
Direct support	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.02
Indirect support	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1.57	---	---
Water supply aid breakdown^a											
Capital investment	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Capital maintenance	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Operation and maintenance	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total infrastructure support	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.34
Direct support	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.04
Indirect support	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2.08	---	---
Alignment, coordination, harmonization											
Coordinated with recipient country programmes (%)	95	100	---	100	90	100	---	100	---	---	100
Proportion of aid to sanitation, hygiene and water that is untied (%)	100	---	---	95	100	---	100	---	100	---	100

APPENDIX E - CAPACITY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE FOR RESPONDING TO QUESTIONNAIRE

The text in each cell in the matrix represents a typical example of a scenario for each parameter: judgment and consideration of the situation are required within each country to reveal its position in each column.

	Service level	Human resources capacity	Institutional capacity	Financial system capacity
Very low	Typically less than 40% and no significant upwards trend.	Problems in recruiting adequately trained staff are common. Depending on national arrangements, staff retention may be problematic. Often, training provision will be significantly driven through ad hoc arrangements (for example, one-off courses).	There may or may not be a declared sector policy but, if present, it is likely to have been developed through an externally-driven process or with limited participation of different institutional and sectoral actors. Institutional arrangements are likely to be unclear and if clear may not be reflected in practice.	Inadequate to advance access to a significant degree, or to maintain existing facilities. Any financial planning is likely to be generic and have limited information support.
Low	May be low (20–60%) but does show year on year improvement.	Significant but potentially not adequate. Often a mix of stable and ad hoc training provision. Likely to be significant “gaps” (some areas of training expertise significantly under-represented).	May be weak but typically there is policy commitment at local or national levels, although institutional arrangements may lag behind.	Significant for “initial investment”, but stable mechanisms for recurrent (renewal, operation and maintenance costs) likely to be absent. Typically some form of national sector financial overview is present but availability of hard data is a significant constraint.
Medium	High levels achieved only in urban areas (up to 90%), but rates of year on year improvement are likely to be low. Typically there is an increasing amount of higher service levels (for example, septic tanks and piped sewer systems, piped water). Service levels in rural areas lag behind.	Moderate or better as typical country has gone through a phase of extending access. Orientation of capacity may be weak (for example, need to re-focus on renewal or operation and maintenance). Often capacity is low in relation to meeting higher service levels. Training and educational provision often involves a mix of formal institutions and ad hoc arrangements.	Strengthened policy position but developed without strong participatory processes. Institutions growing in strength especially at the national level but regulation is largely absent.	Understanding of the financial needs and constraints of the sector significantly developed but may not be consolidated. The link between planning and stable financing may remain limited.
High	Basic access levels are high (over 90%) in both urban and rural areas.	Extensive capacity, including routine provision of further and higher education through mainstream training educational institutions.	Some sectoral policy statements available; these are generated through participatory processes and periodically (but not necessarily frequently) updated. Normally well-defined institutional roles at national, local government (and often regional) levels. May be weaker with regard to formal regulation of higher service levels. Some regulation of service providers is in place and implemented through an independent agency although often at a moderate or low level.	Financial planning at national level developed; capacity within service-providing institutions may remain significantly limited. Public financial accountability may be moderate or limited.
Very high	As above, plus piped sewer or water coverage is high. Service includes effective wastewater treatment and management. Service includes effective safety planning and management.	As above, plus specialist knowledge at hand and experienced specialists trained, available and adequate.	As above, plus formal regulation in place for all major functions, services and products.	Both national planning and financial planning and accountability among service providers is sophisticated and open to scrutiny. Typically, debate occurs in both academic and public media, and is supported by data and information.

