The UN-Water Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-water (GLAAS) monitors the efforts and approaches to extend and sustain water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) systems and services. Between 1990 and 2010, over 321 million in Africa people gained access to improved water sources and 189 million people gained access to improved sanitation. In Africa financing is insufficient and the institutional capacity to absorb what is available is limited. The danger of slippage against the MDG target is real.

Between 1990 and 2010, over 321 million in Africa people gained access to improved water sources and 189 million people gained access to improved sanitation. In Africa financing is insufficient and the institutional capacity to absorb what is available is limited. The danger of slippage against the MDG target is real.

In 2011, countries reported substantive political commitments to WASH, increasing funding allocations, and leadership and coordination among implementing agencies. The majority of countries have established transparent WASH service provision targets and have put in place supporting policies, and many monitor against these targets. Countries also confirm that the rights to water and sanitation are increasingly adopted in laws or policies. Accountability can be improved, as most countries do not include consumers in planning and only half have established regular review processes. The total amount of development aid for sanitation and water for Africa increased from 2008 to 2010 to US$ 2.7 billion, along with a notable increase in non-concessional lending for sanitation and water. Despite these efforts, most countries are falling short on meeting their own national WASH commitments, with over 80% of countries reportedly falling significantly behind the trends required to meet their defined national access targets for sanitation and drinking-water.
DOMESTIC FINANCING: There is insufficient domestic financing for WASH overall, with particularly serious shortfalls for sanitation. This is exacerbated by difficulties in spending the limited funds that are received.

In Africa sanitation funding remains inadequate
Sanitation, adequacy of financing, 2011

Are financial flows sufficient to meet MDG targets?
- >75% of what is needed for both urban and rural
- 75%–70% of what is needed for urban or rural
- ≤50% of what is needed for urban or rural
- <50% of what is needed for both urban and rural
- Not a survey participant
- Data not available
- Not applicable

Average absorption rates of central African government capital commitments are low
Sanitation, absorption of committed domestic funds, 2011

What is the percentage of domestic capital commitments utilized?
- >75% of domestic commitments for both urban and rural
- 75%–70% of domestic commitments for urban or rural
- 50%–75% of domestic commitments for urban or rural
- ≤50% of domestic commitments for urban or rural
- Not a survey participant
- Data not applicable
- Not applicable

SUSTAINABILITY: There is a risk of slippage on progress made unless sufficient financial and human resource support is given to sustain operation and maintenance.

Governments in Africa report that 39% of WASH funding is allocated to support operation and maintenance of services

Global data suggest that less than 10% of external aid is directed towards maintenance of existing services.

Most countries in Africa report insufficient staff to operate and maintain urban and rural drinking-water systems

Two-fifths of African countries indicate that revenues cover less than 80% of operating costs for urban utilities.

Is there sufficient staff to operate and maintain urban and rural drinking-water systems?
TARGETING OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Domestic WASH funding can be made more equitable

Drinking-water continues to absorb the majority of WASH funding, even in countries with relatively high drinking-water supply coverage and relatively low sanitation coverage. Countries also indicate that expenditures are largely targeted for extending services in urban areas, even in countries where urban areas are relatively well served and rural areas are off-track.

Funds are largely targeted for extending services in urban areas

Drinking-water continues to receive the majority of WASH funding

Targeting of external support for WASH can be further improved to assist those most in need

35% of sanitation and drinking-water aid is targeted to Africa

Aid for basic sanitation and drinking-water services increased from 16% to 26% of overall sanitation and water aid commitments between 2008 and 2010

NOTE: An additional 7% of global sanitation and water ODA is targeted to regional programmes

Aid commitment (US$ millions, constant 2009 $US)

Grants

Loans

Average annual commitments to sanitation and drinking-water, 2008–2010 (US$ millions, constant 2009 $US)
MONITORING AND EVALUATION: Improved monitoring is required to generate the information for evidence-based decision making.

The use of periodic reviews to monitor and evaluate the performance of sanitation and drinking-water uptake and services is increasingly used by countries as a basis for planning. However, the lack of robust data is a potentially major constraint to progress.

- Half the countries did not report on access to adequate sanitation in schools or health-care facilities, suggesting a lack of monitoring systems and capacity.
- Despite clear country responses indicating insufficient staff in water and sanitation services, only half of countries were able to provide data for staff in place and one third could anticipate staffing needs.
- To strengthen the collection of WASH financial information, a harmonized method of data monitoring is needed.

For further information: www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/glaas or glaas@who.int
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