

# ProjectReach-Reaching the Urban Poor with Water and Sanitation service

9/ACP/006/WSSSRP/AN/2/

## Water and Sanitation Poverty mapping in 21 Urban towns, Anambra State, Nigeria

**(Executive Summary)**

*Prepared by:*

**Bread of Life Development Foundation**

Suite 3, No 13/15, Ekororo road, Abule Egba, Lagos, Nigeria

[blfnigeria@yahoo.com](mailto:blfnigeria@yahoo.com) Tel: +234-8035897435

*for:* Water Supply and Sanitation Sector Reform Programme,  
State Technical Unit, Anambra State.



European Union Supported  
Water Supply and Sanitation Sector  
Reform Programme  
In association with the Federal  
Government of Nigeria  
and  
Anambra State Government



The European Union Water Supply and Sanitation Sector Reform Programme (EU-WSSSRP), Anambra State Technical Unit Programme on October 21, 2009, signed a grant contract with the Bread of Life Development Foundation to implement a project titled ‘*Project Reach-Reaching the Urban poor with Water and Sanitation Service*’. One of the activities under the grant contract is the conduct of a Water and Sanitation Poverty mapping in 20 focus urban towns of Anambra state using various methods including, Census, Household surveys, and Global Positioning System.

This document which is the findings of the study is divided into Nine chapters.

The **Introductory** chapter gives the background to the project, objectives of the WASH poverty mapping in the focus towns, the scope of study, and the various methods adopted in the study. The chapter reveals the objectives of the study as an attempt to determine:

- *The physical availability of water resource- the resource component.*
- *Identify providers of WSS services, extent of latrine coverage and access to water facilities (access) especially in gender context;*
- *Status of the services- functionality, operational challenges of the private service providers, the constraints of effective service delivery-capacity;*
- *The ways in which water is used for different purposes-use*
- *The integrity of the related environment-environment*

The study was conducted in 22 locations in 21 urban towns in 22 LGAs instead of the 20 urban towns earlier planned.

The second chapter deals with **Strategy and Methodology** adopted in implementing the study. These include Desktop review of data, Key informant interviews, Administration of questionnaires for household surveys, and Mapping of Urban Slums with GPS Coordinates.

Relevant reviewed include:

- a. *Executive Summary of structure plan for Awka, and Nnewi and environs, 2009-2027, produced with the support of UN-Habitat, Anambra state Community Needs Assessment Survey financed by Anambra State Ministry of Budget and Economic Planning with Technical Assistance from EU-SRIP, Anambra STU and prepared by Prof Olaseni Akintola Bello and Mr Samuel Obi;*

- b. *Poverty Mapping and profiling in Anambra state prepared by Mr Samuel Obi and Oluranti Afowowe and jointly financed by the European Commission and the World Bank,;*
- c. *Anambra state WSS Institutional Assessment report prepared by Mrs Nnena Egwuatu for the Anambra state WSSR-STU, November 2007; and*
- d. *Pro-poor Water and Sanitation Poverty in Kathmandu Valley, Nepal produced with the support of WaterAid Nepal.*

On other strategies and methodologies used to conduct the study:

- *Twenty Seven Research Assistants were recruited and trained to administered questions, one working in each of the 22 locations in 21 urban towns.*
- *10 key informants in each focus towns were interviewed to gather information on geographical locations of slums within each urban town.*
- *A total of 229 key informants comprising opinion leaders, five Government officials from key Ministries and Departments were interviewed to define poverty, identify those they consider living below the poverty line, and areas they believe are slums and squatters*
- *The Key Informants were relied upon to identify slums and slums and squatters in the focus towns A total of 113 slums covering 149 streets were identified in the survey through information supplied by Key Informants.*
- *As part of this survey, the Global Positioning System coordinates of all the identified slums were recorded. A digital map reflecting the recorded GPS coordinates was thereafter produced. The objective is to use the digital map for explanatory purposes showing the physical locations of slums. It will also enable service providers or other groups interested in undertaking follow up actions to locate these slums.*

**On the questionnaires used to conduct the Household surveys:**

- *A Rapid Knowledge, Practices and Coverage (KPC) Survey was adopted to get information on Household Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene practices in the 22 locations in Anambra state.*
- *A questionnaire comprising 20 structured on household water supply, sanitation and hygiene, 11 spot observations related to water storage containers, toilet facility, and hand washing supplies, and 10 open ended questions on general water and sanitation*

*problems was designed and administered on averagely 90 households in each of the 21 focus urban towns.*

- *A total of 1,914 household questionnaires were administered, 980 were administered on female respondents and 934 on male respondents to ensure gender balance, particularly as water and sanitation problems are majorly borne by women.*
- *Majority of respondents interviewed in the survey were middle age-1,114 (58.75%) of the respondents were between 31 years to 60 years, 498 (26.2%) respondents are youths below 30 years old, 239 (12.6%) are above 60 years old, while 45 (2.3%) of the respondents did not disclose their age.*
- *The findings of the survey are presently in both tabular and narrative forms. A total of 59 tables are contained in this report.*

The third chapter covers **Description of Primary Indicators**, which defines each of the 36 Indicators used in this report. A total of 36 Indicators were used to analysed the findings.

Indicators 1- 13 are on Drinking water supply, toilet facility, water treatment, hand washing with soap and appropriate faecal disposal, Indicators 14-25 are on the type of toilet facilities used by the Household, and Indicators 26-36 are qualitative questions on various water related issues. The main indicators are:

1. *Indicator 1: Drinking water supply coverage by an improved source for drinking water (percentage of households with an improved source for drinking water).*
2. *Indicator 2: Access to an improved source for drinking water(Percentage of households with an improved source for drinking water within acceptable reach and available daily)*
3. *Indicator 3: Coverage by an improved toilet facility(Percentage of households using an improved toilet facility)*
4. *Indicator 4: Use of an improved toilet facility(Percentage of households using an improved toilet facility, accessible and hygienic toilet facility)*
5. *Indicator 5: Access to essential hand washing supplies(Percentage of households with all essential hand washing supplies available)*
6. *Indicator 6: Appropriate hand washing behaviour(Percentage of households having and using soap for hand washing during 24 hours)*

7. *Indicator 7: Effective household water treatment(Percentage of households that treat water effectively)*
8. *Indicator 8: Regular Household Water Treatment(Percentage of Households that apply effective water treatment)*
9. *Indicator 9: Household safe Water Storage(Percentage of Households storing drinking water safely)*
10. *Indicator 10: Safe faeces Disposal(Percentage of Households who safely dispose of their child's faeces the last time he passed stool)*
11. *Indicator 11: Appropriate Faeces disposal(Percentage of Households who appropriately dispose of their child's faeces the last time s/he passed stool)*
12. *Indicator 12: Safe solid Waste disposal(Percentage of Households that dispose their solid waste safely)*
13. *Indicator 13: Availability of soap for hand washing (Percentage of Households that have soap readily available for hand washing.*
14. *Indicator 14: Type of toilet facility-flush to septic tank*
15. *Indicator 15: Type of toilet facility- Pour flush to septic tank*
16. *Indicator 16: Type of toilet facility-Pour flush to pit*
17. *Indicator 17: Type of toilet facility- Flush or pour-flush to elsewhere*
18. *Indicator 18: Type of toilet facility- Flush or pour-flush to don't know where*
19. *Indicator 19: Type of toilet facility- Ventilated Improved Pit latrine*
20. *Indicator 20: Type of toilet-Simple pit latrine with slab*
21. *Indicator 21: Type of toilet-Simple pit latrine without slab/open pit*
22. *Indicator 22; Type of toilet –Compositing/Dry latrine*
23. *Indicator 23: Type of toilet- Service or Bucket latrine*
24. *Indicator 24: Type of toilet- Hanging latrine*
25. *Indicator 25: Type of toilet- No facility, field, Bush, Plastic Bag*

**Indicators 26-36** are qualitative research questions on various issues including physical access to water, cost of water, affordability of water supplies, identified water problems and providers of WASH services

26. *Indicator 26: Physical access to water supply*
27. *Indicator 27: Right to access to water*

- 28. *Indicator 28: Hindrances to right to access water*
- 29. *Indicator 29: Cost of access to water*
- 30. *Indicator 30: Affordability of Water Supply*
- 31. *Indicator 31: Major water and sanitation problems*
- 32. *Indicator 32: Existing WASH projects by government agencies*
- 33. *Indicator 33: Factors that promote good toilet facilities*
- 34. *Indicator 34: Water Consumers Associations*
- 35. *Indicator 35: Water Vendors Associations*
- 36. *Indicator 36: Solutions to water and sanitation problems*

Chapter four covers the **Tabulation Plan**. This is about how data sourced was analyzed and interpreted in a 59 tables of this report.

Chapter five deals with **Slums in focus urban towns**. It contains the definition of poverty, identification of slums in all the focus towns, providers of water and sanitation services in slums of focus urban towns, and the GPS coordinates of slums in the focus urban towns.

Chapter six covers **Findings of Survey Indicators**, and this discusses the results of the survey in all the towns as it concerns each of the indicators. The findings are shown both in a tabular form and narrative format.

Chapter seven on **Summary of Findings**, goes a step further by showing the overall status of access to Water and Sanitation services in all the focus urban towns and in each of the focus towns. This is interpreted in a tabular and narrative format. The overall access to WASH services in all the focus towns reveals the following:

On **coverage by improved source of drinking water**, out of a total of 1922 households surveyed, 1218 households have improved source of drinking water representing 63.40%.

**Access to improved source of drinking water** was also surveyed. Out of total number 5098 households surveyed, only 2970 households have access to improved source of drinking water. This figure represents 58.30%

The survey also looked at **Coverage by an improved toilet facility**. A total number of 1507 households were covered. Only 709 households have improved toilet facility representing 58.30%.

The **Use of an improved toilet facility** was also captured in the survey. A total number of 4774 households were surveyed and 2835 households use improved toilet facility. This figure represents 58.70%.

On **Access to essential hand washing supplies**, a total number of 3755 households were surveyed. The findings show that only 1767 households have access to essential hand washing supplies, representing just 47.00%.

The survey also investigated **appropriate hand washing behaviour**. A total number of 1161 households were surveyed, but only 322 households have appropriate hand washing behaviour, representing 27.70%.

The percentage of households that do water treatment is 64.40%. This because out of a total number of 576 households surveyed a total of 371 households use **household water treatment**.

The survey of **household safe water storage** revealed that out of 4,286 households investigated, 2,647 households have household safe water storage. This figure represents 61.80%.

On **Safe faeces disposal**, a total number of 1573 households were surveyed. The survey findings however show that only a total number of 410 households practice safe faeces disposal, representing just 26.00%.

The result of the survey on **appropriate faeces disposal** reveals that out of a total number of 1986 households investigated, only 597 households practice appropriate faeces disposal. This figure represents 30.30%.

On **Safe Solid waste disposal**, a total number of 2809 households were surveyed. 818 number of households practice safe solid waste disposal, representing an abysmally low percentage of 29.10%.

The survey also investigated **Availability of soap for hand washing**. Out of a total number of 750 households surveyed, a total number of 453 households have soap for hand washing. This figure represents 62.10%.

The eighth chapter is on the major findings of the report. These are:

1. There are wide disparities in the coverage and access to an Improved source of water supply in Urban towns in Anambra state. While some towns have good coverage, others have very poor coverage. This reveals that there is no planned development of water service provision in the state.
2. Coverage and use of an Improved toilet facility is generally poor in urban towns in the state. While Pour flush to pit followed by flush to septic tank remains the most popular toilet facilities, open defecation remains the mode of sanitation in some small towns like Omor in Ayamelum LGA. As a matter of fact, 16% of total households surveyed still practice open defecation.
3. Majority of households surveyed- about 63% travel more than 200 metres to access water supply, meaning most of these citizens do not have physical access to water. The same percentage does not always have sufficient water to use for domestic purposes.
4. Lack of water supply and insufficient funds are the two greatest factors that hinder access to water in Urban towns surveyed, though in few towns like Omor, distance to water points is considered as the main factor hindering access.
5. The Anambra State Government is not presently implementing any kind of WASH projects in most of the Urban towns in the state. 63% of the overall respondents affirm that there are no ongoing WASH projects in their communities.
6. Small Towns Water Supply programmes are yet to be implemented in all the towns surveyed. Almost all the respondents said that no Water Consumers Association exist in their towns.
7. Small Scale Suppliers of Water Services are more predominant and more unionised mainly in Urban towns as the survey shows that Water Vendors Association exists mainly in big urban towns of Onitsha, Awka, Ekwulobia and Nnewi.



8. Most water consumers 45% of people surveyed, spend more than N1000 monthly to access water supply. This is very peculiar to big towns of Onitsha, Ekwulobia and Nnewi. In Awka South, Anambra East and Abagana, water consumers surveyed spent less than N500 monthly to access water supply.#
9. Most people in the focus towns spend a high percentage of their high income to access water. 38% of respondents say they spend between 25%-50% of their monthly income to access water supply, while 63% say they spend less than 25%.
10. The three most important water and sanitation problems faced by citizens in the order of priority are lack of government support, poor rush at boreholes, and poor sanitation.
11. Increased Government support and provision of more sanitation facilities are considered as factors that will encourage residents to build and use toilets.
12. Most of the people surveyed (40%) believe Government is best placed to solve their water and sanitation problems, while 27% believe the problem of water supply can be solved by the private sector (Truck drivers and Borehole water producers)

The concluding chapter presents the following recommendations in line with findings of the report.

### **Recommendations for Anambra State Government**

1. The government of Anambra States should declare a state of emergency in the Sanitation sector of the state in order to stem the negative health implication that the situation portends.
2. Government should consider the provision of water supply and sanitation service its primary responsibility.
3. The Anambra State Government should adopt and implement the right to water in the state.
4. Efforts to revive the Anambra State Water Corporation to enable it deliver services efficiently should be step up.
5. The Anambra State Government should reprioritise the Water and Sanitation sector and devote more funds to implement programmes and projects that will solve the problems of the sector.
6. The Ministry of Public Utilities, Water Resources and Community Development should facilitate the formation of Water Consumer Associations In the state.

7. Government should set up a regulatory body to regulate water tariffs by Small Scale providers.
8. Government should construct sanitation facilities in public places and encourage bodies and households to construct such.
9. The International Year of Sanitation should be re launched and its components implemented in the state
10. School based hygiene promotion campaigns should be launched in the state.
11. Government should embark on intensive Hand Washing Campaign to change the hand washing habit of the people .A high profile Hand washing with Soap Campaigns should be launched in the state. Government should embark on intensive Hand Washing Campaign to change the hand washing habit of the people
12. Special Sanitation improvement programmes should be launched in Omor in Ayamelum LGA where up to 92% of the residents still practice open defecation.

#### **Recommendations for Civil Society Organisations**

CSOs should campaign for the implementation of the right to water in Anambra state.

#### **Recommendations for Urban and Small Towns Unions**

1. Towns Unions in Urban and Small towns in Anambra State should implement Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS).
2. Towns Unions should commence the process of forming Water Consumer Associations.
3. Town Unions should encourage household to build and use toilets and set regulations to enforce this.

#### **Recommendations for EU-WSSSRP**

The Anambra State STU should ensure this report is reviewed and circulated to all stakeholders.