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# Introduction

The mandate of the ad-hoc Expert Group on Monitoring Progress in Achieving Equitable Access to Water and Sanitation in the pan-European Region is to develop and test a tool[[1]](#footnote-1) that could be used by government and stakeholders to establish a baseline, track progress, and prompt discussions on further actions to be taken in order to achieve equitable access to water and sanitation.

The tool will be presented in a final document, which will represent the final output of the work of the Expert Group. It is suggested that final output document follows the structure presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Suggested Structure of the Expert Group’s Final Output Document**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Purpose** | **Content, sources** | **Size** |
| 1a – Introduction: Equitable access to water and sanitation | To provide an introduction to the topic  | Based on the executive summary of the “No One Left Behind” document | Max. 5 pages |
| 1b– Introduction: Tracking progress towards equitable access  | To provide an introduction to the document, highlighting its aim, scope, potential and limitations.  | Based on the concept note, the experience of the pilot countries and input from members of the Expert Group | Max 5 pages |
| 2 – Scorecard framework for tracking progress | To provide a framework to assess a country/region/city situation as regards actions to achieve equitable access | Final version of this document. It is suggested to identify a maximum of 20 scoring indicators, and dedicate a maximum of one page per scoring indicator.  | Max 20 pages |
| 3 – How to interpret the results of applying the scorecard framework | To provide guidance on how to interpret the results of the scoring exercise, and how to use them for benchmarking, policy advocacy, and accountability purposes | Based on the experience of the pilot countries and input from members of the Expert Group | Max 5 pages |
| 4 – Case studies: the pilot exercises | To document the experiences of the pilot exercises in using the scorecard framework | Description and analysis of the experience of the country piloting exercises, focusing on general and process aspects | Max 10 pages |

#### *Aim and limitations of this document*

This document presents the first draft of the tool to be developed by the Expert Group. Thus, it represents a first draft of section 2 of the final output document. It is intended merely as background for discussion at the first meeting of the Expert Group. It should be read together with the project concept note as well as the draft terms of reference for the country pilots that will help to test the tool.

As highlighted above, the scorecard framework aims to be a tool that could be used by government and stakeholders to establish a baseline, track progress, and prompt discussions on further actions to be taken in order to achieve equitable access to water and sanitation.

The scorecard framework 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 “good enough” 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 framework, however, will focus only on the issues directly related to equitable access outcomes and not on the overall functioning of the water and sanitation sector. The scorecard framework does not focus either on other circumstances that may impinge on access to equitable access and sanitation, such as water resources governance.

#### *General structure of the scorecard*

The suggested general structure of the scorecard framework is as follows:

1. The scorecard framework identifies 20 targets. Accomplishment of each target is evaluated against a set of three indicators[[2]](#footnote-2). Each indicator can be assigned a score of 0, 1 or 2.
2. The 20 targets are grouped under four headings, following the structure of the “No One Left Behind” document:
	1. Sector governance (5 targets)
	2. Geographical disparities in access (4 targets)
	3. Access by vulnerable and marginalized groups (7 targets)
	4. Affordability issues (4 targets)

**Issue to be discussed by the Expert Group**: Issues such as water quality and sustainability were to a large extent left out of the “No One Left Behind” document. To what extent do those issues need to be integrated in the scorecard framework? How could this best be done?

1. Each target is presented in one page. Each page includes:
	1. Target and target rationale to which the set of scoring indicators is linked
	2. Set of scoring indicators linked to the target
	3. Space for justifying the scores
	4. Options to carry out the scoring (means of verification)
	5. Illustrative example of the use of the scoring methodology in the pilot countries (once the pilot country exercises have been carried out).
2. A summary scorecard sheet is available to provide the total score for each target

#### *Preparing for the first meeting of the Expert Group*

At their meeting, the members of the Expert Group will be asked to discuss:

* The general concept of the scorecard framework and its design
	+ Number of targets (20)
	+ Number of indicators per target (three)
	+ Number of scoring options per indicator (three)
	+ Relevance of sections on target rationale, scoring justification, and means of verification
* Overall balance of:
	+ Equitable access vs equitable access actions
	+ Qualitative vs quantitative information
* Indicator descriptors for each of the 20 targets (60 indicators)
	+ Relevance and usefulness
	+ Availability of information

In order to prompt reflection on how to improve the scorecard framework, it is suggested that each member of the Expert Group (including those in which a pilot is expected to be carried out) try to roughly fill the scorecard for their country/region/city (on their own or with the support of some colleagues) in advance of the meeting. It is not expected that the members will share their scorecard with the rest of the Expert Group.

|  |
| --- |
| Scorecard Section 1. STEERING GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORKS TO DELIVER EQUITABLE ACCESS TO WATER AND SANITATION**Suggested targets**1.1 Equitable access to water and sanitation is recognized as an important issue in the country/region/city1.2 There is a strategic framework for achieving equitable access1.3 Sector financial policies contribute to achieving and maintaining equitable access1.4 All users and right-holders are empowered1.5 Water operators are responsive to equitable access needs |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **PEq1.1. Equitable access to water and sanitation is recognized as an important issue in the country/region/city** |
| **Target rationale** | Achieving equitable access to water and sanitation requires a change in the way many stakeholders operate, organise their resources, and relate to each other. The recognition of equitable access to water and sanitation as an important issue would help, and in many contexts will be a pre-requisite, for those changes to happen. |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes** **= 2** | **To some extent = 1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **The key actors are aware of equitable access issues** |  |  |  | **Official documents** |
| **The key actors have committed to address equitable access issues** |  |  |  | **Official documents****Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **National/local legislation reflects international commitments** |  |  |  | **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **1.2 There is a strategic framework for achieving equitable access** |
| **Target rationale** | 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.  |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes****=2** | **To some extent =1** | **No****=0** | **Means of verification** |
| **Progress in closing equity gaps has been evaluated and published, and accountability mechanisms have been created** |  |  |  | **Official documents** |
| **Equitable access targets have been set, responsibilities for achieving them have been identified and allocated, the required financial resources have been assessed and the sources of funding identified, and****awareness-raising and capacity-development initiatives have been developed** |  |  |  | **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop****Official documents** |
| **Linkages between access to water and sanitation and other public services are well understood, and spaces for discussion and coordination by competent authorities have been created** |  |  |  | **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop****Official documents** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **1.3 Sector financial policies contribute to achieving and maintaining equitable access** |
| **Target rationale** | 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. |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes =2** | **To some extent =1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **The financial resources needed to achieve equitable access targets have been identified, made available and spent**  |  |  |  | **Official documents** |
| **Financing strategies for the WSS sector take equity issues into account both in the revenue side (tariff policy, subsidy policy) and the expenditure side (allocation of expenditures)** |  |  |  | **Official documents** |
| **Development partners active in the sector have identified equitable access to water and sanitation as a key aspect of their financial support to the sector, and are allocating their support accordingly** |  |  |  | **Development partner documents** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **1.4 All users and right-holders are empowered** |
| **Target rationale** | 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.  |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes =2** | **To some extent =1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **There are effective mechanisms in place to ensure that users are able to play an active role in managing the level of access that they receive and the costs that they pay (e.g. participatory mechanism in WSS infrastructure and service planning, metering)** |  |  |  | **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **There are effective mechanisms in place to ensure that users are able to influence the solutions chosen to meet their water and sanitation needs (e.g. public participation and accountability mechanisms)** |  |  |  | **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **There are effective mechanisms in place to ensure that users are aware of their rights and the options for exercising them as well as their duties (e.g. public awareness and information campaigns)** |  |  |  | **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **1.5 Water operators are responsive to equitable access needs** |
| **Target rationale** | National and local governments set public policy objectives, but operators (whether public or privately-owned) can have substantial influence over key variables. |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes =2** | **To some extent =1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **Water operators face monetary and/or non-monetary incentives (whether positive or negative) to ensure that their investment plans favor providing access to those lacking it** |  |  |  | **Official documents****Conclusions from stakeholder workshop** |
| **Water operators face monetary or non-monetary incentives to ensure that people from vulnerable and marginalized groups receive the same level of customer service as other customers** |  |  |  | **Official documents****Conclusions from stakeholder workshop** |
| **Water operators face monetary and/or non-monetary incentives (whether positive or negative) to ensure that tariff levels and structures are designed to ensure affordability by all** |  |  |  | **Official documents****Conclusions from stakeholder workshop** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |
| --- |
| Scorecard Section 2. REDUCING GEOGRAPHICAL DISPARITIES**Suggested targets**2.1 Geographical disparities in access are reduced2.2 Public policies support the reduction of access disparities between geographical areas2.3 Public policies support the reduction of price disparities between geographical areas2.4 External support for the sector targets areas that lag behind  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **2.1 Geographical disparities in access are reduced** |
| **Target rationale** | Access to improved water and sanitation in rural areas in the pan-European region is 10% lower than for urban areas. Geographical disparities in access (including wastewater treatment) need to be reduced if equitable access is to be achieved.  |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes = 2** | **To some extent = 1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **There are reliable official statistics on access to water and sanitation disaggregated by geographical area** |  |  |  | **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
|  | **Less than 3% =2** |  **Between 3% and 10% =1** | **Above 10% = 0** |  |
| **The disparity in access to water supply between urban areas and rural areas has been reduced to ….** |  |  |  | **Official statistics** |
| **The disparity in access to sanitation between urban areas and rural areas has been reduced to ….** |  |  |  | **Official statistics** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **2.2 Public policies support the reduction of access disparities between geographical areas** |
| **Target rationale** | Public policies can play a major role in reducing disparities in access between geographical areas, and in particular in increasing access in rural areas.  |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes =2** | **To some extent =1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **The policy framework provides incentives for the development and adoption of appropriate technical solutions for service delivery in rural areas** |  |  |  | **Official documents** **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **The policy framework supports the development of comprehensive and integrated approaches to service delivery in rural areas** |  |  |  | **Official documents** **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Sector financial policies mobilise sufficient resources to close the access gap (either through direct public investment or through cross-subsidy schemes)** |  |  |  | **Official documents** **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **2.3 Public policies support the reductions of price disparities between geographical areas** |
| **Target rationale** | Public policies can play a major role in reducing price disparities in between geographical areas.  |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes =2** | **To some extent =1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **Price benchmarking tools (e.g. affordability indicators, tariff reference values) are available** |  |  |  | **Official documents** |
| **Public subsidies are targeted to those areas that face higher costs of service provision**  |  |  |  | **Official documents** |
| **There is cross-subsidisation between localities with high-cost and low-cost of provision –either trough explicit cross-subsidisation schemes between service areas or implicit cross-subsidisation (allowed by a sector organisation that combines in a single service area localities with high and low cost of provision)**  |  |  |  | **Official documents** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **2.4 External support for the sector targets areas that lag behind** |
| **Target rationale** | In some countries, development partners 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. |
| **Indicators** |  | **More than 75% = 2** | **Between 25% and 75% = 1** | **Less than 25% = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **Development partners active in the sector target a significant share of their financial resources for the sector to support increasing access in geographical areas that lag behind** |  |  |  | **Development partner documents** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |
| --- |
| Scorecard Section 3. ENSURING ACCESS FOR VULNERABLE AND MARGINALISED GROUPS**Suggested targets**3.1 The poorest have the similar levels of access to water and sanitation than the rest of the population in the country/region/city 3.2 Water and sanitation policies prioritise and address the needs of vulnerable and marginalised groups 3.3 There is an integrated policy response to lack of access by vulnerable and marginalised groups 3.4 All persons with special physical needs have access to water and sanitation3.5 All users of institutional facilities and all institutionalised persons have access to water and sanitation3.6 All persons without access to private facilities have access to public facilities3.7 There is no people living in housing without access to water and sanitation in neighbourhoods where access is available |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **3.1 The poorest have similar levels of access to water and sanitation to the rest of the population in the country/region/city** |
| **Target rationale** | Monitoring progress on improving access to water and sanitation tends to focus on the average, while the poorest segments of the population often have far lower levels of access.  |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes = 2** | **To some extent = 1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **There are reliable official statistics on access to water and sanitation disaggregated by quintiles** |  |  |  | **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
|  | **Less than 5% =2** | **Between 5% and 10% =1** | **More than 10% = 0** |  |
| **The gap in access to an improved, safe and sustainable drinking water source between the poorest fifth of the population and the average is …..** |  |  |  |  |
| **The gap in access to improved, safe and sustainable sanitation between the poorest fifth of the population and the average is …..** |  |  |  |  |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **3.2 Water and sanitation policies prioritise and address the needs of vulnerable and marginalised groups** |
| Target rationale | There are many vulnerable and marginalized groups (VMGs), each with their own needs and facing different barriers to achieving equitable access and thus requiring differentiated solutions. |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes =2** | **To some extent =1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **The water and sanitation policy recognizes the special and differentiated needs of VMGs, and data on access to water and sanitation by different VMGs is regularly collected** |  |  |  | **Official documents** |
| **Water and sanitation authorities have put in place specific mechanisms (including participation by representatives of VMGs) to identify and address the needs of the different VMGs** |  |  |  | **Official documents** **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Public water and sanitation budgets have been reviewed from the perspective of ensuring access by VMGs, and sufficient funding has been secured to implement the activities designed to address the needs of VMGs** |  |  |  | **Official documents****Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **3.3 There is an integrated policy response to the lack of access by vulnerable and marginalised groups** |
| **Target rationale** | Achieving access to water and sanitation by vulnerable and marginalised groups (VMGs) is not the exclusive responsibility of the water and sanitation sector stakeholders. Public authorities and other stakeholders in the social inclusion and social protection, education, health, prison, and sectors also need to be involved so that social programmes also contribute to address this challenge and an integrated policy response is articulated.  |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes =2** | **To some extent =1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **The formulation of relevant non-WSS policies ( social inclusion and social protection, education, health, prisons, and housing) reflects their role in achieving equitable access to water and sanitation** |  |  |  | **Official documents** |
| **Mechanisms for collaboration across public agencies in the water and sanitation, social inclusion and protection, education, health, prison, and housing sectors have been established and are effectively used** |  |  |  | **Official documents** **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Integrated programmes to deal with access to water and sanitation by VMGs have been designed and are being effectively implemented** |  |  |  | **Official documents****Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **3.4 All persons with special physical needs have access to water and sanitation** |
| **Target rationale** | Many disabled, sick, and elderly people face problems in accessing water supply and sanitation services because of their specific physical needs – 8% of the people in the pan-European region suffer some form of disability.  |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes =2** | **To some extent =1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **Technical standards that ensure the establishment of accessible facilities have been adopted, and the way to public facilities is indicated by understandable information** |  |  |  | **Official documents** **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Information on access to water and sanitation by persons with special physical needs is available**  |  |  |  | **Official documents** **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
|  | **More than 75% =2** | **Between 25% and 75% =1** | **Less than 25% = 0** |  |
| **The number of accessible facilities ensures access for persons with special physical needs representing …** |  |  |  | **Official documents** **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **3.5 All users of institutional facilities and all institutionalised persons have access to water and sanitation** |
| **Target rationale** | Many people spend all or a significant part of their time in institutional facilities (which include schools, hospitals, retirement homes, prisons, and refugee camps), and they cannot secure independent access to water and sanitation.  |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes =2** | **To some extent =1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **The national legal framework incorporates the relevant international obligations** |  |  |  | **Official documents** |
| **All facility management contracts incorporate provisions on providing water and sanitation services, and effective complaint mechanisms have been put in place** |  |  |  | **Official documents** **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **All schools, hospitals, retirement homes, prisons, and refugee camps have enough and well-kept water and sanitation facilities** |  |  |  | **Official documents** **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **3.6 All persons without access to private facilities have access to public facilities** |
| **Target 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.  |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes =2** | **To some extent =1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **The responsibilities and obligations of public authorities and water operators towards right-holders without private facilities are well defined** |  |  |  | **Official documents****Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Information on access to water and sanitation by persons without access to private facilities is available**  |  |  |  | **Official documents** **Conclusion of stakeholder workshop** |
|  | **More than 75% =2** | **Between 25% and 75% =1** | **Less than 25% = 0** |  |
| **The number of public facilities ensures access for persons without access to private facilities representing …** |  |  |  | **Official documents** **Conclusion of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **3.7 There is no people living in housing without water and sanitation in neighbourhoods where access is available** |
| **Target rationale** | People belonging to vulnerable and marginalised groups often live in housing without basic water and sanitation. The causes include situations of illegal tenure, low quality of rented accommodation, squatting, as well as discrimination of ethnic minorities. |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes =2** | **To some extent =1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **There is an official diagnostic of the extent of the problem and a characterisation of the different situations** |  |  |  | **Official documents** |
| **Integrated programmes addressing the symptoms and causes of the lack of progress have been formulated and are being implemented** |  |  |  | **Official documents** **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
|  | **Less than 1% = 2** | **Between 1% and 5% = 1** | **More than 5% = 0** |  |
| **The number of people living in housing without access to water and sanitation (in localities where access is available to some), in comparison to the total population in those localities represents ...** |  |  |  | **Official documents** **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |
| --- |
| Scorecard Section 4. KEEPING WATER AND SANITATION AFFORDABLE FOR ALL**Suggested targets**4.1 The water and sanitation bill is affordable to all4.2 Water and sanitation policy addresses affordability issues of water and sanitation services 4.3 The tariff system helps to address affordability issues4.4 Social protection measures help to address affordability issues  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **4.1 The water and sanitation bill is affordable for all**  |
| **Target rationale** | The water supply and sanitation bill (including wastewater treatment charges) may represent a high financial burden, particularly for the poorest households. In some contexts, the cost for households of acceding to water supply and sanitation is dominated by time costs. In many countries, monitoring of affordability of water and sanitation is lacking.  |
| **Indicators** |  | **Less than 3% =2** | **Between 3% and 10% =1** | **More than 10% = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **The sub-set of financial of water and sanitation household expenditure as proportion of income or total expenditure of the poorest (last income quintile) households represents ...** |  |  |  | **Official statistics** |
| **The full economic household costs of WSH as proportion of income or total expenditure of the poorest (last income quintile) households represents …** |  |  |  | **Official statistics** |
|  | **Yes =2** | **To some extent =1** | **No = 0** |  |
| **There are reliable official statistics on affordability indicators disaggregated by quintiles** |  |  |  | **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **4.2 National/local policies address affordability issues of water and sanitation services**  |
| **Target rationale** | Affordability is a common and increasing concern in the pan-European region. However, in many cases national/local policies do not address this issue.  |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes =2** | **To some extent =1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
|  **Water and sanitation policy includes affordable access as one of its objectives** |  |  |  | **Official documents** |
| **Social policy considers and addresses affordability of water and sanitation services**  |  |  |  | **Official documents** |
| **A long term strategy to address affordability issues of water and sanitation services has been formulated** |  |  |  | **Official documents****Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **4.3 The tariff system helps to address affordability issues** |
| **Target rationale** | Tariff design offers several options to address affordability issues.  |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes =2** | **To some extent =1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **The impact of different alternatives to address affordability issues through tariff measures (e.g. increasing block tariffs, cross-subsidies between user categories, social tariffs) have been analysed and publicly discussed** |  |  |  | **Official documents** **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Tariff measures have been included in the long-term strategy to address affordability issues** |  |  |  | **Official documents** |
| **Tariff reforms have been implemented to help address affordability issues, without damaging the financial sustainability of service provision** |  |  |  | **Official documents** **Conclusions of stakeholder workshop** |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target** | **4.4 Social protection measures help to address affordability issues**  |
| **Target rationale** | Social protection measures offer several options to address affordability issues.  |
| **Indicators** |  | **Yes =2** | **To some extent =1** | **No = 0** | **Means of verification** |
| **The impact of different alternatives to address affordability issues through social protection measures (preventive and curative) has been analysed and publicly discussed** |  |  |  |  |
| **Tariff measures have been included in the long-term strategy to address affordability issues** |  |  |  |  |
| **Social protection measures currently in place guarantee that (within the prevalent tariff system) no family breaks the nationally-defined affordability threshold**  |  |  |  |  |
| **Score justification** | (to be filled during the piloting exercises) |
| **Illustrative example of the use of the scoring in the pilot countries** | (to be included after the piloting exercises are carried out and analysed) |

# Summary Scoring Sheet

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Target** | **Score** |
| Steering governance frameworks to deliver equitable access to water and sanitation | 1.1 Equitable access to water and sanitation is recognized as an important issue in the country/region/city |  |
| 1.2 There is a strategic framework for achieving equitable access |  |
| 1.3 Sector financial policies contribute to achieving and maintaining equitable access |  |
| 1.4 All users and right-holders are empowered |  |
| 1.5 Water operators are responsive to equitable access needs |  |
| Reducing geographical disparities | 2.1 Geographical disparities in access are reduced |  |
| 2.2 Public policies support the reduction of access disparities between geographical areas |  |
| 2.3 Public policies support the reduction of price disparities between geographical areas |  |
| 2.4 External support for the sector targets areas that lag behind  |  |
| Ensuring access for vulnerable and marginalised groups | 3.1 The poorest have similar levels of access to water and sanitation to the rest of the population in the country/region/city  |  |
| 3.2 Water and sanitation policies prioritise and address the needs of vulnerable and marginalised groups |  |
| 3.3 There is an integrated policy response to lack of access by vulnerable and marginalised groups |  |
| 3.4 All persons with special physical needs have access to water and sanitation |  |
| 3.5 All users of institutional facilities and all institutionalised persons have access to water and sanitation |  |
| 3.6 All persons without access to private facilities have access to public facilities |  |
| 3.7 There is no people living in housing without access to water and sanitation in neighbourhoods where access is available |  |
| Keeping water and sanitation affordable for all | 4.1 The water and sanitation bill is affordable for all |  |
| 4.2 Water and sanitation policy addresses affordability issues of water and sanitation services  |  |
| 4.3 The tariff system helps to address affordability issues |  |
| 4.4 Social protection measures help to address affordability issues  |  |

1. In this document the tool will be named “scorecard framework”. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. As an exception, in this proposal target 2.4 is tracked by only one indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)