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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sector (s)** | WASH |
| **Donor** | UNICEF |
| Country | Philippines |
| **Specific location** | Selected locations in regions 6, 7 and 8 affected by Yolanda  |
| Main objective | The main objective of the assessment is to measure change in sanitation since the baseline amongst households and school children in the target population. |
| Specific objectives | 1. Measure change in sanitation knowledge, attitudes and practices at household level, in the target population.
2. Measure change in sanitation at school level, in the target area.
 |
| Data Sources | **Primary Data Collection**: household survey; community focus group discussions; school survey;**Secondary Data Collection**: desktop review of project documents and situation reports. |
| Sample | Population includes 6 provinces across 45 municipalities and 879 Barangays where the UNICEF project is being implemented. Representative sample to be done at the province level. |
| Period of assessment | February – March 2016 |
| Key activities | 1. Household survey (approx. 1,645)
2. Community focus group discussions (approx. 24)
3. School survey (approx. 180)
4. Presentation of findings
 |
| Expected Deliverables | 1. Assessment plan
2. Finalised set of data collection tools
3. Populated excel database
4. Draft report including:
	* Household KAP
	* WASH in schools
5. Final report
6. PowerPoint presentation of key findings
 |

# Background & Rationale

One of the most powerful storms in recorded history, ‘Super Typhoon’ Haiyan cut through the Philippines with Tsunami-like storm surge and winds reaching up to 375 kilometres per hour. Even in the third most disaster-prone country (World Disaster Report, 2012), where on average 20 typhoons make landfall every year, the devastation was overwhelming. Locally known as Yolanda, Haiyan made landfall in the early hours of 8 November 2013, lashing coastal communities in the Philippines’ central islands.

More than 6,000 people lost their lifes, a total of 14 million people were affected and 4.1 million people were displaced – including 1.7 million children. More than a million homes were damaged or destroyed, winds and surging seas wrecked over 20,000 classrooms and health centres were shut down across all affected areas while people were simultaneously cut off from assistance as land, air and sea access was close to impossible. Access to safe water and sanitation significantly decreased with damages to sanitation facilities and water supply systems, triggering concern on the potential outbreak of water-borne diseases.

The government estimated a total loss at US$ 12.9 billion in a country with 40 per cent of children living in poverty. The country as a whole was is still recovering from other previous emergencies, including escalation of conflict in Zamboanga in September 2013 which displaced120,000 people; and a 7.2 magnitude earthquake that struck Bohol province in October 2013 affecting more than 3.2 million people.

Given the scale of the devastation, the Government of the Philippines mounted an immediate response to deliver life-saving relief, accepting also the offer of assistance by the United Nations. UNICEF’s Corporate Emergency Procedures for Level 3 Emergencies were triggered by the Executive Director, initiating an organisation-wide response mobilising resources regionally and globally. The cluster system, co-led by the Government and UN agencies, was also immediately made operational.

Based on a Multi-Cluster/Sector Initial Rapid Assessment (MIRA) an Inter-Agency Strategic Response Plan (SRP) was developed. The UN response was rolled out under the SRP, running from November 2013 to November 2014 with a total appeal of US$ 791 million, including a US$ 119 million UNICEF component. The interagency response complemented the Government-led efforts under the “Reconstruction Assistance for Yolanda” (RAY) plan for 2014-2015 and beyond, with requirements estimated at more than US$ 8 billion.

UNICEF’s focus was on the most urgent needs for life saving measure in all affected areas, targeting now but not being limited to 40 selected municipalities where 1.34 million people are affected, of which 558,000 are children. These communities were found to be the most affected further to analysis of storm signal strength on impact on the Typhoon’s course, level of storm surge, and proportion of affected population.

The WASH Cluster partners, co-lead by the Department of Health have developed a Sanitation Strategy for Early Recovery in Yolanda (Haiyan) affected areas based on the rural sanitation concept prior to Yolanda. The proposed framework of Philippine Approach to Total Sanitation (PhATS) is conceptionalized as a means to help national government achieve the goals set forth in the Philippine Sustainable Sanitation Roadmap and the National Sustainable Sanitation Plan alike. It builts on the national sanitation roadmap envisioning the creation of an open defecation free environment with safe disposal of liquid and solid waste and the promotion of health and hygiene practices in the promoting an adjusted Community Led Total Sanitation model and within a holistic approach to promote an enabling environment.

The strategy is envisioned to provide a common framework to detail sanitation roadmap initiatives to achieve zero open defecation free status at national level while providing implementation details to reach out to a large number of Yolanda affected Barangays and achieve the WASH cluster targets of providing access to basic sanitation to about 650,000 people by end of November 2014, based on the Cluster’s Strategic Response Plan.

The rationale to have a Philippines specific sanitation approach is linked to the sector context prioritizing sanitation referring to the socio-economic, political and cultural context, including its development trajectory with slow progress on rural sanitation and regional and income group based inequities, the occurrence of frequent disasters and the current development aid architecture. The strategy also tries to take note of the institutional set up of the sector, the potential links to national provincial and local institutions and recent patterns on public and private sector investments.

In December 2014, as UNICEF and partners conducted the PhATS based sanitation programme in selected Yolanda affected areas, a baseline assessment (including KAP analysis) has been conducted by REACH. After the completion of the programme, an end line is required to measure change in sanitation in the area of the PhAST based sanitation programme.

# Research Objectives

The main objective of the assessment is to measure change in sanitation since the baseline amongst households and school in the target area.

## The specific objectives are the following:

* Measure change in sanitation knowledge, attitudes and practices at household level, in the target population.
* Measure change in sanitation at school level, in the t­arget area.

# Research Questions

* Are there been an improvement in sanitation knowledge, attitudes and practices at household level, in the target population?
	+ Are there been an improvement in sanitation knowledge, attitudes and practices at household level, in the target population?
	+ Are there been an improvement of sanitation in school of the targeted area?

# Methodology

***Sampling Location***

The assessment is limited to PhATS Yolanda project areas, which were identified in coordination with the WASH cluster as the Yolanda affected areas most in need of intervention (REACH II). The project areas include three regions, six provinces and 879 barangays (see breakdown in table below). This covers a total of 45 municipalities, 223,365 households, and 1,009,003 individuals. The sampling methodology for this assessment is outlined in the following section.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sn** | **PCA Partners** | **Province** | **# of Barangay** | **# HH**  | **# ind.** |
| 1 | ACF ES | East Samar | 40 | 5,805 | 28,704 |
| 2 | ACF | Capiz / Iloilo | 44 | 11,827 | 58,289 |
| 3 | ACTED | East Samar | 74 | 12,634 | 59,331 |
| 4 | ARCHE NOVA | Leyte | 38 | 13,459 | 59,802 |
| 5 | ASDSW - Single Drop | Capiz | 105 | 29,747 | 151,257 |
| 6 | CRS | Leyte | 62 | 17,762 | 73,680 |
| 7 | IMC | Leyte | 74 | 12,932 | 56,451 |
| 8 | Islamic Relief (IR) | Cebu | 15 | 13,308 | 58,842 |
| 9 | OXFAM | Eastern Samar | 79 | 14,209 | 63,835 |
| 10 | Plan International | E-Samar / Samar | 62 | 10,444 | 51,542 |
| 11 | Relief International (RI) | Leyte | 93 | 20,146 | 95,413 |
| 12 | Save the Children | Leyte | 63 | 28,516 | 117,243 |
| 13 | Samaritan Purse (SP) | Leyte / Samar | 130 | 32,576 | 134,614 |
|  | **Grand Total** |  | **879** | **223,365** | **1,009,003** |

***Household Survey***

The proposed sampling methodology is based on statistically significant data at the province level. The sampling process aim for each household in a given province an equal chance of selection. The sampling is a two stages cluster sampling, the first stage is a PPS cluster sampling with replacement of PSUs. A cluster of five surveys is conducted in each selected barangay. Where a barangay was selected more than once, an additional cluster of five surveys was added. In the second stage, a simple random sampling of the households inside the barangays will be conducted based on households list available at barangays level.

The Sampling framework is based on meeting the following criteria

* The sampling size by province is adjusted to account for the design effect (DEFF) that affects cluster sampling methodologies, with an average interclass correlation (ICC) by province (average calculated on the PhAST baseline).
* Minimum statistical significance at the province level of 92%, +/- 7% margin of error. Based on population data. This will enable effective comparisons across the provinces to identify similarities or differences in the indicators.
* Representative sample at the entire population level. Based on 945 effective surveys (1,645) household surveys the statistical significance will be 95% +/- 3.2% margin of error.
* The number of survey is increased by 10% to account for non-response rate and as buffer during data collection.
* The power on comparison between baseline and end line will be checked to ensure that efficient comparison can be conducted between the two assessments.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Province** | **Population (estd. HH)** | **Effective sample size** | **Average cluster size** | **Intra Class Correlation (Avg estimate)** | **Average design effect** | **Sample size (with DEFF)** | **Sample size (+10% buffer)** | **Statistical Significance** |
| Capiz | 36,673 | 157 | 6.77 | 0.060 | 1.34 | 210 | 235 | 92% +/-7% |
| Cebu | 13,308 | 155 | 16.67 | 0.039 | 1.61 | 250 | 275 |
| Eastern Samar | 40,046 | 157 | 6.03 | 0.100 | 1.5 | 235 | 260 |
| Iloilo | 4,901 | 155 | 15.91 | 0.084 | 2.26 | 350 | 385 |
| Leyte | 113,989 | 160 | 5.77 | 0.086 | 1.41 | 225 | 250 |
| Samar | 14,448 | 156 | 7.68 | 0.057 | 1.38 | 215 | 240 |
| **Area of intervention** | **223,365** | **940** |  |  |  | **1,485** | **1,645** | **95% +/- 3.2%** |

It can be seen from the above table that while the sample is not representative across the entire population (e.g. collecting x% in all barangays), by collecting surveys in the largest and smallest provinces will yield very similar statistical significance. That is, the samples are weighted – not every house has an equal opportunity to be selected; those in smaller province will have a greater chance of being selected. This needs to be taken into consideration when aggregating data (it should be weighted) but will provide more accurate information as a result. For example, if two provinces are aggregated then the province that has a larger population should have a larger impact on the aggregated results.

***Community FGDs***

The proposed methodology for selection of barangays for community FGDs is based on purposive selection of coastal and inland barangays in each province. In each of these two barangays, women’s and men’s focus groups will be conducted separately. A total of 24 community FGDs in 12 barangays will be conducted. They will provide qualitative information to help analyse and explain the quantitative information collected from households.

***School Survey***

A sample of 180 schools will be randomly selected from all schools in PhATS program areas (total 649 schools). This sampling methodology is based on statistical significance (92%, +/-7% margin of error) at the level of all schools in PhATS program areas.

***Student FGDs***

The proposed methodology for selection of schools for student FGDs is purposive selection of schools from the survey sample based on division and school size. In each division, there are two schools (of different sizes where possible) selected for student FGDs, with boys and girls groups conducted separately. The sample as a whole includes small schools (<500 students), medium schools (500-999 students) and big schools (>999 students). A total of 28 focus group discussions in 14 schools will be conducted (representing 7 divisions).

# Product Typology

The following deliverables will be provided:

* Term of reference
* Finalised set of data collection tools
* Clean database
* Draft report including:
	+ Household KAP
	+ WASH in schools
* Final report
* PowerPoint presentation of key findings.

# Data entry and analysis

All data collected at the household level will be collected using smartphones with Open Data Kit (ODK) software. This allows for questionnaires to be uploaded from the phone directly, eliminating the need for data entry and improving accuracy. To ensure the data quality the following steps are followed during the data collection exercise: 1) Team leaders are proceeding to systematic checks after data collection in each Barangays. In case of discrepancies, the team is going back to the household in order to double check the questionnaire. 2) Daily debriefing on the data collection will be conducted in order to spread data collection lesson learned across the fields team in different area. 3) The data are transferred to the server on a daily basis and checked by the assessment officer. Before starting the analysis process, a comprehensive data cleaning will take place.

Focus group discussions will be recorded on paper, with data entry completed in Tacloban.

A data analysis plan by indicator will be developed after the completion of the data collection tools / indicator identification. This will include review of which indicators are to be analysed and by what method. For example, this may include regression analysis / hypothesis testing to understand how indicators relate to each other and/or measure of differences between base line and end lines; the representation of means, standard deviations, maximums and minimums through box whisker plots; etc. Qualitative data such as focus group discussion would be used to bolster the analysis around the quantitative data.

It is recommended that the data analysis is undertaken at an indicator level, disaggregated up by the spatial units of provinces. Specifically, it is recommended to:

* KAP data presented for each indicator, then disaggregated to the province level and compare with baseline finding. Focus group discussions would be populated throughout to support the analysis.
* School based information from the key informants and other associated data.

Throughout all of the aforementioned analysis, mapping of the data will be inserted to enable quick analysis of the spatial dimension of indicators. Where there are linked indicators, such as that identified in the hypothesis testing or through the qualitative information, overlapping of multiple indicators will be included in the maps (e.g. the relationship of open defecation to access to toilets is likely to be significant and could be mapped collectively).

# Management arrangements and work plan

* **Roles and Responsibilities, Organogram**
	+ **REACH assessment coordinator**
		- Team A, Eastern Samar, Samar, Leyte. 2 team leaders & 10 Enumerators.
		- Team B, Lliolo Capiz: 2 team leaders & 10 Enumerators.
		- Team C, Cebu city. 1 team leader & 7 enumerators.
* **Workplan**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task** | **Location** | **Responsible** | **Feb-16** | **Mar-16** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| **Inception** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Finalize Study Design, Sampling & Tools* | Tacloban / Remote | UNICEF, REACH |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| *Build ODK and set up network requirements.* | Geneva / Remote | IMPACT, REACH |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Beneficiary Data Collection** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Train Enumerators*  | Samar, E Samar, Iloilo, Capiz, Leyte, Cebu | REACH |   |  |  |  |   |   |   |   |
| *Community Focus Group Discussions* | Samar, E Samar, Iloilo, Capiz, Leyte, Cebu | REACH |   |  |  |  |  |  |   |   |
| *Household Surveys*  | Samar, E Samar, Iloilo, Capiz, Leyte, Cebu | REACH |   |  |  |  |  |  |   |   |
| *School assessment* | Samar, E Samar, Iloilo, Capiz, Leyte, Cebu | REACH |   |  |  |  |  |  |   |   |
| *Data Entry* | Tacloban | REACH |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |
| **Analysis and Reporting** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Geospatial Mapping* | Geneva / Remote | IMPACT, REACH |   |   |   |   |  |  |   |   |
| *Quantitative Data Analysis*  | Tacloban / Remote | REACH |   |   |   |   |  |  |   |   |
| *Qualitative Data Analysis* | Tacloban / Remote | REACH |   |   |   |   |  |  |   |   |
| *Draft Report* | Tacloban / Remote | REACH, UNICEF |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |   |
| *Final Report* | Tacloban / Remote | REACH |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| *Powerpoint Presentation (1 day)* | Tacloban | REACH, UNICEF, Partners |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| **Webmap and Information Management** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Publish databases online* | Geneva | IMPACT, REACH |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| *Create online webmap* | Geneva | IMPACT, REACH |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |

# Risks & Assumptions

Households agree to participate in the assessment.

*Mitigating action: the benefits to the community of the assessment will be explained by field staff before beginning data collection.*

No security incidents or major practical/logistical impediments at field level.

*Mitigating action: REACH security protocol will be put in place to minimize these risks.*

# Annexe 1 – Analysis Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| # | **Thematic** | **Indicator Name** | **Disaggregation** | **Base line** | **End line** | **Tool**  |
| 1.01 | Access to water | Main drinking water source | province; water source | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.02 | Access to water | Location of drinking water point | province; location | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.03 | Access to water | Households reporting water treatment, by type | province; yes/no; type water treatment | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.05 | Access to water | Water storage type | province; storage type  | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.06 | Access to water | Households reporting water storage in covered containers | province; | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.07 | Access to water | Access to water for purposes other than for drinking, | province; yes/no | Y |  | HH |
| 1.08 | Access to water | Water source (for purposes other than for drinking) | province; water source  | Y |  | HH |
| 1.09 | Access to water | Water collection  | province; adult/child; male/female  | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.10 | Access to water | Time spent collecting water | province | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.11 | Access to water | Number of times water is collected per day  | province | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.12 | Access to water | Households reporting payment for drinking water, by type of cost, by amount (PHP) | province; type of cost; | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.15 | Access to water | Households reporting payment for water used for other purposes than drinking, by payment type and cost | province; payment type | Y |  | HH |
| 1.18 | Health and Hygiene awareness  | Households receiving hygiene and sanitation messages in last 6 months  | province | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.19 | Health and Hygiene awareness  | Messages still remembered by respondent | province; type of hygiene and sanitation message  | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.20 | Health and Hygiene awareness  | Source of message on hygiene and sanitation  | province; message source  | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.21 | Health and Hygiene awareness  | Most trusted source  | province | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.22 | Health and Hygiene awareness  | Perceived health risks related to unsafe water  | province | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.23 | Health and Hygiene awareness  | Households with designated place for hand washing in HH  | province | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.24 | Health and Hygiene awareness  | Observed hand washing facility by enumerator: presence of soap and water | province; presence of hand washing place (yes/no); water present; soap present  | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.25 | Health and Hygiene awareness  | Soap availability  | province; yes/no  | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.26 | Health and Hygiene awareness  | Observed soap availability by interviewee  | province; seen/unseen/unable to check  | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.27 | Health and Hygiene awareness  | Frequency of hand washing with soap in previous 24 hours  | province; number of times | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.28 | Health and Hygiene awareness  | When hands were washed  | province; activities/moments when hands washed  | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.29 | Health and Hygiene awareness  | Perceived importance of hand washing with soap after toilet use  | province; ranking of importance  | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.30 | Health and Hygiene awareness  | Perception of proportion of community wash hands with soap after toilet use  | province; range from agree to disagree with statement  | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.31 | Health and Hygiene awareness  | Perceived importance of hand washing before feeding children  | province; ranking of importance  | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.32 | Health and Hygiene awareness  | Belief that majority of people in community wash hands with soap after feeding children  | province; range of agree to disagree  | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.33 | Health and Hygiene awareness  | Diarrhoea for under 5 year olds (in past 2 weeks) | province; yes/no, male/female  | Y | Y | HH |
| 1.34 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Most used type of toilet facility  | province; type of sanitation facility  | Y  | Y  | HH |
| 1.35 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Shared sanitation facility (with members not in the household) | province; yes/no | Y  | Y  | HH |
| 1.36 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Shared sanitation facility open to public or to know members only  | province; open to known members only/ open to general public  | Y  | Y  | HH |
| 1.37 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Number of people using shared facility  | province; number of people  | Y  | Y  | HH |
| 1.38 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Ownership of toilet in use  | province; yes/no  | Y  | Y  | HH |
| 1.39 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Barriers to having own toilet  | province; type of barrier  | Y  | Y  | HH |
| 1.40 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Payment type for construction of toilet  | province; payment type | Y  | Y  | HH |
| 1.41 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Toilet construction by household  | province; yes/no  | Y  |  | HH |
| 1.42 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Time since toilet construction  | province; number of years since construction  | Y  | Y | HH |
| 1.43 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Households having received aid from organisation for toilet construction, by type | province; yes/no; type of aid  | Y  | Y  | HH |
| 1.44 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Financial aid received, by type | province; type financial aid  | Y  | Y  | HH |
| 1.45 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Reported reasons for Open Defecation  | province; reason for OD  | Y  | Y | HH |
| 1.46 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Reported extent of Open Defecation by household members, by who defecates, by time of day OD practised | province; adult/child; male/female; province; daytime/night-time/both; toilet ownership  | Y  | Y | HH |
| 1.49 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Households with a child under 3 years old  | province; yes no  | Y  | Y | HH |
| 1.50 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Last disposal method of youngest child's stools | province; disposal method  | Y  | Y | HH |
| 1.51 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Perceived acceptability of OD by most people  | province; agree to disagree with statement  | Y  | Y | HH |
| 1.52 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Acceptability of OD according to respondent  | province | Y  | Y | HH |
| 1.53 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Estimated proportion of people in community who defecate in the open  | province; percentage according to view of respondent  | Y  | Y | HH |
| 1.54 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Estimated proportion of people in community who think households should have own toilet  | province; percentage according to view of respondent  | Y  | Y | HH |
| 1.55 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Perceived risks/problems of open defecation  | province; perceived risks  | Y  | Y | HH |
| 1.56 | Access to sanitation facilities  | Respondents believing they could have an open discussion on OD with neighbours  | province | Y  | Y | HH |
| 1.57 | Solid Waste Management  | Reported method of disposal of household garbage  | province | Y  | Y | HH |
| 1.58 | Work & Income  | Work type of primary income earner in HH  | province; work type; nature of work  | Y  | Y | HH |
| 1.59 | Work & Income  | Average monthly income  | province; Income in PHP/ No income  | Y  | Y | HH |

# Annexe 2 – Analysis Plan School assessment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Thematic | Indicator | Analysis | Baseline | Endline |
| 1.01 | General information | Number of students in the school; by gender | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 1.02 | General information | Funding allocated to water and sanitation in the Maintenance and Other Operations Expenses (MOOE) or School Building Repair and Maintenance Fund (SBRMF) | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 1.03 | General information | WASH included in annual investment plan / School improvement plan | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 2.01 | Hygiene | Frequency of solid waste disposal | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 2.02 | Hygiene | Type off solid waste disposal | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 2.03 | Hygiene | Practice of group hand-washing with Soap | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 2.04 | Hygiene | Barriers daily hand washing | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 2.05 | Hygiene | Practice of daily tooth brushing | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 2.06 | Hygiene | Barriers to practice of daily tooth-brushing | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 2.07 | Hygiene | Water Sanitation or hygiene in school | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 2.08 | Hygiene | Type of water sanitation or hygiene in school | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 2.09 | Hygiene | Presence of student club for water, sanitation and hygiene | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 2.10 | Hygiene | Presence of active committee for water, sanitation or hygiene | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 3.01 | Water supply | Main source of drinking water in the school compound | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 3.02 | Water supply | Barrier to drinking water | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 3.03 | Water supply | Coping strategy when lack of drinking water | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 3.04 | Water supply | Presence of hand washing facilities near the toilet | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 3.05 | Water supply | Presence of soap close to hand washing facilities | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 3.06 | Water supply | Availability of water in hand washing facilities | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 3.07 | Water supply | Coping strategy not availability of hand washing facilities | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 4.01 | Sanitation | # of functional toilet Male / Female - Student / Teacher | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 4.02 | Sanitation | Ratio functioning toilets / student | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 4.03 | Sanitation | Average distance to toilet  | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 4.04 | Sanitation | Main toilet type | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 4.05 | Sanitation | Practice of urination in the open | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 4.06 | Sanitation | Practice of defecation in the open | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 4.07 | Sanitation | Toilet cleaned | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 4.08 | Sanitation | Challenge toilet cleaned | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 4.09 | Sanitation | Coping toilet non functioning | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 5.01 | Observation | Availability of water | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 5.02 | Observation | Availability of hand-washing facilities | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 5.03 | Observation | Availability of water at the hand washing facilities | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 5.04 | Observation | Availability of soap at the hand washing facilities | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 5.05 | Observation | Observation: # functional toilets | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 5.06 | Observation | Observation: toilets cleaned | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 5.07 | Observation | Observation: Privacy of toilet | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 5.08 | Observation | Observation: Presence of light inside the toilets | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 5.09 | Observation | Observation: Presence of bin in female toilets | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 5.10 | Observation | Observation: Evidence of open defecation inside school compound | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 5.11 | Observation | Observation: Evidence of open defecation in surrounding of the school | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |
| 5.12 | Observation | Observation: Evidence of flowing liquid waste/puddles of stagnant water on the ground inside the school compound | Baseline / Endline | Y | Y |