

Six communities for rehabilitation

WASH coverage and water quality by district

Organisation	WASH programme covering three districts and eighteen communities
Prepared for	WASH coordinator and the district water authority
Updated	July 26, 2026
Sectors	WASH
Standards and methodologies	Sphere Standards · Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) · Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS)
Data	wash-household-survey-2024

DECISION THIS INFORMS

Which six communities receive water point rehabilitation in the next funding cycle.

Every dataset behind this report is synthetic. No record traces to a real person, and no figure here describes a real programme.

Read the project online at data-analysis.cassion.dev/projects/wash-coverage-analysis

This report is licensed CC BY 4.0. You may adapt and redistribute it, including commercially, with attribution to Cassion.

Contents

Context	2
1 Recommendation	2
2 What changed in the measurement	2
3 The ranking	2
4 Why the list can be defended	3
5 Water quality, reported separately	3
6 What this does not establish	4
7 Recommended next steps	4
About this edition	4

Context

The problem

Coverage was reported by counting improved water sources, which ignored collection time entirely. Communities with a functioning borehole an hour away were counted as served, so rehabilitation budget went to the districts with the fewest boreholes rather than to the households with the worst service.

1 Recommendation

Fund water point rehabilitation in **SU-02, SU-05, NO-05, NO-01, NO-06 and CE-05** in the next cycle.

The selection is drawn from a ranking of all eighteen communities on the four conditions a rehabilitation changes. It is stable: dropping any single component of the ranking leaves five or six of the same six communities selected.

Three consequences the cluster should take with the list:

- **Coverage as previously reported was wrong, not merely incomplete.** 82.3% of households use an improved source; 56.3% have at least basic drinking water service. The gap is 26 points, and every household in it was counted as served.
- **The selection concentrates in Nord-Ouest** — three of six, against two in Sud-Est and one in Centre. That is an output of the ranking, not a quota.
- **Water quality is not addressed by this budget.** Contaminated supply needs treatment or a new source, and four of the six selected communities test above 47% for *E. coli* detection among households sampled.

2 What changed in the measurement

The programme reported coverage by counting improved water sources. The JMP drinking-water ladder does not classify a source; it classifies a household, and an improved source more than thirty minutes' round trip away is **limited** service, not basic.

Measure	Households
Improved source (as previously reported)	82.3%
At least basic service (source and ≤ 30 min)	56.3%
Improved source but over 30 minutes	26.1%

A quarter of households in this survey sit on limited service for collection time alone. Under the old measure every one of them was counted as covered, which is why rehabilitation budget had been going to the districts with the fewest boreholes rather than to the households with the worst service.

Full numerator, denominator and disaggregation for every indicator are in `docs/indicator-definitions.md`. This report does not restate them.

3 The ranking

Communities are scored on the four conditions a rehabilitation changes — collection time, water quantity against the Sphere minimum, source type, and basic service — each standardised across the eighteen so that no component dominates by scale.

Rank	District	Community	Basic water	Over 30 min	Below Sphere	Need
1	Sud-Est	SU-02	15.0%	85.0%	25.6%	2.020
2	Sud-Est	SU-05	25.6%	73.7%	18.8%	1.195
3	Nord-Ouest	NO-05	34.6%	65.4%	18.8%	0.966
4	Nord-Ouest	NO-01	42.9%	54.1%	15.8%	0.795
5	Nord-Ouest	NO-06	49.6%	42.9%	18.8%	0.564
6	Centre	CE-05	37.6%	60.9%	13.5%	0.539

Each community carries 133 to 136 surveyed households, so the rates are directly comparable without weighting.

Sanitation and hygiene are deliberately excluded from the ranking. A water point rehabilitation shortens the walk and restores function; it does not build latrines or supply soap. Including those components would let a community with poor sanitation displace one with a broken water point, funding a need this budget cannot meet. Sanitation and hygiene rates are held separately and should inform a different line.

CE-05 ranks sixth despite a worse collection-time rate than NO-06. Its Sphere-quantity and unimproved-source rates are lower, and the composite weighs all four. A reader who expects the list to be ordered by any single column should be pointed at the definitions document.

4 Why the list can be defended

A composite that reorders entirely when one input is removed is a composite the water authority should not trust. Each component was dropped in turn and the top six recomputed:

Component dropped	Of 6 still selected
Basic water service	5
Over the walk limit	5
Below the Sphere quantity minimum	5
Unimproved source	6

No community is on the list because of one input. Had the overlap fallen to three or four, this report would say the ranking is not reportable and ask for a different basis.

5 Water quality, reported separately

Quality was tested on roughly a third of surveyed households, so these rates rest on a denominator a third the size of the access figures and are not representative of a community.

Community	Households tested for <i>E. coli</i>	<i>E. coli</i> detected
NO-01	31.6%	61.9%
SU-02	40.6%	57.4%
NO-05	31.6%	52.4%
NO-06	31.6%	47.6%
SU-05	28.6%	39.5%
CE-05	37.6%	38.0%

These are reported beside the selection and not inside it. A contaminated supply needs treatment or a new source — a different intervention, on a different budget line, and one this recommendation does not fund.

6 What this does not establish

Collection time is reported, not measured. Where a community systematically under- or over-states the walk, the ranking moves with it, and nothing in this survey can detect that. It is the single largest threat to the selection.

The survey does not say why a source is distant or unimproved. A broken pump, a dry borehole and a community that never had a water point are indistinguishable here, and only the first is what a rehabilitation budget buys.

Seasonality is unobserved. A single survey round cannot separate a dry-season walk from a year-round one.

7 Recommended next steps

1. **Confirm by site visit before committing funds.** For each of the six, establish whether the fault is a broken pump, a dry borehole or an absent water point. Only the first is a rehabilitation.
2. **Publish the district distribution with the reasoning.** Three of six in Nord-Ouest will be read as a political choice unless the ranking is shown.
3. **Raise water quality separately with the cluster.** Four of the six selected communities detect *E. coli* in more than 47% of tested households, and no part of this budget addresses it.
4. **Re-survey collection time on a sample, by measurement rather than report.** It is the assumption the whole ranking rests on and the one nothing here can check.

About this edition

This report is generated from the same source as the project page, so the two cannot drift. The online edition carries the analysis notebook, the dataset and any corrections issued since this file was produced.

Read the project online at data-analysis.cassion.dev/projects/wash-coverage-analysis

This report is licensed CC BY 4.0. You may adapt and redistribute it, including commercially, with attribution to Cassion.

Generated July 26, 2026.