The Community Managed Project approach in WASH

Embassy of Finland in Ethiopia
Total water supply community beneficiaries of Go Finland financed projects in Ethiopia (cumulative, EFY)

- CMP implementation starts
- RWSEP ends and COWASH starts
- FinnWASH starts

Achieved June 2015
Projected June 2016

People served

191,750 247,500 303,250 359,000 425,000 593,000 780,250 910,660 1,122,160 1,442,480 1,753,650 2,103,950 2,674,402 3,341,210 4,316,210

Finnish CMP approach in WASH/ Tiina Byring-Ilboudo, Counselor
CMP facts - introduction

- Shift from *government* responsibility to enable and capacitate *communities* to manage the scheme construction process and thereby circumvent the challenges created by the bureaucracy and limited capacity of local governments (CMP approach in 2003)
- The major innovation of the CMP method was to transfer funds for physical construction directly to the community (WASHCO). In turn communities themselves are responsible for the full development process, through planning, implementation (including procurement) and maintenance.
- This approach avoids any ‘handing over’ of schemes and thus improves the chances that the project will be sustained. External support and capacity building provided by district local governments will further contribute to the sustainability. The success of CMP is now helping to dispel the myth that communities do not have the capacity to manage funds for such development processes for themselves.
- Rural water services are often unsustainable because they result from one-off, stand-alone projects and are not part of large scale approaches that decentralize service delivery. The CMP approach explicitly addresses these issues by making communities responsible for the planning, implementation and maintenance of new water schemes. Commonly the communities participate in government projects but CMP is working the opposite way – it is about government participation in community initiatives.
- It harnesses new and underutilized capacities, e.g. micro-finance institutions, communities, private sector.
CMP key lessons

- The introduction of the CMP approach resulted in increased utilization of investment budgets from an average of 53% to close to 100%. This, without reduction in investment costs per scheme, then led to a doubling of construction of new water points.
- The implementation rate of schemes per district has increased by up to a factor of 5.
- The level of expenditure on investments relative to operational costs and technical assistance increased from 15% to 58% of total expenditures.
- The management of funds by communities has not led to poorer outcomes in terms of build quality, functionality, or sustainability. There is encouraging evidence of operational and financial sustainability and community management structures are being well sustained.
- High functionality rates are observed: roughly 94% of schemes constructed under CMP approach.
Key CMP Findings

✓ With the CMP approach, water scheme implementation rate in Amhara region of Ethiopia increased by up to a factor of 5 (from an average of 200 water points per year (1994-2003) increasing steadily, from 2003, to over 2000 water points per year in 2010/11). This equates to an average of over 70 new schemes per CMP district per year.

✓ Utilization of investment budgets in Amhara region increased from an average of around 53% between 1998-2002 (pre-CMP) to close to 100% during 2006-2011.

✓ In the CMP approach, communities are responsible for the planning, implementation and maintenance of new water schemes, whilst district authorities provide capacity building and external support. The CMP approach is demand-driven.

✓ The utilization of microfinance institutions (MFIs) in the CMP approach has provided an additional capacity-related advantage versus using a traditional government-managed approach.

✓ The level of expenditure on investments relative to operational costs and technical assistance increased from 15% to 58% of total expenditures.

✓ The management of funds by communities has not led to poorer outcomes in terms of build quality, functionality, or sustainability. There is encouraging evidence of operational and financial sustainability and community management structures are being well sustained.
Where is CMP implemented and by whom?

☑ In Ethiopia, successful projects have been running in the Amhara region since 2003 and in the Benishangul-Gumuz region since 2009. In March 2013 the approach was mainstreamed into Ethiopia’s WaSH Implementation Framework and is now implemented also in Oromiya, Tigray and SNNPR regions. CMP is currently (November 2013) implemented in 70 Districts in Ethiopia.

☑ The CMP approach in Ethiopia is supported by the Government of Ethiopia, the Government of Finland, the Government of the Netherlands and IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre.
Breakdown of annual CMP expenditure by category in Amhara region, 2003 – 2009/10
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Projects using CMP approach

- COWASH 2011-2016
- FinnWASH 2008-2015
COWASH 2011-16

- COWASH is now in 5 regions and in 71 woredas
- CMP Implementation Guideline for One WASH has been submitted to MoFED to be part of POM
- Rural point water supply O&M manual completed
- Combined National Rural Water Supply Operation and Maintenance Manual and Strategic Framework – first draft completed for TF comments
- Kebele Water Safety Planning Guideline
- All 5 regional RSUs capacitated to implement CMP
Total number of water supply beneficiaries (community and institutions) served by COWASH

- **Plan cumulative**
- **Actual cumulative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011/2012</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1,952,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,952,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,894,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>1,894,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>1,894,310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan for 2007 EFY: 1,894,310
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total No. of Kebeles in COWASH woredas</th>
<th>Total number of COWASH Kebeles by 2007 EFY</th>
<th>COWASH Kebele coverage (%)</th>
<th>COWASH kebeles declared ODF by July 2014</th>
<th>ODF Kebele declaration plan for 2007</th>
<th>Planned number of ODF Kebeles in COWASH woredas end of 2007 EFY</th>
<th>Planned ODF coverage in COWASH Kebeles by 2007 EFY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>1 065</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>69 %</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>63 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46 %</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNP</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>40 %</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromia</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>58 %</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSGR</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32 %</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 720</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 028</strong></td>
<td><strong>60 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>337</strong></td>
<td><strong>376</strong></td>
<td><strong>713</strong></td>
<td><strong>69 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FinnWASH-BG

- FinnWASH-BG replicating CDF approach in Benishangul Gumuz
- 2001 EFY Planning Phase
- 2002-2005 EFY Phase-I
- 2006-2007 EFY Phase-II
From 2005 to 2007: Toward 98% coverage

Wombera
- 61 WPs
- 450 Bio Sandfilters
- 3000 traditional pit latrines and solid waste disposal pits

Bullen
- 41 WPs
- 700 bio sandfilters
- 1500 traditional pit latrines and solid waste disposal pits

Pawe
- Ali Spring
- 800 biosandfilters
- 900 traditional pit latrines and solid waste disposal pits

Mandura
- 5 WPs
- 2800 traditional pit latrines and solid waste disposal pits

Dibate
- 61 WPs
- 150 sandfilter
- 4700 traditional pit latrines and solid waste disposal pits

Additional beneficiaries: 150,000 people.
THANK YOU!

"We are happy, when people are happy."

Dereje Aknaw, Water Expert Mandura Woreda