

Full List of CWIS Indicators

Full List of CWIS Indicators

Updated July, 2021

The list of CWIS indicators are mapped to the six areas of the CWIS Service Framework—Equity, Safety, Sustainability, Responsibility, Accountability, and Resource Planning and Management. There are 40 quantitative and qualitative indicators and indicator areas. An indicator area is a description of a set of indicators but is not measured as an indicator in itself. All indicator areas are marked with **[Indicator Area]** at the beginning. Some of the indicators and indicator areas also have sub-indicators that further dive into specific aspects of the indicator or indicator area. A sub-indicator is only applicable if data is available for the linked higher level indicator (for quantitative indicators) or if the answer to the higher level indicator is “Yes” (for qualitative indicators). The indicators mapped to the CWIS Functions of Responsibility, Accountability, and Resource Planning and Management are further divided into indicators that are measured at the national/state level (legal/policy/institutional design) and those that are measured at the city level (implementation of national/state level design).

How to read this document:

Indicator / [Indicator Area]

First Level Sub-Indicator

Second Level Sub-Indicator

Answer Type: Quantitative ▲

Answer Type: Qualitative (Yes/No) ● ●

◆ **National/state level design**

◆ **City level implementation**

Equity

Safety

Sustainability

Responsibility

Accountability

Resource Planning & Management

EQ - 1. % of LIC population with access to ‘safe’ individual toilets / % of total population with access (calculated by dividing the value of SF-2a with the value of SF-1a) ▲

EQ - 2. % safe management LIC/% safe management citywide (IHHL) (calculated by dividing the value of SF-2 with the value of SF-1) ▲

EQ - 3. Subsidy amount paid to NSS/SS (non-sewered sanitation / sewered sanitation) ▲
**Applicable to cities which have a combination of both sewered and non-sewered sanitation systems.*

EQ - 4. % of women in sanitation related decision-making bodies (service authorities) ▲

% of women in leadership positions within sanitation related decision-making bodies ▲

EQ - 5. Gender pay gap in the sanitation workforce ▲**EQ - 6. [Indicator Area] Sanitation worker equity**

Training/ certification is required to be a sanitation worker ●●

Training covers labor rights and recourse ●●

Training covers occupational safety, health risks, and Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) ●●

All sanitation workers, regardless of employment formality, have a formal channel for legal recourse ●●

Workers have the right to unionize ●●

Operational worker unions exist ●●

Support is offered by the city/ utility to run the union ●●

All workers are covered by social security ●●

All workers are covered by health insurance ●●

Equity

Safety

Sustainability

Responsibility

Accountability

Resource Planning & Management

SF - 1. % safely managed sanitation (citywide IHHL) ▲

% of population with access to safe individual toilets ▲

% of IHHL OSSs that have been desludged ▲

% of collected FS disposed at treatment plant or designated disposal site ▲

FS treatment capacity as a % of total FS generated from non-sewered connections ▲

FS treatment capacity as a % of volume disposed of at the treatment plant ▲

WW treatment capacity as a % of total WW generated from sewer connections and greywater and supernatant generated from non-sewered connections ▲

Effectiveness of FS/WW treatment in meeting prescribed standards for effluent discharge and biosolids disposal ▲

SF - 2. % safely managed sanitation for LIC IHHL ▲

% of low income community (LIC) population with access to safe individual toilets ▲

% of LIC OSSs that have been desludged ▲

% of FS collected from LIC that is disposed at treatment plant or designated disposal site ▲

SF - 3. % safely managed liquid waste for shared facilities (CT & shared household toilets) ▲

% dependent population (without IHHL) with access to safe shared facilities ▲

% of shared facilities that adhere to principles of universal design ▲

% of shared facility users who are women ▲

Average waiting time at shared facility ▲

Average distance from HH to shared facility ▲

SF - 4. % of public spaces that have adequate sanitation facilities (Public Toilets/PT) ▲

% of PTs where FS/WW generated is safely transported to TP or safely disposed in situ ▲

% of PTs that adhere to principles of universal design ▲

Average waiting time at PT ▲

% of PT users who are women ▲

SF - 5. % of educational institutions where FS/WW generated is safely transported to TP or safely disposed in situ ▲

SF - 6. % of healthcare facilities where FS/WW generated is safely transported to TP or safely disposed in situ ▲

SF - 7. % of desludging services completed mechanically or semi-mechanically (gulper) ▲

SF - 8. % of desludging vehicles which comply with maintenance standards ▲

SF - 9. % of water contamination compliance (on fecal coliform) ▲

SF - 10. Incidence (per 1000) of fecal-oral pathway diseases ▲

SF - 11. [Indicator Area] Sanitation worker safety

Health and safety standards and Standard Operating Procedures exist to protect sanitation workers and others who may engage in emptying on-site systems from occupational hazards ● ●

Compliance with the health and safety standards is monitored and enforced ● ●

All desludging operators are registered and licensed ● ●

Licensing includes compliance with practices that protect the health and safety of workers ● ●

Regular health checkups are available to all sanitation workers regardless of form of employment and are ensured by the government ● ●

SF - 12. Is there a certification mechanism for which treated wastewater and biosolids have to qualify? ● ●

Equity

Safety

Sustainability

Responsibility

Accountability

Resource Planning & Management

SS - 1. % of treated FS and WW that is reused ▲

SS - 2. % of O&M cost recovered for sanitation infrastructure ▲

SS - 3. % of sanitation capital investments covered by budget line/government transfers ▲

Equity

Safety

Sustainability

Responsibility

Accountability

Resource Planning & Management

◆ **RS - 1a. [Indicator Area] Legal mandate for service delivery is clear and inclusive**

Clear and non-overlapping legal mandate around who is responsible for sanitation service provision-safe containment ● ●

Clear and non-overlapping legal mandate around who is responsible for sanitation service provision-safe collection & transport ● ●

Clear and non-overlapping legal mandate around who is responsible for safe treatment & disposal ● ●

Clear and non-overlapping legal mandate around who is responsible for safe reuse ● ●

National/ state level policies and laws do not create/perpetuate service-exclusions, especially densely populated low income communities (e.g. non-notified slums) ● ●

Policies and laws include explicit responsibility to reach the poor ● ●

Policies and laws are explicit about the need to reach women, girls, and socioeconomically vulnerable groups ● ●

Policies and laws cover service delivery standards/guidelines in institutional and public places ● ●

◇ **RS – 1b. [Indicator Area] Mandated service authorities are delivering inclusive services**

Mandated service authorities are providing the service on safe containment as per the mandate ● ●

Mandated service authorities are providing the service on safe collection & transport as per the mandate ● ●

Mandated service authorities are providing the service on safe treatment & disposal as per the mandate ● ●

Mandated service authorities are providing the service on safe reuse as per the mandate ● ●

Service authorities are actively providing services across the city, including in densely populated low income settlements in and around the city ● ●

Service authorities have taken specific measures to reach the poor ● ●

Service authorities have taken specific measures to reach women, girls, and socioeconomically vulnerable groups ● ●

Service authorities are providing services in institutional and public places as per policy ● ●

◇/◇ **RS – 2a. Approved local service authority staff positions within mandated authority areas are sufficient to execute mandate ● ●**

** Context specific. Evaluated at point where staff head count and organogram is determined for mandated authority. This could be city, state or national.*

◇ **RS – 2b. [Indicator Area] Local service authority staff positions are filled and capable to execute mandate**

All approved staff positions are filled ● ●

Periodic training and capacity building sessions are carried out to equip staff with necessary skills for execution ● ●

◇ **RS - 3. Local service authority sanitation budget is a separate line item independent of water, solid waste management, health, or environment ● ●**

◇ **RS - 4. Local authority's sanitation revenue is ringfenced ● ●**

Equity

Safety

Sustainability

Responsibility

Accountability

Resource Planning & Management

◇ AC – 1a. [Indicator Area] Performance indicators are set and monitored

National accountability mechanism exists to monitor service authority performance against KPIs that reflect mandate elements ● ●

Performance indicators cover sanitation service provision-safe containment ● ●

Performance indicators cover sanitation service provision-safe collection & transport ● ●

Performance indicators cover safe treatment & disposal ● ●

Performance indicators cover safe reuse ● ●

Performance indicators include pro-poor indicators ● ●

Performance indicators include gender intentional indicators ● ●

Performance indicators include citizen grievance redressal indicators ● ●

System exists to aggregate all data across cities on safely managed sanitation related KPIs (in digital format) ● ●

Data is used for national or state level decision-making ● ●

◇ AC – 1b. [Indicator Area] Service authorities actively report on the performance indicators

The city regularly reports on the KPIs ● ●

Service authorities regularly report on indicators on safe containment ● ●

Service authorities regularly report on indicators on safe collection and transport ● ●

Service authorities regularly report on indicators on safe treatment and disposal ● ●

Service authorities regularly report on indicators on safe re-use ● ●

Service authorities regularly report on pro-poor indicators ● ●

Service authorities regularly report on gender intentional indicators ● ●

Service authorities report data directly into a digital information system ● ●

Data is used for city-level decision making ● ●

◇/◇ AC – 2. [Indicator Area] Clear and progressive performance targets are set, monitored, and enforced for sanitation

**Context specific. Evaluated at the level where performance targets are set. This could be city, state or national.*

Clear and progressive performance targets in sanitation service provision-safe containment ● ●

Clear and progressive performance targets in sanitation service provision-safe collection & transport ● ●

Clear and progressive performance targets in safe treatment & disposal ● ●

Clear and progressive performance targets in safe reuse ●●

Performance targets are monitored and enforced ●●

◆ **AC – 3a. [Indicator Area] Performance data from service authorities are transparent**

Sanitation data collected and reported are open to the public ●●

◆ **AC – 3b. [Indicator Area] Service authorities regularly collect representative data**

Sanitation data collected are open to the public ●●

Sanitation data collected are open to the public ●●

Service authorities collect data at intervals appropriate for service provision related decision-making ●●

Data collected are based on actual surveys, monitoring data from tools, and are representative of the entire service area, including LICs ●●

◆ **AC – 4a. Incentives and/or penalties tied to performance exist for sanitation service authority** ●●

◆ **AC – 4b. Incentives and/or penalties are actively used/applied by national/ state accountability authorities at the service area level** ●●

Equity

Safety

Sustainability

Responsibility

Accountability

Resource Planning and Management

◆ **RPM – 1a. [Indicator Area] Clear financing framework at the national level to guide allocation of resources (budget)**

A budget line item exists for urban sanitation at the national/ state level ●●

An objective framework exists to allocate financial resources to lower level governments or authorities for sanitation ●●

Financing framework is followed in practice ●●

Resources are allocated to meet targets in sanitation service provision-safe containment ●●

Resources are allocated to meet targets in sanitation service provision-safe collection & transport ●●

Resources are allocated to meet targets in sanitation service provision-safe treatment & disposal ●●

Resources are allocated to meet targets in sanitation service provision-safe reuse ● ●

Financing framework allocates dedicated resources to meet the sanitation needs of vulnerable population groups ● ●

Resources allocated are disbursed on time ● ●

◇ **RPM – 1b. [Indicator Area] Clear financing framework at the city level to guide allocation of resources (budget)**

Resources are allocated to meet targets in sanitation service provision-safe containment ● ●

Resources are allocated to meet targets in sanitation service provision-safe collection & transport ● ●

Resources are allocated to meet targets in sanitation service provision-safe treatment & disposal ● ●

Resources are allocated to meet targets in sanitation service provision-safe reuse ● ●

Resources are allocated to meet pro-poor targets ● ●

Resources are allocated to meet the sanitation needs of vulnerable groups ● ●

Resources allocated are utilized for budgeted purposes ● ●

◇ **RPM – 2a. [Indicator Area] National/ state level decision-making process for sanitation budget allocation is transparent, inclusive, and informed by city /service area strategies**

National/state level decision-making process for budget allocation is transparent ● ●

National/state level decision-making for budget allocation is inclusive ● ●

National/state level decision-making for budget allocation is based on city sanitation strategies ● ●

◇ **RPM – 2b. [Indicator Area] City level decision-making process for sanitation budget allocation is transparent, inclusive, and informed by city /service area strategies**

City level decision-making process for budget allocation is transparent ● ●

City level decision-making for budget allocation is inclusive ● ●

City level decision-making for budget allocation is based on city sanitation strategies ● ●

◇ **RPM - 3. [Indicator Area] Quality of investment decision-making**

Sanitation service authority evaluates different investment options to meet service delivery gaps ●●

While calculating investment costs, sanitation service authority accounts for all project related capital, operations, maintenance, and replacement costs on a full lifecycle cost basis using accounting and monitoring data from service authority ●●

When planning for new investments, sanitation service authority undertakes an assessment of the impact of the new investments on overall utility system costs and revenues using data from service authorities and other stakeholders ●●

Feasibility assessment includes considerations of potential ecological and environmental impacts ●●

Feasibility assessment includes considerations of energy requirements for effective functioning of the system, including energy availability and cost ●●

Feasibility assessment includes considerations of water requirements for effective functioning of the system, including water availability and cost ●●

◇ RPM - 4. [Indicator Area] Integrated citywide inclusive sanitation strategy

The city has a integrated city sanitation strategy developed/updated in the past five years ●●

The city sanitation strategy covers all households, including those in LICs and densely populated peri-urban areas ●●

The city sanitation strategy is developed based on representative surveys on city service level data ●●

Sanitation investments are made based on the integrated citywide sanitation plan ●●

Sanitation budgets are allocated based on a needs assessment ●●

Sanitation authority has conducted an assessment of the baseline condition of existing infrastructure and service delivery gaps ●●

Sanitation authority has conducted an assessment of the baseline condition of existing infrastructure and service delivery gaps in informal settlements and low-income service areas ●●

Sex-disaggregated data is collected for sanitation planning and investment ●●

Sex-disaggregated data is actively used for sanitation planning and investment ●●

Budget allocation is responsive to the differential needs of women based on sex-disaggregated data ●●

Data by income groups is collected for sanitation planning and investment ●●

Data by income groups is actively used for sanitation planning and investment ●●

Data by ethnic or social groups is collected for sanitation planning and investment ●●

Data by ethnic or social groups is actively used for sanitation planning and investment ●●