

by ttz, TUHH and NETSSAF consortium. Deliverable D04



The following table contains a set of identified criteria sorted according to different aspects considered critical when using a holistic approach to assess sanitation systems. These include (1) health criterion, (2) environmental and resource criteria, (3) technical and operational criteria, (4) financial and economical criteria, (5) social, cultural and gender criteria. The objective is to include a comprehensive list of evaluation criteria to provide the decision makers with a complete overview of the existing aspects of sanitation systems.

The starting point for the development of the criteria was the list proposed by Bracken et al. (2004), in which five criteria were proposed as an expansion of the conventional triple bottom line usually accepted as the three pillars of sustainability –economy, society and the environment (Panesar et al., 2006).

For the purposes of this document, each criterion is accompanied by simple and easily interpretable indicator. The indicators will allow the planers and end-users to describe the technical, social, financial requirements as well as the impacts and the benefits obtained by the application of a sanitation system.

When dealing with a measurable aspect, for instance energy required, a measurement will be chosen with an appropriate unit. In this case, the planers will be able to evaluate different sanitation systems by comparing the value of the measurements. For instance, land required by system A is equal to  $1.0 \, \text{m}^2/\text{pe}$ , which is less than the land required by system B ( $1.2 \, \text{m}^2/\text{pe}$ ). To ensure that all relevant aspects of a sanitation system are covered, qualitative evaluation has been suggested as methodology to evaluate those indicators, which cannot be expressed quantitatively.

The final choice of sanitation system to be implemented will be the decision of the users and planners who will select from the given set of criteria, those parameters relevant to their community's profile. Furthermore, it is open for the decision makers to select a rating system that better suits their local framework.

**Table 1**.-Criteria for the assessment of sanitation systems

#### Health issues

The risk of exposure to pathogens and non-pathogenic substances, that could infect members of communities, is classified in different groups according to the mode of contact. The degree of sanitation achieved by the sanitation technology is also considered in this section, assumed as an additional factor in health issues. This group of criteria also includes the health benefits; including hygiene, nutrition and improvement of livelihood achieved by the application of a certain sanitation technology. For details refer to section A.1.

Criteria	Indicator for characterisation
Exposure to pathogens and risk of infection related to all system elements including collection, transportation, treatment, reuse and final destination of products / wastes.	
For communities of users and consumers	Qualitative evaluation
For operators of the sanitation system	Qualitative evaluation
Health benefits due to food production, nutrition status, livelihood	Qualitative description





# <u>Criteria for the assessment of sanitation</u> <u>technologies</u>

by ttz, TUHH and NETSSAF consortium. Deliverable D04

### NETSSAF Coordination Action



Project supported by the European Union under the 6<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme Start date: 1<sup>st</sup> of October 2006 Contract number: 032443

### Impact to the Environment/Nature

This set of criteria involves the required natural resources for construction and running of the sanitation system, as well as the potential emissions to the environment (water, air and soil) that could result from the use of such systems. It also includes the potential gained benefits from reusing material, contributing to the cycle of nutrients and water. For more details on impact to the environmental, refer to section A.2.

Criteria	Indicator for characterisation		
Use of natural resources — Construction:			
• Land	m²/pe		
Energy	MJ/pe		
Construction materials	type and quantity		
Use of natural resources- Operation and Maintenance (O&M):			
Land	m²/pe/yr		
Construction materials	type and quantity		
Energy from renewable resources	MJ/pe/yr		
Energy from non-renewable resources	MJ/pe/yr		
Total use on non-renewable resources	Non-renewable resource units		
Fresh water	m³/pe/yr		
Precipitation agents or other chemicals	Type and quantity/pe/yr		
Emissions to the environment:			
- Discharge to surface water			
• BOD	g of BOD/pe/yr		
• COD	g of COD/pe/yr		
<ul> <li>Nutrients</li> </ul>	g of N/pe/yr		
- Hadrenes	g of P/pe/yr		
	mg of Cd/pe/yr		
	mg of Cu /pe/yr		
Hazardous substances: heavy metals, persistent organic	mg of Ni /pe/yr		
compounds, antibiotics/medical residues, natural and synthetic hormones	mg of Pb /pe/yr		
	mg of Zn /pe/yr		
	mg of Hg /pe/yr		
	mg of Cr /pe/yr		













Boata







by ttz, TUHH and NETSSAF consortium. Deliverable D04

#### **NETSSAF Coordination Action**



Project supported by the European Union under the 6<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme Start date: 1<sup>st</sup> of October 2006 Contract number: 032443

Criteria		Indicator for characterisation	
		mg/pe/yr of persistent organic compound	
		mg/pe/yr pharmaceutical residues	
		mg/pe/yr hormonal substances	
•	Salts	g/pe/yr of NaCl	
- D	ischarge to groundwater		
•	BOD	g of BOD/pe/yr	
•	COD	g of COD/pe/yr	
•	Nutrients	g of N/pe/yr	
-		g of P/pe/yr	
		mg of Cd/pe/yr	
		mg of Cu /pe/yr	
		mg of Ni /pe/yr	
		mg of Pb /pe/yr	
•	Hazardous substances: heavy metals, persistent organic	mg of Zn /pe/yr	
	compounds, antibiotics/medical residues, natural and synthetic hormones	mg of Hg /pe/yr	
	normones	mg of Cr /pe/yr	
		mg/pe/yr of persistent organic compound	
		mg/pe/yr pharmaceutical residues	
		mg/pe/yr hormonal substances	
•	Salts	g/pe/yr of NaCl	
- Em	issions to the air		
•	Emissions of climatic relevant gases (e.g. CO <sub>2</sub> , CH <sub>4</sub> , GHGs, etc)	kg of CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent/pe/yr	
•	Emissions of acidifying gases (e.g. NH <sub>3</sub> , SO <sub>2</sub> etc)	kg mole of H <sup>+</sup> equivalent/pe/yr	
	Resources recovered		
•	Mass	g/pe/yr of weight for each recovered product	
_	Nutrients	g/pe/yr of N	
•		g/pe/yr of P	























by ttz, TUHH and NETSSAF consortium. Deliverable D04

#### **NETSSAF Coordination Action**



Project supported by the European Union under the 6<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme Start date: 1<sup>st</sup> of October 2006 Contract number: 032443

Criteria	Indicator for characterisation
	g/kg of S
	g/pe/yr of K
• Energy	MJ/pe/yr
Organic material	g of total organic matter/pe/y
	mg/pe/yr of persistent organic
	mg/pe/yr pharmaceutical
	mg/pe/yr hormonal substance
	mg of Cd/pe/yr
<ul> <li>Quality of recycled products (released to soil): heavy metals, persistent organic compounds, pharmaceutical residues hormones, etc.</li> </ul>	mg of Cu /pe/yr
	mg of Ni /pe/yr
	mg of Pb /pe/yr
	mg of Zn /pe/yr
	mg of Hg /pe/yr
	mg of Cr /pe/yr
Area of common staple crop that can be fertilised	m²/pe
Water	m³/pe/yr
Area of common staple crop that can be irrigated	m²/pe
Accumulation of environmental burden in landfill	
Nutrients	g/pe/yr of N
• Nutrients	g/pe/yr of P
Organic material	g/pe/yr
<ul> <li>Estimated cumulative production of green house gases (CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O etc.)</li> </ul>	kg of CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent/pe/yr
<ul> <li>Hazardous substances: heavy metals, persistent organic compounds, antibiotics/medical residues, hormones</li> </ul>	mg/pe/yr of respective substance
Water (increases risk of leachate formation)	m³/pe/yr
Volume on landfill	m³/pe/yr























by ttz, TUHH and NETSSAF consortium. Deliverable D04

#### **NETSSAF Coordination Action**



Project supported by the European Union under the 6<sup>th</sup> Programme Start date: 1st of October 2006 Contract number: 032443

## Technical characteristics of the sanitation system and its operation

This set of criteria includes the technical characteristics of a sanitation system regarding the functionality and the ease with which the system can be constructed, operated and monitored by the own members of a community. Furthermore, it evaluates the robustness of the systems and the adaptability of its technical elements to the existing infrastructure. For details refer to section A.3.

Criteria	Indicator	
Construction		
System robustness	Qualitative description	
Robustness against drought, flooding, earthquake etc.	Qualitative description	
Possibility to use local competence for construction	Qualitative description	
Durability / lifetime	time Yrs	
Compatibility with existing system	Qualitative description	
<ul> <li>Flexibility / adaptability (to urban development, population growth etc)</li> </ul>	Qualitative description	
Complexity of construction	Qualitative description	
Need of large scale infrastructure	Qualitative description	
O&M		
System robustness: risk of failure, effect of failure	Qualitative description	
Robustness to use of system: shock loads, effects of abuse of system	Qualitative description	
Availability of spare parts, parts for maintenance, etc.	Qualitative description	
Possibility to use local competence for O&M	Qualitative description	
Ease of system monitoring	Qualitative description	
Need of large scale infrastructure for operation	Qualitative description	
Complexity of O&M	Qualitative description	















Boata







by ttz, TUHH and NETSSAF consortium. Deliverable D04

#### **NETSSAF Coordination Action**



Project supported by the European Union under the 6<sup>th</sup> Programme Framework Start date: 1st of October 2006 Contract number: 032443

#### **Economical and Financial Issues**

The economical and financial issues are related to the capacity of the communities to pay for the sanitation service, including both the construction of the facilities and maintenance of the system. This set of criteria also includes the economic benefits that could be obtained through the application of a sanitation system, including employment creation and enterprise possibility. For details refer to section A.4.

Criteria	Indicator
Construction	
Input of own resources and labour in construction	Hours and quantities/pe
Initial costs/ construction costs, total and annual costs	Costs/pe and cost/pe/yr
Operation and Maintenance	
Annual costs for operation and maintenance	Cost/pe/yr
Input of own resources and labour in operation and maintenance	Hours and quantities/pe/yr
Local economy	
Employment creation	Number
Business and income generation, enterprise possibility	Qualitative or quantitative
Benefits from reuse	Generated income/pe/yr or increased production in kind/pe/yr
Environmental and health costs	Cost/pe/yr or qualitative





















by ttz, TUHH and NETSSAF consortium. Deliverable D04

#### **NETSSAF Coordination Action**



Project supported by the European Union under the  $6^{\text{th}}$ Framework Programme Start date: 1st of October 2006 Contract number: 032443

### Social, cultural and gender aspects

The social, cultural aspects and gender aspects refer to "soft criteria", which are of utmost importance but difficult to evaluate. The criteria in this category shall evaluate the acceptance and appropriateness of the system, legal and institutional requirements, convenience, system perception and gender issues. For details refer to section A.5.

	Criteria	Indicator
Acceptance by t	he users/social acceptability	Qualitative evaluation
	contribute through work and or money for es (% of available income)	Qualitative evaluation
	- comfort	Qualitative evaluation
	- personal security	Qualitative evaluation
	- privacy/dignity	Qualitative evaluation
Convenience	- smell	Qualitative evaluation
	- noise	Qualitative evaluation
	- attractiveness/ status	Qualitative evaluation
	- adaptability to needs of different age and handicapped, gender and income groups	Qualitative evaluation
	- location and availability	Qualitative evaluation
<ul> <li>Current and for compatibility</li> </ul>	preseen legal acceptability and institutional	Qualitative evaluation
<ul> <li>Appropriateness use and maintain</li> </ul>	to current local cultural context (acceptable to n)	Qualitative evaluation
<ul> <li>System percept including aspect</li> </ul>	ion (complexity, compatibility, observability – s of reuse)	Qualitative evaluation
<ul> <li>Ability to addres</li> </ul>	s awareness and information needs	Qualitative evaluation
Positive/negative	e impact to women, children and elderly.	Qualitative evaluation



















