

**EcoSan** Club

Ê

🐸 ABOBO-ADJAME

## Criteria for the assessment of sanitation technologies



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

NETSSAF Coordination Action

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  $m^2/pe$ , which is less than the land required by system B (1,2 m<sup>2</sup>/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.

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	
<i>Exposure to pathogens and risk of infection related to all system elements including collection, transportation, treatment, reuse and final destination of products / wastes.</i>		
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	

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

Boata

International Water Association

Bobo Dioulasso aquatic resea



#### **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

by ttz, TUHH and NETSSAF consortium. Deliverable D04

#### 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 na	tural resources – Construction:	
Land		m²/pe
Energy		MJ/pe
Construction mat	erials	type and quantity
Use of natural resou	rces- Operation and Maintenance (O&M):	
• Land		m²/pe/yr
Construction mat	erials	type and quantity
Energy from rene	wable 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 ager	nts or other chemicals	Type and quantity/pe/yr
Emis	sions to the environment:	
Discharge to surfa	ice water	
• BOD		g of BOD/pe/yr
• COD		g of COD/pe/yr
Nutrients	Nutrients	g of N/pe/yr
		g of P/pe/yr
	Hazardous substances: heavy metals, persistent organic compounds, antibiotics/medical residues, natural and synthetic hormones	mg of Cd/pe/yr
		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





ttz

# **Criteria for the assessment of sanitation technologies**

**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

Bobo Bobo aquatic research 0000

by ttz, TUHH and NETSSAF consortium. Deliverable D04

	Criteria	Indicator for characterisation
		mg/pe/yr of persistent organ compound
		mg/pe/yr pharmaceutical residues
		mg/pe/yr hormonal substance
•	Salts	g/pe/yr of NaCl
Dis	scharge 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
	Hazardaus substances, boau, metals, persistent expanse	mg of Cu /pe/yr
		mg of Ni /pe/yr
		mg of Pb /pe/yr
•		mg of Zn /pe/yr
•	Hazardous substances: heavy metals, persistent organic compounds, antibiotics/medical residues, natural and synthetic	mg of Hg /pe/yr
	hormones	mg of Cr /pe/yr
		mg/pe/yr of persistent organ compound
		mg/pe/yr pharmaceutical residues
		mg/pe/yr hormonal substance
•	Salts	g/pe/yr of NaCl
Emi	ssions 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/
	Resources recovered	
•	Mass	g/pe/yr of weight for each recovered product
•	Nutrients	g/pe/yr of N
•	nachanas	g/pe/yr of P

.







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

by ttz, TUHH and NETSSAF consortium. Deliverable D04

Criteria		Indicator for characterisation	
		g/kg of S	
		g/pe/yr of K	
• E	nergy	MJ/pe/yr	
• C	Organic material	g of total organic matter/pe/yr	
		mg/pe/yr of persistent organic compound	
		mg/pe/yr pharmaceutical	
		mg/pe/yr hormonal substances	
		mg of Cd/pe/yr	
р	Quality of recycled products (released to soil): heavy metals, persistent organic compounds, pharmaceutical residues hormones, etc.	mg of Cu /pe/yr	
n		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	
• A	rea of common staple crop that can be fertilised	m²/pe	
• V	Vater	m³/pe/yr	
• A	rea of common staple crop that can be irrigated	m²/pe	
	Accumulation of environmental burden in landfill		
N	l. devie and a	g/pe/yr of N	
• IN	lutrients	g/pe/yr of P	
• C	Organic material	g/pe/yr	
	stimated cumulative production of green house gases ( $CH_4$ , $N_2O$ tc.)	kg of CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent/pe/yr	
	lazardous substances: heavy metals, persistent organic ompounds, antibiotics/medical residues, hormones	mg/pe/yr of respective substance	
• V	Vater (increases risk of leachate formation)	m <sup>3</sup> /pe/yr	
• V	olume on landfill	m³/pe/yr	







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

**NETSSAF Coordination Action** 

by ttz, TUHH and NETSSAF consortium. Deliverable D04

#### 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	Yrs
Compatibility with existing system	Qualitative description
Flexibility / adaptability (to urban development, population growth etc)	Qualitative description
Complexity of construction	Qualitative description
Need of large scale infrastructure	Qualitative description
0&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





#### **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

by ttz, TUHH and NETSSAF consortium. Deliverable D04

#### **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







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

**NETSSAF Coordination Action** 

by ttz, TUHH and NETSSAF consortium. Deliverable D04

### 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 the users/social acceptability		Qualitative evaluation
<ul> <li>Willingness to contribute through work and or money for sanitation services (% of available income)</li> </ul>		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
Current and foreseen legal acceptability and institutional compatibility		Qualitative evaluation
Appropriateness to current local cultural context (acceptable to use and maintain)		Qualitative evaluation
<ul> <li>System perception (complexity, compatibility, observability – including aspects of reuse)</li> </ul>		Qualitative evaluation
Ability to address	awareness and information needs	Qualitative evaluation
Positive/negative	impact to women, children and elderly.	Qualitative evaluation

