

ANNEX

TOOL FOR MONITORING PROGRESS IN ACHIEVING EQUITABLE ACCESS TO WATER AND SANITATION IN THE PAN-EUROPEAN REGION **FOR ALL**

This is the third draft of a tool currently under development. The aim of the tool is to support countries in the pan-European region to assess and track their progress in achieving equitable access to water and sanitation, in the context of the implementation of the Protocol on Water and Health under the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes.

This draft of the tool was tested in **the Greater Paris urban area** in early 2013.

Part 1 and 2 of the score card were initially fulfilled by the Greater Paris urban area project team. The information contained in the score card was then discussed at the multi-stakeholders workshop, which was held on 18-19 February 2013, in Paris, France. This version reflects the conclusions of the multi-stakeholders workshop discussion.

The final version of this document, dated 18 April 2013, was prepared to respond to an international exercise in order to test a self-assessment tool. It was fulfilled in a limited period of time, by a pilot team focusing on the Greater Paris area, and discussed with stakeholders during a workshop on 18 and 19 February 2013.

It does not reflect an exhaustive vision of policies aimed at ensuring equitable access to water and sanitation in France.

Table of contents

- INTRODUCTION 4
 - Rationale, aim and scope 4
 - Notes for using the tool..... 5
 - Glossary 7
- PART 1. COUNTRY or REGION PROFILE: CONTEXT* 10
 - Socio-economic and sector data 11
 - International obligations on water and sanitation..... 13
- PART 2. SCORECARD: ACTIONS TAKEN* 15
 - Section 1. Steering governance frameworks to deliver equitable access to water and sanitation .. 16
 - Area 1.1 Strategic framework for achieving equitable access 17
 - Area 1.2 Sector financial policies..... 21
 - Area 1.3 Rights and duties of users and other right-holders 24
 - Area 1.4 Incentive framework for water and sanitation service providers 27
 - Section 2. Reducing geographical disparities 29
 - Quantitative information on geographical disparities 30
 - Area 2.1 Public policies to reduce access disparities between geographical areas..... 32
 - Area 2.2 Public policies to reduce price disparities between geographical areas 34
 - Area 2.3 Geographical allocation of external support for the sector 36
 - Section 3. Ensuring access for vulnerable and marginalized groups..... 37
 - Quantitative information on vulnerable and marginalised groups..... 38
 - Area 3.1 Public policies to address the needs of vulnerable and marginalised groups 40
 - Area 3.2 Persons with special physical needs 42
 - Area 3.3 Users of institutional facilities and institutionalised persons 44
 - Area 3.4 Persons without a fixed residence 46
 - Area 3.5 Persons living in housing without water and sanitation..... 48
 - Area 3.6 Persons without access to water and sanitation in their workplaces 51
 - Area 3.3.A Educational facilities 52
 - Area 3.3.B Health facilities 54
 - Area 3.3.C Prison facilities** 56

INTRODUCTION

Rationale, aim and scope

Access to water and sanitation has been recognised as human rights by the United Nations General Assembly and the Human Rights Council. This means that ensuring access to water and sanitation for all is a legal obligation and that progressive steps have to be taken to fulfil that obligation. In order to comply with this obligation, special attention needs to be paid at an early stage to ensure that access to water and sanitation is equitable for all members of the population.

In the pan-European region, around 110 million people do not have access to safe drinking water and sanitation. The Parties to the UNECE/WHO-EURO Protocol on Water and Health have committed to ensure equitable access to water and sanitation. In 2012, the Working Group on Water and Health launched the publication “No One Left Behind”, which presents policy options and good practices to ensure equitable access to water and sanitation, and agreed to develop a tool for support countries in their efforts to monitor progress. This document presents the third draft¹ of the tool.

The objective of this tool is to offer governments (and other stakeholders) a tool that would help to establish a baseline, track progress, and prompt discussions on further actions to be taken in order to achieve equitable access to water and sanitation. It aims to support the implementation of policies and practices to uphold the human rights to water and sanitation under the principle of “progressive realization”.

The tool does not aim to provide a fully comprehensive assessment of the extent to which water and sanitation is equitable in a country/region/city. Rather it focuses on selected issues and indicators that together could provide a solid (but not perfect) overview of the situation at different time points, and thus allow the tool to accomplish its specific aim.

Achieving equitable access and keeping access equitable is contingent on a well-functioning water and sanitation sector. The tool, however, will focus only on the issues directly related to equitable access outcomes and not on the overall functioning of the water and sanitation sector. The tool does not focus either on other circumstances that may impinge on access to equitable access and sanitation, such as water resources governance.

¹ An Ad-Hoc Expert Group on Monitoring Progress in Achieving Equitable Access to Water and Sanitation has been set up to develop the tool. This draft incorporates the comments and contributions discussed at its first meeting in September 2012, as well as comments provided in October 2012 on the second draft.

Notes for using the tool

Background information. Background information on equitable access issues can be found in the UNECE/WHO publication “No One Left Behind”. The introduction to each section in Part II indicates the relevant section in the “No One Left Behind” publication that relates to each Area of Action.

Glossary. This document includes a short glossary to define key concepts used throughout the scorecard. It is worth highlighting two issues:

In this document, the expression “access to water and sanitation” includes four of the five dimensions that define the human rights to water and sanitation: *availability*, *accessibility*, *acceptability*, and *quality/safety*. It does not include *affordability* because that dimension is addressed specifically in section 4 of the scorecard.

This document refers to the expression “equitable access to water and sanitation”, since this is the wording in the Protocol on Water and Health. Some experts favor the expression “equality and non-discrimination”. While there are some differences of connotation, those two expressions can be considered equivalent from a practical perspective.

Structure of the tool. The tool includes a country profile (which focuses on quantitative data to help put in context the results) as well as four sections addressing broad themes. The four thematic sections are further subdivided in areas of action – which focus on the actions taken to improve equitable access. The last three thematic areas also requests quantitative information on outcomes and means.

Quantitative information. To the extent possible, the source of quantitative information should be official statistics. When information on financial resources is requested (and if your country does not use the Euro as official currency), please express the answer both in Euros and in the official currency.

Scoring methodology.

- Progress under each Area of Action is measured through qualitative questions. The number of questions varies between 2 and 6.
- Each question requires one answer. (There are four possible answers: *No / To a little extent / To a large extent /Yes.*)²
- Each answer has to be justified. In order to provide the justification, respondents are encouraged to use as much space as needed.
- The reliability of each answer has to be self-evaluated (see below).
- One summary score has to be calculated for each Area of Action. This score has to be calculated taking into account the score for each question as well as the number of questions under each Area of Action. Only answers with a HIGH or MEDIUM degree of reliability should be considered when calculating the summary score.

² The answers were given according to the following criteria, considering the data available at national and/or local level:

No – No data, national or local;

To a little extent – No national data and some local data OR some national data, but not satisfying or merely indirect data

To a large extent – Some national data, regardless of the availability of local data

Yes – Data at national level is fully satisfying

- The summary score has to be reproduced in the summary sheet.

Reliability assessment methodology. The tool asks to self-evaluate the reliability associated to each of the answers provided. It is not the reliability of the data that has to be evaluated. Rather, it is the reliability of the process of gathering and reporting the data that has to be evaluated.

- There are three possible levels of reliability: High (Very Reliable), Medium (Reliable), Low (Unreliable).
- The criteria to be considered for assigning a degree of reliability are: procedures, traceability, and validation.
- The table below provides guidance on how to assign a level of reliability, according to those criteria.
- The aggregate level of reliability for each Area of Action will be determined as follows:
 - HIGH – if all the answers in the Area of Action are classified as HIGH
 - MEDIUM – if no answer is classified as LOW and at least one answer is classified as MEDIUM
 - LOW --- if at least one answer is classified as LOW
- The aggregate level of reliability for each Area of Action has to be reproduced in the summary sheet.

| HIGH: Very reliable | MEDIUM: Reliable | LOW: Unreliable |
|---|---|---|
| <p>There is a coherent and easily accessible set of documents that identifies responsibilities for data gathering, treatment and quality control.</p> <p>The data can be traced to a formal source that is accessible to any interested person.</p> <p>The data have been formally validated.</p> | <p>Responsibilities for data gathering, treatment and quality control have been identified.</p> <p>The data can be traced to a source.</p> <p>The data have been validated.</p> | <p>Responsibilities for data gathering, treatment and quality control have not been identified.</p> <p>Not all the data can be traced to a source.</p> <p>Not all the data have been validated.</p> |
| <p>Note: The term “data” in this table must be interpreted as any relevant qualitative or quantitative information underpinning the response to a question</p> | | |

Non-relevant questions. Not all questions within each area of action are equally relevant to all countries/regions in the pan-European region. If those responsible for filling the scorecard part consider that a particular question is not relevant, they are encouraged to justify why that is the case.

Summary sheet. The summary scores for the 15 areas of action are presented in a summary sheet at the end of the document. The summary sheet can help to identify the areas of action where the country (or region) is lagging behind, as well as areas where the information available is particularly unreliable.

Annex. In order to support the assessment of Area of Action 3.3 (which refers to several types of institutional facilities, which are in turn overseen by different government departments), the Annex provides separate sheets to assess the situation in educational facilities, health facilities, and prison facilities. How to use the results of those separate sheets to derive an overall assessment of Area of Action 3.3 is at the discretion of the scorecard coordinator.

Use of results. The tool has been designed to help a country (or region) to track its own progress towards equitable access. The tool has not been designed to establish comparisons between countries (or regions), as the pan-European region includes countries (or regions) with very different levels of socio-economic development and organization of the water and sanitation sector. Analysts wishing to establish those comparisons are encouraged to use the context data offered in the Country/Region Profile in order to identify suitable countries/regions peers for comparison.

Presentation of results. Testing countries/regions are encouraged to present the results in visually appealing ways (such as spider-net graphs).

Glossary

Accountability. In a human rights context, accountability encompasses monitoring mechanisms and remedies. For the rights to water and to sanitation to be realized, service providers and public officials must be accountable to users. Promoting accountability involves, inter alia, developing effective monitoring bodies and processes; devising sound indicators for assessing progress, affordability, and the fair and equitable distribution of water and sanitation resources according to the needs; creating reliable, accessible and effective judicial and administrative complaints mechanisms that allow individuals to air and satisfactorily redress their grievances; and promoting good governance.

Affordability. Access to sanitation and water facilities and services must be accessible at a price that is affordable for all people. Paying for services, including construction, cleaning, emptying and maintenance of facilities, as well as treatment and disposal of faecal matter, must not limit people's capacity to acquire other basic goods and services, including food, housing, health and education guaranteed by other human rights. Accordingly, affordability can be estimated by considering the financial means that have to be reserved for the fulfilment of other basic needs and purposes and the means that are available to pay for water and sanitation services.

Development partners. In a development co-operation context, it refers to the range of partners that support a government from a transition or developing country to design and implement its development agenda. Those partners include bilateral development co-operation agencies (e.g. the Swedish International Development Agency), international financial institutions (e.g. the World Bank), international technical co-operation institutions (e.g. UNECE) and international non-governmental organizations (e.g. Global Water Partnership).

Drinking water. Water which is used, or intended to be available for use, by humans for drinking, cooking, food preparation, personal hygiene or similar purposes.

Equitable access to water and sanitation. In the context of this document, it refers to a situation defined by access outcomes that are similar for all people irrespective of where they live, whether they belong to vulnerable or marginalized groups, while their associated costs remain affordable for all users.

GDP. It stands for Gross Domestic Product. It represents an indicator of the size of an economy measured through the value of the goods and services produced.

Institutionalised persons. It refers to those people that are in prison, whether they have received a final sentence or not.

Lowest quintile, lowest decile. The distribution of income or wealth in a country is usually analysed by dividing the population in five or ten groups according to their level of income or wealth. When the number of groups is five each group represents a "quintile"; when the number of groups is ten, each group represents a "decile". The "lowest quintile" refers to the group with the lowest income

or wealth, when society is divided in five groups. The “lowest decile” refers to the group with the lowest income or wealth, when society is divided in ten groups.

Non-discrimination. Non-discrimination is central to human rights. Discrimination on prohibited grounds including race, colour, sex, age, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, physical or mental disability, health status or any other civil, political, social or other status must be avoided, both in law and in practice.

Peri-urban areas. Areas that are adjoining to urban areas, located between the suburbs and the countryside.

Poverty line. Value that indicates the minimum level of income of an individual that is considered adequate. Official poverty lines definitions and values vary from country to country.

Progressive realization. States must take measures towards the progressive realization of the rights to water and sanitation. This requires concrete and targeted steps to the maximum of their available resources. States are required to move towards the goal of full realization as expeditiously and effectively as possible, within the framework of international cooperation and assistance, where needed. Certain aspects of these rights are immediate obligations, including the requirement to guarantee them without discrimination.

Progressive tariff systems. It refers to tariff systems where the tariff per cubic meter increases with volume consumed – it is usually articulated by defining three or more blocks of water consumption and applying a different tariff to each block.

Public financial resources. Financial resources supplied by governments (whether national, regional or local). The origin of the funds is mostly general taxation (e.g. income or VAT tax) but also includes other sources, such as the provision of services by government departments (e.g. licensing charges) and borrowing (e.g. issuing government bonds).

Remedial actions. In this document, actions taken to correct a situation where the human rights to water and sanitation were not respected. Victims of human rights violations are entitled to adequate reparation, including restitution, compensation, satisfaction and/or guarantees of non-repetition. States have to provide accessible, affordable, timely and effective remedies. While administrative remedies will be adequate in many cases, a right of judicial appeal as a last resort is often appropriate and sometimes indispensable.

Right-holders. In the context of the human rights to water and sanitation, it refers to every person. The difference with “water and sanitation users” is that some people do not have access to water and sanitation, and thus they cannot be considered users, but they are right-holders because they hold the right to get access.

Safe drinking water. Safe drinking water is water with microbial, chemical and physical characteristics that meet WHO guidelines or national standards on drinking water quality.

Sanitation means the collection, transport, treatment and disposal or reuse of human excreta or domestic waste water, whether through collective systems or by installations serving a single household or undertaking. States must ensure without discrimination that everyone has physical and economic access to sanitation, in all spheres of life, which is safe, hygienic, secure, socially and culturally acceptable, provides privacy and ensures dignity. Depending on the culture, acceptability can often require privacy, as well as separate facilities for women and men in public places, and for girls and boys in schools. Facilities will need to accommodate common hygiene practices in specific cultures, such as for anal and genital cleansing. And women’s toilets need to accommodate menstruation needs.

Self-service. Situation in which households provide themselves the service for water and sanitation, often because they live in areas where there is no service provider.

Service providers. Public or private institution that operate water supply and/or sanitation systems.

Social tariffs. Tariffs that include a discount for certain individuals or households due to their social characteristics (such as age, certified disability, or number of persons in the household)

Tariff reference values. In some countries, central authorities overseeing the water and sanitation sector have published “tariff reference values” to provide a reference on what is the expected level that water and sanitation tariffs should reach. They provide useful information to customers as well as to water and sanitation service providers, without infringing in the allocation of tariff-setting responsibilities (which usually remains at the local level).

Vulnerable and marginalized groups. Groups composed of individuals that have a particularly hard time exercising their rights to water and sanitation as a result of living in vulnerable situations, or suffering discrimination or stigma (or a combination of those factors). Groups and individuals who have been identified as potentially vulnerable or marginalized include, inter alia, women, children, inhabitants of (remote) rural and deprived urban areas as well as other people living in poverty, refugees and internally displaced persons, minority groups, indigenous groups, nomadic and traveller communities, elderly people, persons living with disabilities, persons living with HIV/AIDS or affected by other health conditions, people living in water scarce-regions and sanitation workers amongst others. In the process of identifying groups and individuals who are disadvantaged, States need to survey the population based on these grounds and investigate further when they find that certain groups are discriminated against. In the context of this document, vulnerable and marginalised groups include (among others) the homeless, nomads, the disabled, school children, hospitalized patients, people living in prisons and refugee camps, and people without secure tenure. While gender issues related to access to water and sanitation must be taken into consideration to ensure equitable access, this document does not treat women as a vulnerable or marginalized group on its own.

PART 1. COUNTRY or REGION PROFILE: CONTEXT

Greater Paris urban area (Paris – SEDIF - SIAAP areas)

Socio-economic and sector data

| | 2011 or latest available year (please indicate) | 2006 (please choose another baseline year if it fits better with your national/regional processes) | Source (please use official statistics wherever possible) |
|--|---|--|--|
| Population (inhabitants) | 11 786 234 (2010) for the French region of Ile de France including : - 4 339 776 in the SEDIF area(144 communes) - 2 268 265 in Paris - 8 791 589 people connected to the sanitation network for SIAAP | 11 532 398 (2006) for Ile de France region | Official statistics (INSEE) |
| Extension (km²) | 12 012 km ² including - 762,2 km ² for the SEDIF territory, - 105,40 km ² for Paris - 1980 km ² for SIAAP | 12 012 km ² including - 762,2 km ² for the SEDIF territory, - 105,40 km ² for Paris - 1980 km ² for SIAAP | Official statistics (INSEE) |
| GDP per capita (EUR/person) | 48 378 (2010) for Ile de France region | 39 960 (2003) for Ile de France region | Official statistics (INSEE) |
| % of population below national poverty line | 16%(Paris 2009) | Paris : 11,9 %(2004) Hauts-de-Seine department : 8,5% Seine Saint Denis department : 18% Val de Marne department : 9,5% | 2004 : Insee, 2009 : Compas (consultants) Poverty line : 60 % of median income |
| % of population living in urban areas | 100 | 100 | Insee |
| % of population living in peri-urban areas (ONLY if this category is relevant in your country/region) | | | Not relevant |
| % of population living in rural areas | 0 | 0 | Insee |
| Renewable freshwater resources (million m³ per capita) | | | River basin Agency |
| % of population <u>without</u> access to safe drinking water | 0 | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| % of population <u>without</u> access to wastewater collection | 0 | | |
| % of population <u>without</u> access to wastewater treatment (any level) | 0 | | |
| Public financial resources <u>spent</u> on the water and sanitation sector | <p><u>Water sector (2011) :</u> Paris : 4,2 M€ and 350 M€ for Eau de Paris SEDIF 448,8 M€</p> <p><u>Sanitation sector :</u> Paris : 107 M€ SIAAP : 1 229 M€</p> <p><u>On a national level :</u> The estimated global expenses of water and sanitation utilities are around 16 billion € in 2009</p> | <p><u>Water sector</u> N.A</p> <p><u>Sanitation sector</u> Paris 119,5 M€ SIAAP :974 M€</p> <p><u>On a national level :</u> 13 billion € (2004)</p> | <p>Water and sanitation utilities</p> <p>Ernst&Young study</p> |
| Public financial resources <u>spent</u> in ensuring equitable access to water and sanitation | <p>Paris : around 4 M€ (preventive and curative aid measures to pay water bills, fountains and public toilets) SIAAP : 340 000 € (curative aid measures) SEDIF : 2,3 M€ for the Water solidarity plan</p> | N.A | Water and sanitation authorities |

N.A. – Non available.

International obligations on water and sanitation

| The international legal instruments listed below generate obligations on water and sanitation ³ | Has the country signed this legal instrument? | | What has been done to translate these international commitments into your national legislation? | Sources (and year) |
|---|---|----|---|--------------------|
| | Yes | No | | |
| Protocol on Water and Health | | | | |
| 1949 Geneva Convention (III) relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War | | | | |
| 1949 Geneva Convention (IV) relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War | | | | |
| 1977 Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and Relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I) | | | | |
| 1977 Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and Relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II) | | | | |
| 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) | | | | |
| 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) | | | | |
| ILO Convention No. 161 of 1985 on Occupational Health Services | | | | |

³ More information is available at www.waterlex.org/waterlex/en/resources/online-legal-database and the supporting document “International Obligations on Water and Sanitation”

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
| 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) | | | | |
| 2007 Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) | | | | |
| 1966 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) | | | | |
| 1989 ILO Convention No. 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples | | | | |
| 1992 United Nations Framework Convention of Climate Change (UNFCCC) | | | | |
| 1994 Convention to Combat Desertification in Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (UNCCD) | | | | |
| 1997 Convention on the Law of the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses | | | | |

PART 2. SCORECARD: ACTIONS TAKEN

Section 1. Steering governance frameworks to deliver equitable access to water and sanitation

| Areas of action | Relevant section in the “No One Left Behind” document |
|---|--|
| 1.1 There is a strategic framework for achieving equitable access to water and sanitation | Section 3.1 Section 3.4 |
| 1.2 Sector financial policies contribute to achieving and maintaining equitable access | Section 3.1 Section 2.3 |
| 1.3 Users and right-holders can exercise their rights and are aware of their duties | Section 3.2 |
| 1.4 The incentive framework for water and sanitation service providers includes equitable access considerations | Section 3.3 |

Area 1.1 Strategic framework for achieving equitable access

Rationale. Although progress is achieved through individual initiatives, a strategic framework is needed to ensure that the whole water and sanitation sector (and the whole public administration more generally) contributes to achieving equitable access.

| | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
|---|----|---------------------|-------------------|-----|
| 1.1.1 There is a strategic plan in place to ensure equitable access to water and sanitation | | | x | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p>In France, different measures contribute to define a framework for equitable access to water and sanitation. Ensuring access to water for all is an undisputed social and policy goal. The 2006 Law on Water and Aquatic Environments (LEMA, 2006) stipulates that water is a common heritage and every person has the right to have access to water of sufficient quantity and quality and under affordable conditions.</p> <p>This principle may be included in regional strategic plans for water at the basin Level (in French : SDAGE).</p> <p>This principle is implemented locally :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>The development of preventive aid measures.</i> Municipalities, social services authorities and water operators have adopted measures aimed at preventing the poor and socially excluded from incurring water debt and risking (risk? – I'm not sure what risking means here) - <i>The development of remedial aid measures.</i> These measures are applied when households are still unable to pay their water bills, either because they did not take advantage of the preventive aid or because of unexpected and sudden difficulties. <p>These different measures are included in different official documents, but strictly speaking they are not a dedicated framework.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LEMA, 2006 - Regional strategic plans for water at the basin Level (SDAGE) - Law n° 90-449 du 31 mai 1990 relative à la mise en œuvre du droit au logement modifiée - Law n° 2004-809 du 13 août 2004 relative aux libertés et responsabilités locales (art. 65). - Circulaire n° 2004-58 UHC/IUH 1 du 4 novembre 2004 relative aux nouvelles dispositions concernant les fonds de solidarité pour le logement (FSL) contenues dans la loi n° 2004-809 du 13 août 2004 relative aux libertés et responsabilités locales (art. 65) - Code concerning family and social action (L.115-3) - Decree n° 2008-780 du 13 août 2008 relatif à la procédure applicable en cas d'impayés des factures d'électricité, de gaz, de chaleur et d'eau - Code concerning public health - National action plan on environment and health <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. <u>high</u>, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p> | | | | |
| 1.1.2 Equitable access targets have been set | | | x | |

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

At national level, the LEMA set the general principles concerning equitable access to water and sanitation, but it doesn't mention specific objectives.

At local level, in the city of Paris : one of the priorities of the contract between the city and its operator for drinking water (Eau de Paris) is "To Guarantee access to water for the poorest". The rules for the public water service stipulate also obligations in ensuring access to water.

At local level, in the SEDIF zone : Access to sanitation in the 149 cities included in the SEDIF zone is the responsibility of the SEDIF. The SEDIF sets prices for drinking water; the prices are the same for each city. The public service delegation contract includes a requirement to devote 1 % of the proceeds from sales, to the "Water Solidarity" plan, which is dedicated to the SEDIF users with financial difficulties. The "Water Solidarity" plan is divided into three parts and the delegate is responsible for implementing them :

- 1- To bring financial support to people with difficulties to pay their water bill, in particular when it represents more than 3% of their income;
- 2- Perform accompanying actions towards apartment buildings with difficulties;
- 3- Implement preventive actions

Furthermore, the concerning water service defines the obligations for water access. So, a connection is opened for anyone who asks for it. In the SEDIF zone, there are 800 kms of water pipes.

Deficiency: no specific target for equitable access to water and sanitation at national level

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)
City of Paris Contract – Eau de Paris and annual reports
Public service delegation contract for SEDIF, annual reports

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

1.1.3 Responsibilities for achieving equitable access have been identified and allocated

x

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

At the national level, in 2004, a law bound local authorities (departments) to create a housing solidarity fund, and since 2011 all the implementing regulations have been in place. The housing solidarity fund receives contributions from utilities (electricity, gas, telephone and water service providers), social housing authorities and local authorities.

The local action plan for housing and poorest people (in French : PDALPD) identifies social measures that aim at :

- Access to decent housing
- To have a supply of water, energy and telephone

The local authority and representatives of the cities are responsible for drafting the PDALPD.

The "Cambon" Law stipulates that water and sanitation service providers can voluntarily contribute up to 0.5% of their profits to the housing solidarity fund. The housing solidarity fund helps households to pay their water bill, in particular when the water bill represents more than 3% of their income.

At the local level, the cities (and their social services), the department, and operators share the responsibilities. The responsibilities are defined in the contract.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)
Law n° 2004-809 du 13 août 2004

Decree 29 novembre 2007 (PDALDP)
 Law « Cambon » n° 2011-156 du 7 février 2011

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

1.1.4 Awareness-raising and capacity-development initiatives for achieving equitable access have been developed

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

At the national level, the French ministry in charge of ecology issued (2012) a good practice document in order to encourage water access for the poorest. The good practices are :

- Identify water access
- Re-open public fountains
- Install new water access
- Coping with emergency situations
- Open bath houses
- Distribute hygiene kits
- Install automatic toilets

At the regional level (the French region “Ile de France”): the regional observatory on sanitation (in French : Obusass) set actions to raise awareness , and conducted a study on access to water for the poorest people in “Ile de France”. The hydrology observatory in Seine saint Denis also set actions to raise awareness.

At the local level (Paris), signature of a charter with social landlords whose objectives are to ensure access to quality water while ensuring the limitation of the burden of rental charges, including the installation of water-saving devices (saving kits). Actions are conducted with associations and points of information and multi-mediation (PIMMS) to inform users, the means to and awareness of saving water.

At the local level (SEDIF), support and awareness are part of the "Water solidarity" plan. Actions are conducted with associations and points of information and multi-mediation (PIMMS) to inform users and raise awareness to save water. In addition, some operators have developed indicators to assess the benefit of awareness.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)
 Charter with the city of Paris and social landlords
 OBUSASS studies
<http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/Acces-eau-assainissement.pdf>

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

1.1.5 There are mechanisms in place to enable discussion and coordination by competent authorities

x

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

At the national level, In order to improve the quality of legislative proposals concerning water management, the French water law of 1964 created the National Water Committee as a consultative mechanism, which gives advice to the French Government on water pricing and on the quality of water distribution and treatment by public utilities, among other issues. In 2009 the National Water Committee created a working group devoted to water access issues. The result has been the creation?

of different laws dedicated to these topics.

At the local level, there is no specific coordination on equitable access to water and sanitation. The operator “Eau de Paris” communicates with its own partners (French Department of Paris for the housing solidarity fund), and signs agreements with them. For the SEDIF zone : the delegate is in charge of implementing the housing solidarity fund with the different actors: cities, social centers, French departments

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) <http://www.comitenationaldeleau.fr>

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

1.1.6 The country/region/city has assessed the equity of access to water and sanitation

x

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

At the national level, there is no global assessment on equitable access to water and sanitation. But, several sectoral assessments exist:

- for the existing mechanisms [housing solidarity fund, water pricing, building of areas (halting sites) for travelers (in French : gens du voyage)]
- for some institutions (prisons, schools).

At the local level:

The SEDIF assesses the implementation of the “Water solidarity” plan. The city of Paris assesses the objectives identified in the contract with the drinking water operator.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Reports (in french) :

- ACCÈS À L’EAU ET À L’ASSAINISSEMENT DANS DES CONDITIONS ECONOMIQUEMENT ACCEPTABLES PAR TOUS - Rapport de mission sur la mise en œuvre de l’article 1er de la loi n° 2006-1772 du 30 décembre 2006 sur l’eau et les milieux aquatiques
- Rapport sur les modalités d’application des règles d’accessibilité du cadre bâti pour les personnes handicapées – octobre 2011- CGEDD IGAS CGEFi
- Les aires d'accueil des gens du voyage – octobre 2010 - rapport du CGEDD
- ÉTUDE SUR LES SANITAIRES DANS LES ÉCOLES ÉLEMENTAIRES (CM1, CM2) - Année scolaire 2006-2007 - Observatoire national de la sécurité des établissements scolaires et d’enseignement supérieur
- Les droits de l’homme dans la prison - Commission nationale consultative des droits de l’homme - Volume 1- 2007

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

Please calculate the score for Area 1.1

1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____
2. Divide the number of total points by 6 ____

Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered (please mark one option) High x Medium ____ Low ____

Area 1.2 Sector financial policies

Rationale. Financial resources will have to be spent to implement the initiatives needed to achieve the equitable access targets. At the same time, the overall policies steering sector revenue and expenditures may have large positive and negative impacts on achieving equitable access. In some countries, sector financing is dependent to a large extent on development partner support and there is scope to increase the contribution of this support to achieving equitable access.

| | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
|--|----|---------------------|-------------------|----------|
| 1.2.1 The financial resources needed to achieve equitable access to water and sanitation have been identified | | | | x |

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

Affordability issues: public policies exist, in particular through the housing solidarity fund. This fund is regularly assessed. According to the IGAS-CGEDD report (a ministerial high level report – ministry in charge of social affairs and ministry in charge of housing - 2011) the part dedicated to water is sufficient.

This report describe a proposal for remedial aid measures “*Capping the financial burden of households to 3% of their mean income for the poorest would mobilize an annual amount of approximately € 50 million*”

At the local level :

Paris: a financial resource of 500 € was identified. In 2011, 440,000 € was spent to take care of some water bills.

The SIAAP gives 340,000€ to the housing solidarity funds in 3 departments of the French region “Ile de France”

In the SEDIF zone, 1% of the proceeds from sales (which represents 2.3 Million Euros) is dedicated to equitable access to water for SEDIF users.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Decision 2012-127 CA Eau de Paris for the financial resources dedicated to the housing solidarity fund.

Budget SEDIF and annual report of the delegate.

Report CGEDD-IGAS *Accès à l'eau et à l'assainissement dans des conditions économiquement acceptables par tous*, - 2011

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------|--|
| 1.2.2 The sources of funding to achieve equitable access to water and sanitation have been identified | | | x | |
|--|--|--|----------|--|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

At the national level, for affordability issues, the financial resources are mainly :

- Operators, associations of municipalities, and French department (for the housing solidarity fund)
- Municipalities: municipalities have the possibility of helping households to pay water bills, to avoid the bill being left unpaid.

There are also some proposals for identifying financial resources (in discussion):

- A tax on the sales of bottled water and an allocation of 20% of the penalties paid by municipalities that don't fulfill the obligation of having 20% social housing;
- A tax on the turnover of water companies.

The financial support only concerns people connected to the public water network; there is no financial support for people who are not connected, except for sanitation not connected to a sewerage system.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)
 Law n° 90-449 du 31 mai 1990 sur la mise en œuvre du droit au logement institue un fonds de solidarité pour le logement (FSL)
 code concerning family and social action (article L.115-3)

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

| | | | | |
|---|--|----------|--|--|
| 1.2.3 Financing strategies for the water and sanitation sector take equity issues into account | | x | | |
|---|--|----------|--|--|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

Financing of the water and sanitation utilities is in the French code for municipalities (they are responsible for water supply and for waste water management).

The main principle is that “water pays water”; equitable access is not included in the laws concerning the financing of water and sanitation utilities.

A recent legislative proposal (law “Brottes”) stipulates that the municipalities and associations of municipalities are authorized to identify budgetary resources necessary for people in difficulty with their water bill. This authorization would be a derogation of the general rules, in an experimental context.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)
 Code concerning local authorities -articles L2224-12-2 CGCT / L.2224-12-3 / L.2224-12-3-1
 Law n°2013-312 « Brottes »

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| 1.2.4 The national/regional/city government monitors and publicly reports financial resource allocation | | | | x |
|--|--|--|--|----------|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

At the national level, the ministry in charge of housing and the ministry of social affairs (in particular, department on statistics of the ministry in charge of social affairs (Drees) are in charge of the assessment of the housing solidarity fund.

At the local level :

- Annual report on water price and water and sanitation utilities;
- Annual report of EAU DE PARIS;
- Annual report of SEDIF and its delegate;
- Report on the financial aids system in the city of Paris;
- The social centers and the local collectivities supervise allocation of housing social fund.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)
<http://www.drees.sante.gouv.fr/donnees-relatives-au-fonds-de-solidarite-pour-le-logement,10060>

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

1.2.5 International financial support for the water and sanitation sector takes equity issues into account

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

Not applicable

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

Please calculate the score for Area 1.2

1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) ____
2. Divide the number of total points by **5** ____

Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered (please mark one option) High ____ Medium ____ Low ____

Area 1.3 Rights and duties of users and other right-holders

Rationale. Water and sanitation users and right-holders should not be considered merely the beneficiaries of access to water and sanitation. They have roles to play in demanding, shaping, and maintaining equitable access to water and sanitation.

| | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
|--|----|---------------------|-------------------|-----|
| 1.3.1 There are mechanisms in place to ensure that right-holders are aware of their rights (and the options for exercising them) as well as their obligations | | | x | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p>At the national level, informative actions are undertaken with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The consulting commission on water utilities (in French: CCSPL), concerning the operation of these utilities; - The public, concerning drinking water quality. The results of the official control of drinking water (and bathing waters) are on line on the web site of the French ministry of health. They are also available in the water bill, once a year. <p>The official consumer associations play an important role.</p> <p>At local level, the rights and obligations of utilities users are described in the utilities rules that are sent to the users.</p> <p>Different documents are available about the existing aid (the solidarity in Paris guide). The SEDIF delegate set in place a meeting point dedicated to the “ Water Solidarity” plan The information to the users is also available on web sites (City of Paris, Eau de Paris, SEDIF), or via the phone call centers for the users.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Code concerning local authorities : art L.1413-1 Code concerning public health art D1321-103 Annual reports Ministry of health web site : http://www.sante.gouv.fr/resultats-du-controle-sanitaire-de-la-qualite-de-l-eau-potable.html</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. <u>high</u>, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p> | | | | |
| 1.3.2 There are mechanisms in place to allow right-holders to access relevant information | | | x | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p>Same answer as for 1.3.1</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p> | | | | |
| 1.3.3 There are mechanisms in place to allow right-holders to participate in decisions concerning the level and quality of access that they receive | | | x | |

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

At the national level, the principal of public participation in environmental decision is set by the law, in application of the Aarhus convention.

The utilities users participate in:

- The consulting commission on water utilities (local commissions)
- The National Committee on water (in French : Comité national de l'eau): associations are one of the stakeholders in this committee
- The users board of the basin committee of the French basin agencies.

At local level, the users are involved in

- The Parisian water observatory
- Veolia (SEDIF delegate) encourages and leads participating groups at municipality level, dealing with different issues of concern, like water origin, quality, pricing, and the "Water solidarity" plan.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Law n° 2012-1460 of 27 December 2012 (application of the Aarhus convention)

Code concerning local authorities - art L1413-1

Code concerning environment - article D213-1

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| 1.3.4 There are mechanisms in place to allow right-holders to seek redress and enforce remedial actions | | | | x |
|--|--|--|--|----------|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

At the national level, specific and non-specific mechanisms are in place to allow right holders to seek redress :

- Administrative and judicial appeal;
- The Water Mediator: a national specific mediator for all water disputes. The water mediator can be found via the Internet,
- The Warsmann law deals with the protection of users against abnormal variations of water bill due to a network leakage.

At the regional level : the operators forecast

Operators are insured against non-compliance of certain engagements in the rules of service (SEDIF)

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Code concerning local authorities - Article L. 2224-12-4 (Warsmann law)

Annual report of the water mediator

Contractual report to the SEDIF

Annual report - EAU DE PARIS

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1.3.5 There are mechanisms in place to allow right-holders to keep responsible authorities accountable | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)
See 1.3.4

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

Please calculate the score for Area 1.3

1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) _____
2. Divide the number of total points by **5** _____

Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered (please mark one option) High ___ Medium ___ Low___

Area 1.4 Incentive framework for water and sanitation service providers

Rationale. Water and sanitation service providers can have a substantial influence on equitable access outcomes. National and local governments can set, through public policies, the right incentives to ensure that service providers contribute to equitable access.

| | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
|---|----|---------------------|-------------------|-----|
| 1.4.1 There are mechanisms in place to induce service providers to implement investment plans that favor providing access to those right-holders that lack it | | | | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p> | | | | |
| 1.4.2 There are mechanisms in place to induce service providers to implement operational plans that do not discriminate between service areas | | | | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p> | | | | |
| 1.4.3 There are mechanisms in place to induce service providers to offer the same level of customer service to people belonging to vulnerable and marginalized groups than to any other customer | | | | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p> | | | | |

1.4.4 There are mechanisms in place to induce service providers to design tariff structures that ensure that the water and sanitation bill is affordable by all

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

Please calculate the score for Area 1.4

1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) _____
2. Divide the number of total points by **4** _____

Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered (please mark one option) High ____ Medium ____ Low ____

Section 2. Reducing geographical disparities

| Areas of action | Relevant section in the “No One Left Behind” document |
|---|--|
| 2.1 Public policies to reduce access disparities between geographical areas | Section 4.1 |
| 2.2 Public policies to reduce price disparities between geographical areas | Section 4.2 |
| 2.3 Geographical allocation of external support for the sector | Section 2.3 |

Quantitative information on geographical disparities

| Provide the official definition of rural, urban and (if applicable) peri-urban areas in your country/region | The statistical definitions are: | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| | <p>Zone urbaine : <i>On appelle unité urbaine une commune ou un ensemble de communes présentant une zone de bâti continu (pas de coupure de plus de 200 mètres entre deux constructions) qui compte au moins 2 000 habitants</i> (municipality or group of municipalities with a continuous built area and at least 2000 inhabitants)</p> <p>zone rurale : <i>les communes sans zone de bâti continu de 2000 habitants, et celles dont moins de la moitié de la population municipale est dans une zone de bâti continu</i> (municipalities without a continuous built area of 2000 inhabitants, and municipalities where less than half of the population lives in a continuous built area).</p> | | |
| | 2011 or closest year (please indicate) | 2006 or closest year (please indicate) | Source (please indicate whether this is an official source) |
| Rate of access to water in urban areas (%) | >99% | >99% | |
| Rate of access to water in peri-urban areas (%) (ONLY if this category is relevant in your country/region) | | | Not relevant |
| Rate of access to water in rural areas (%) | | | Not relevant |
| Rate of access to sanitation in urban areas (%) | >99% | >99% | Ministry of charge of environment and ecology http://www.stats.environnement.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/Eider/tables.do# (Insee) |
| Rate of access to sanitation in peri-urban areas (%) (ONLY if this category is relevant in your country/region) | | | Not relevant |
| Rate of access to sanitation in rural areas (%) | | | Not relevant |
| Public financial resources spent in reducing geographical disparities in access to water | | | Not relevant |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|
| and sanitation (million EUR) | | | |
| Public financial resources spent in reducing geographical disparities in access to water and sanitation (EUR per capita) | | | Not relevant |
| Public financial resources spent in reducing geographical disparities in access to water and sanitation (% of public budget spent on water and sanitation) | | | Not relevant |

Area 2.1 Public policies to reduce access disparities between geographical areas

Rationale. Public policies play a major role in reducing disparities in access between geographical areas, and in particular in increasing access in rural areas

| Except for the national legal framework, this part is relevant at the pilot scale only for informal settlements | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
|---|----|---------------------|-------------------|-----|
|---|----|---------------------|-------------------|-----|

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| 2.1.1 There is a public policy for reducing disparities between urban, peri-urban, and rural areas | | | | X |
|---|--|--|--|----------|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

On a national level, national equalization funds have been created to redistribute financial resources between urban and rural municipalities. There is a public engineering policy and a financial support is provided by the Ministry of Agriculture with the National Fund for the Development of Drinking Water Networks (FNDAE). In the water and sanitation fields, ensuring urban/rural solidarity is one of the river basin agencies' goals: financial aids are granted by agencies to rural municipalities to build and rehabilitate water and sanitation infrastructures.

Not relevant at the pilot scale.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

- Article 58 of the 2000 Finance Law creating the National Water Fund (then the FNDAE)
- Article 83 of the 2006 Water and Aquatic Environments Law

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

High

| | | | | |
|--|--|----------|--|--|
| 2.1.2 Integrated approaches have been adopted to support the delivery of water and sanitation services in rural areas, informal settlements and slums | | X | | |
|--|--|----------|--|--|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

Municipalities are compelled by law to define a collective and/or individual sewage treatment zoning and a water delivery zoning (*zonage d'assainissement collectif et non collectif, zonage d'adduction en eau potable*).

SEDIF and Eau de Paris are putting collective or individual water delivering facilities in camps or squats when they are asked for by the municipalities. SEDIF and its operator VEOLIA EAU D'ILE DE FRANCE are providing collective systems of access to a safe drinking water in Roma camps and squats. EAU DE PARIS guarantees access to water to squatters by signing conventions.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Expert opinion, SEDIF and Eau de Paris contracts

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

Medium

| | | | | |
|---|--|----------|--|--|
| 2.1.3 There are mechanisms in place to support the implementation of appropriate technical solutions for service delivery in rural, informal settlements and slums | | x | | |
|---|--|----------|--|--|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

On a national level, the national fund "FNDAE" provided guidelines and technical support to implement appropriate technical solutions to improve access to water in rural areas.

On a local level: there are public fountains (1200 drinking water points) and public toilets (around 400) in Paris, and in the SEDIF zone, the installation of collective access points ensures the delivery of a safe drinking water.

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Expert opinion</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) Medium</p> | | | | |
| <p>2.1.4 There are mechanisms in place to support the implementation of appropriate technical solutions for self-provision of services by households in areas where there is no service provider</p> | | | | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) The national policy on private sewer systems (<i>assainissement non collectif</i>) provides a framework to implement appropriate technical solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individual sewer systems have to receive an agreement from the ministries in charge of health and environment; - Private systems must comply to the regulation - Old systems must be renewed when they are dangerous for people or to prevent a risk for the environment; - Individual sewer systems public services (SPANC) are control authorities in non collective sewer system zones. <p>Not relevant at the pilot scale.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Regulation on individual sewer systems (<i>arrêtés du 7 septembre 2009 fixant les prescriptions techniques applicables aux installations d'assainissement non collectif de moins de 20 EH, et relatif aux modalités de l'exécution de la mission de contrôle des installations d'assainissement non collectif réalisées et réhabilitées</i>)</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| <p>2.1.5 Sector policies mobilize sufficient financial resources to reduce the access gap in rural and peri-urban areas according to the established targets</p> | | | | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) In their next action programs, river basin agencies are considering to devoting 800 million Euros to the rehabilitation of private sewer systems.</p> <p>Not relevant at the pilot scale.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p> | | | | |
| <p>Please calculate the score for Area 2.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) <u>6</u> 2. Divide the number of total points by 5 <u>1,2</u> | | | | |
| <p>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered (please mark one option) High <u> </u> Medium <u>x</u> Low <u> </u></p> | | | | |

Area 2.2 Public policies to reduce price disparities between geographical areas

Rationale. Some geographical areas face higher prices than others. This may be due to higher levels of service, higher cost of service provision (e.g. due to expensive access to clean water sources, or to low density of population), less efficient provision of services (e.g. poor maintenance leading to higher cost, or too many staff per connection), or uneven distribution of public subsidies. Public policies can play a major role in reducing price disparities between geographical areas.

| | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
|--|----|---------------------|-------------------|-----|
| 2.2.1 There are mechanisms in place to track prices as well as cost of provision of water and sanitation services | | | | x |

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

Mechanisms to track prices as well as cost of services provision exist:

- The price of water is taken into account in the formation of the consumption prices index, published every month by INSEE (National Statistical and Economical Studies Institute);
- The national Observatory of water and sanitation services provides descriptive and performance indicators;
- Studies have been made for the years 2004 and 2009 on a national level, about cost of provision of water and sanitation services (Ernst&Young)

On a regional level, a local association in Ile-de-France (Obusass) is giving on its web site a decomposition of water and sanitation prices for the greater Paris. SEDIF is also giving the water price for all the municipalities on its web site.

The annual report published by the water and sanitation services provides indicators on investment costs, replacement of the infrastructures and prices paid by the users.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Official documents available online:

http://www.economie.eaufrance.fr/IMG/pdf/Ernst_Young_Recuperation_des_couts_eau_27_042012_rév1.pdf

<http://www.insee.fr/fr/themes/info-rapide.asp?id=29>

<http://www.services.eaufrance.fr/sispea/showLogin.action>

<http://www.economie.eaufrance.fr>

http://www.sedif.com/imageProvider.aspx?private_resource=11250&fn=ANNEXE%201%20prix%20par%20commune%201er%20trimestre%20_0.pdf

<http://www.obusass-idf.fr>

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

High

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| 2.2.2 Price benchmarking tools (such as affordability indicators or tariff reference values) have been introduced | | X | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

There are no tariff reference values on a national level, the homogenisation of water prices is not given as a goal in public policies, as the financial balance and prices are fixed by the municipal services.

On a regional level, in Paris and the SEDIF zone, in January 2012, the prices went from 3,18€/m³ (Paris) à 5,15€/m³ in Villeneuve-le-Roi (Val-de-Marne).

Obusass made a study on water affordability in Ile de France.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Official documents

- Obusass study on the affordability of water for RSA beneficiaries

- Price of water in the SEDIF zone in January 2012
http://www.sedif.com/imageProvider.aspx?private_resource=11250&fn=ANNEXE%201%20prix%20par%20commune%201er%20trimestre%200.pdf
- Annual report on price and quality of water and sanitation services 2011, Paris

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

High

2.2.3 Public subsidies are targeted to those areas that face higher costs of service provision (not just higher prices)

X

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

Not relevant for Paris.

In the SEDIF zone, a unique price for the delivery of water is applied for all the municipalities. The general tariff in the SEDIF zone is 0,8088 €/m³ between 0 and 180 m³ and 0.9889 € above 180 m³.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Official documents

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

High

2.2.4 The sector is organized to enable cross-subsidization between localities with high-cost and low-cost of service provision

X

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

In the SEDIF and SIAAP zones there are two unique prices for water delivery and sewage treatment, which creates de facto cross-subsidization between localities. (SIAAP tariff: 0,81€/m³).

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Official documents

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

High

Please calculate the score for Area 2.2

1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) _12_
2. Divide the number of total points by 4 _3_

Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered (please mark one option) High x Medium __ Low __

Area 2.3 Geographical allocation of external support for the sector

Rationale. In some countries, development partners (donor countries) are key providers of funding for water and sanitation infrastructure. There is often scope to reallocate the funding to accelerate access in geographical areas that lag behind.

| NOT RELEVANT | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
|--|----|---------------------|-------------------|----------|
| 2.3.1 Public authorities have identified in the sector plan the areas that are lagging behind plan and require external support | | | | x |
| Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) | | | | |
| 2.3.2 There is international financial support to increase access in geographical areas that lag behind (as identified in the sector plan) | | | x | |
| Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) | | | | |
| Please calculate the score for Area 2.3 1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) <u>_5_</u> 2. Divide the number of total points by 2 <u>_2,5_</u> | | | | |
| Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered (please mark one option) High ___ Medium <u>_x_</u> Low ___ | | | | |

Section 3. Ensuring access for vulnerable and marginalized groups

| Areas of action | Relevant section in the “No One Left Behind” document |
|--|--|
| 3.1 Public policies to address the needs of vulnerable and marginalised groups | Section 5.1 |
| 3.2 Persons with special physical needs | Section 5.2 |
| 3.3 Users of institutional facilities and institutionalised persons | Section 5.3 |
| 3.4 Persons without a fixed residence | Section 5.4 |
| 3.5 Persons living in housing without water and sanitation | Section 5.5 |
| 3.6 Persons without access to water and sanitation in their workplaces | Not discussed |

Quantitative information on vulnerable and marginalised groups

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Please, provide the official definition of vulnerable and marginalized groups in your country/region/city | There is no official definition but this category includes: homeless people, nomadic communities, illegal immigrants, migrants, people living in housing without access to water and sanitation, and poor people with insufficient financial resources (Henri Smets, <i>La mise en œuvre du droit à l'eau, les solutions à Paris</i> , 2010) | | |
| | 2011 or closest year (please indicate) | 2006 or closest year (please indicate) | Source (please indicate whether this is an official source) |
| Rate of access to water in the country/region/city (%) | >99 | >99 | Water and sanitation operators |
| Rate of access to water by the poorest fifth of the population (%) | 99 | 99 | Water and sanitation operators |
| Rate of access to sanitation in the country/region/city (%) | >99 | 98 | Insee (ENL inquiry, results for Paris) |
| Rate of access to sanitation by the poorest fifth of the population (%) | 99 | 98 | “ “ |
| Percentage of water and sanitation facilities open to the public that are accessible to people with disabilities | 100 (for public toilets in Paris) | N.A. | City of Paris |
| Percentage of schools that have sufficient and adequate water and sanitation services | > 99 | >99 | All schools have water and sanitation facilities |
| Percentage of hospitals that have sufficient and adequate water and sanitation services | >99 | >99 | “ “ |
| Percentage of prisons that have sufficient and adequate water and sanitation services | N.A. | N.A. | |
| Percentage of persons without a fixed residence that have access to water and sanitation through public facilities | N.A. 6 homeless people out of 10 have no access to public water delivery systems | N.A. | <i>(Could be replaced by the number of public facilities / population)</i> National Observatory on Poverty and Exclusion (ONPES) |
| Number of people lacking access to water and sanitation that live in neighbourhoods where access is available | N.A. on a local level | N.A. | National level: 170 000 housing without private toilets, 180 000 housings without a private bathroom (Insee 2006) |
| Public financial resources spent in ensuring access to water and sanitation by vulnerable and marginalized groups (EUR per | Partly available Paris : around 600 k€/years for water consumption, 120 | N.A. | City of Paris, EAU DE PARIS |

| | | | |
|--|---|------|-------|
| capita) | k€ for maintenance of fountains + costs of homeless shelters and service centers... SEDIF: 7636 € in 2012 for maintaining access to water in squats. | | SEDIF |
| Public financial resources spent in ensuring access to water and sanitation by vulnerable and marginalized groups (million EUR) | N.A. | N.A. | |

N.A. – Non available.

Area 3.1 Public policies to address the needs of vulnerable and marginalised groups

Rationale. There are many vulnerable and marginalized groups, each with their own needs and facing different barriers to achieve equitable access, and thus requiring different solutions. Public policies, both in the water and sanitation sector and in other sectors, can play a major role in ensuring access. An integrated policy response needs to be articulated.

| <i>The general questions and justifications given to the answers in chapter 1 are redundant with those declined in the next chapters</i> | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
|--|----|---------------------|-------------------|-----|
| 3.1.1 There is a water and sanitation policy recognizing the special and differentiated needs of vulnerable and marginalized groups | | | X | |

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

Several sectorial policies, aimed at vulnerable and marginalized groups (education, hospitals, housing...) permit to deal with the equitable access to water and sanitation → see 3.2.1

On a local level, when the public operator EAU DE PARIS was created in 2009, a general policy to favor access to water to all has been implemented, including the maintenance and development of public fountains, distribution of maps, financing less consumptive water equipments. The City decided to implement a “no disconnection from the water grid” policy, even for illegal tenants (squatters).

During summertime, EAU DE PARIS participates to social round ups by giving water bottles to homeless people. The City of Paris also provides several public facilities, all free of charge:

- 1200 water points,
- 400 public toilets,
- 17 bath and shower establishments.

SEDIF includes in its “Water solidarity” plan a fund to help buildings’ co-owners facing financial difficulties to rehabilitate the water network inside the building. VEOLIA EAU d’ILE DE FRANCE is giving collective access to water in Roma camps and squats when the municipalities agree with it.

On a national level, several law proposals on access to water to marginalized people (homeless, nomadic communities, squatters) have been studied by the National Water Committee (CNE) and NGOs.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)
Stakeholder consultation
Eau de Paris, SEDIF-Veolia contract

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)
Medium

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------|--|
| 3.1.2 Relevant policies in other sectors (e.g. social inclusion, social protection, education, health, prisons, housing) includes their role in ensuring access to water and sanitation by vulnerable and marginalize groups. | | | X | |
|--|--|--|----------|--|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

Developed in the next chapters and annexes.

Municipalities can create solidarity centres (*espaces solidarité insertion*) to give access to essential services such as toilets and showers to homeless people or those living in housings without access to water and sanitation (for instance, Paris has 15 solidarity centres).

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)
City of Paris

| | | | | |
|---|----------|--|----------|----------|
| Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High | | | | |
| 3.1.3 There are mechanisms in place to identify (in a participatory manner) and address the water and sanitation needs of vulnerable and marginalized groups | X | | | |
| Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) No participatory mechanism has been identified during the stakeholder consultation. | | | | |
| Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Stakeholder consultation | | | | |
| Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) Low | | | | |
| 3.1.4 Public budgets provide specific funding to address the water and sanitation needs of vulnerable and marginalized groups | | | | X |
| Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) One part of the water and sanitation budgets on the local level, is devoted to address the water and sanitation needs of vulnerable and marginalized groups (for instance, 120 k€ in 2012 for the maintenance of fountains by EAU DE PARIS, and 7636 € for SEDIF to maintain access to water in squats). Other solidarity expenses (to improve housing, access to water in schools, in hospitals...) are part of each institution's budget. | | | | |
| Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Stakeholder consultation Operators | | | | |
| Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High | | | | |
| 3.1.5 Integrated approaches (involving different administrations) have been adopted to support the delivery of water and sanitation services for vulnerable and marginalized groups | | | X | |
| Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) Integrated approaches do exist. For details, see 3.2.3 or 3.5.5. In the SEDIF area, all the "Water solidarity" actions are realized with the participation of the social services of municipalities and departments, and so are the actions realized by Eau de Paris at the municipal level. | | | | |
| Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Stakeholder consultation | | | | |
| Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High | | | | |
| Please calculate the score for Area 3.1 1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) 2. Divide the number of total points by 5 | | | | |
| Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered (please mark one option) High ___ Medium ___ Low ___ | | | | |

Area 3.2 Persons with special physical needs

Rationale. Many disabled, sick, and elderly people face problems in accessing water supply and sanitation services because of their specific physical needs.

| | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
|--|----|---------------------|-------------------|-----|
| 3.2.1 There is data on levels of access to water and sanitation by persons with special physical needs | | X | | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) The Inter-ministerial Observatory on Accessibility noted in its first report in 2011 that we lack data on the implementation of the accessibility policy, because the 2005 law do not compel public and private actors to give information on this subject. According to the “<i>Association des paralysés de France</i>” (French association of disabled), only 15% of institutions opened to public are currently accessible.</p> <p>Quantitative data are not available at the pilot scale.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Official document and experts opinion: http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/-Observatoire-interministeriel-de-1,2954-.html http://www.senat.fr/rap/r11-635/r11-63511.html</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) Medium</p> | | | | |
| 3.2.2 There is a public policy to ensure access to water and sanitation by persons with special physical needs | | | X | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) Institutions opened to public and housings are compelled by law to be accessible for disabled people (<i>personnes à mobilité réduite</i>). Technical standards are fixed in order to make sanitation facilities accessible. Toilets in new buildings have to be accessible since 2007, in old buildings they must comply with the legislation by 2015. For people on dialysis, there is a protocol followed by water operators to prevent patients from water cuts.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Official document: 2005 Act on equality of rights and chances of disabled people Stakeholder consultation.</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| 3.2.3 There is specific public funding to support access to water and sanitation by persons with special physical needs | | | X | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) There is some public funding to support access to water and sanitation by persons with specific physical needs, for instance from ANAH (National Agency for the Improvement of Housing) or Departmental centers for disabled people (<i>Maisons départementales des personnes handicapées</i>).</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Stakeholder consultation</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p> | | | | |

Medium

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| 3.2.4 There are technical standards that ensure the establishment of facilities accessible to persons with special physical needs | | | | X |
| Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 1994 Decree on accessibility of housings and institutions opened to public to disabled people,- Ministerial order of 2006 fixing technical standards for the construction or creation of institutions or buildings opened to public. | | | | |
| Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Official documents | | | | |
| Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High | | | | |
| 3.2.5 There are mechanisms in place to support the adaptation of private facilities for persons with special physical needs | | | | X |
| Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) This question could be merged with 3.2.3 Private facilities in newly built housing must be accessible and there are some public subsidies. | | | | |
| Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Stakeholder consultation | | | | |
| Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High | | | | |
| Please calculate the score for Area 3.2 <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0)2. Divide the number of total points by 5 | | | | |
| Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered (please mark one option) High _ _ Medium _ _ Low _ _ | | | | |

Area 3.3 Users of institutional facilities and institutionalised persons

Rationale. Many people spend all or a significant part of their time in institutional facilities (which include kindergartens, schools, health facilities, retirement homes, prisons, and refugee camps), and they cannot secure independent access to water and sanitation.

| | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
|--|----|---------------------|-------------------|-----|
| 3.3.1 There is data on levels of access to water and sanitation in institutional facilities | | | X | |

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)
Several reports have been published on the living conditions in institutional facilities, including comments and indicators on access to water and sanitation (see annexes A to C for more details).

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)
Official documents and stakeholder consultation: reports of the International Observatory on Prisons, of the French general controller of prisons, of the National Observatory on Security and Accessibility in Schools, Reports of a parents' association on access to water and sanitation in Parisian schools (FCPE)...

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)
High

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3.3.2 There is a public policy to ensure access to water and sanitation by users of institutional facilities and institutionalized persons | | | X | |
|---|--|--|---|--|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

A national policy led by the Ministry of Health is declined for each category of institutional facilities (schools, hospitals, prisons...), with the department sanitary rules (*règlement sanitaire départemental*) at the local level.

Moreover, different sectorial policies address the access to water and sanitation issue:

- In schools, the Ministry of Education made recommendations and fixed technical standards on the number of water points and toilets ;
- Prisoners should be allowed to take three showers a week, but this prescription is only applicable "as far as possible" (article D.358 *Code de procédure pénale*).

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)
Official documents (in French) :
- Guide "construire des écoles : guide de programmation fonctionnelle et données techniques : école maternelle, élémentaire, groupe scolaire et petite école en milieu rural"(1989)
- article D. 358 du Code de procédure pénale.

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)
High

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| 3.3.3 There is specific public funding to support access to water and sanitation by users of institutional facilities and institutionalized persons | | | | X |
|--|--|--|--|---|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

No specific data available.

There is public funding to ensure compliance to the law and access to water and sanitation by users of institutional facilities and institutionalized people, often taken on the general budget of these institutions.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)
Expert opinion; Stakeholder consultation;

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High | | | | |
| 3.3.4 Institutional facilities have relevant complaint mechanisms in place | | | | X |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) See in annexes A to C, each institution has its own complaint mechanisms. For the users of institutional facilities, there is also a possibility of legal recourses to administrative jurisdictions.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Official documents</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| 3.3.5 Institutional facilities have separate toilets for males and females as well as adequate facilities for menstrual hygiene management | | | | X |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) Technical standards and regulation in workplaces, schools, and institutional opened to public.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Stakeholder consultation; official documents</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| <p>Please calculate the score for Area 3.3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) 2. Divide the number of total points by 5 | | | | |
| <p>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is High considered (please mark one option) High ___ Medium ___ Low ___</p> | | | | |

Area 3.4 Persons without a fixed residence

Rationale. A number of people lack access to water and sanitation services not because their locality is not served or because they cannot afford them, but because they have no fixed dwelling to be connected to the water and sanitation networks. They include homeless persons, travelers, and nomadic communities. (The challenge of settlements of ethnic minorities is considered under area 3.5)

| | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
|---|----|---------------------|-------------------|-----|
| 3.4.1 There is data on levels of access to water and sanitation by persons without a fixed residence | | X | | |

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

No data available at the water and sanitation services.

The national Observatory on Poverty and Exclusion (ONPES) estimated that 6 homeless people out of 10 do not have access to public water points.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)
www.onpes.gouv.fr

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)
 High

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3.4.2 There is a public policy to ensure access to water and sanitation by persons without a fixed residence | | | X | |
|---|--|--|---|--|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

For homeless people:

A housing policy is implemented by the State and municipalities. A 2007 law establishes an enforceable right to housing (*droit au logement opposable*).

Municipalities implement overnight accommodations, and sanitary and hygiene services. In Paris for instance, there are 15 solidarity and insertion centres (ESI), opened by day, providing showers and toilets.

Water and sanitation authorities can also implement their own policies, in accordance with social services, to deal with water access problems. On the SEDIF territory, Veolia Eau d'Ile-de-France puts collective water supply systems in insalubrious, illegally occupied housing, or Roma camps in accordance with NGOs and municipalities.

Paris has developed a policy to ensure access to water and sanitation to persons without a fixed residence, including bath and shower establishments, public fountains and toilets, and distribution of water during summertime (see II.3.1). The performance contract between the city and its operator Eau de Paris stipulates that Eau de Paris shall make each year +2% fountains available to the public, including during winter.

For nomadic communities:

There is a 2000 law for travellers/nomadic communities to comply municipalities to build halting areas with access to water and sanitation, but it has been unequally implemented on the national territory— in Ile-de-France, less than 35% of the planned halting sites were built at the end of 2011.

| | | | |
|--|--|--|-----------------|
| <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Stakeholder consultation http://www.mipes.org/-Des-Gens-du-voyage-en-Ile-de-.html Official documents: 2000 law and 2001 decree on technical standards for halting sites, 2007 law implementing an enforceable right to housing Performance contract between the City of Paris and EAU DE PARIS Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | |
| <p>3.4.3 There is specific public funding to support access to water and sanitation by persons without a fixed residence</p> | | | <p>X</p> |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p>All the aforementioned policies are supported by public funding.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Stakeholder consultation</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) Medium</p> | | | |
| <p>Please calculate the score for Area 3.4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) 2. Divide the number of total points by 3 | | | |
| <p>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered (please mark one option) High ___ Medium ___ Low_ ___</p> | | | |

A question about the complaint mechanisms should be added.

Area 3.5 Persons living in housing without water and sanitation

Rationale. People belonging to vulnerable and marginalized groups often live in housing without basic water and sanitation, even if they are located in neighborhoods/localities with access. The causes include situations of illegal tenure, low quality of rented accommodation, squatting, as well as discrimination of ethnic minorities. (The challenge of full localities without access is considered under area 2.1)

| | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
|--|----|---------------------|-------------------|-----|
| 3.5.1 There is data on lack of access to water and sanitation by households living in neighborhoods with access | | | X | |

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

On a national level, the National Institute of Statistical and Economical studies (INSEE) evaluates the level of comfort in housing, including the existence or not of sanitation. In 2006, it reported 353 000 housings without sanitary comfort (without access to water, or sanitation facilities, or inside toilets), which represented 1,3% of housings.

On a local level, the City of Paris is implementing a policy to identify and prevent the degradation of ancient buildings.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)
Official documents (INSEE study PREMIERE N° 1202 - JUILLET 2008); Stakeholder consultation

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)
High

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 3.5.2 There is a public policy to address the lack of access to water and sanitation by households living in neighborhoods with access | | | | X |
|---|--|--|--|---|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

The housing policy is implemented by the State and the local administration. The struggle against insalubrity and the policy to improve the decency of housing are aimed to address the access to water and sanitation issue for households living in neighborhoods with access.

Struggling against insalubrity is aimed to protect the current and future tenants from health problems they may experience because of the housing conditions. A landlord must provide a decent housing, which means it cannot affect someone's physical security or health. The conditions required for a decent housing for water and sanitation are:

- A water delivery system inside the housing with enough pressure and flow for a normal use;
- A wastewater evacuation system preventing from outputs of wastewater and equipped with a trap

Ministries in charge of health and housing work together on several action plans on this topic:

- National priority plan 2008-2012 for housing and access to housing of homeless people and people living in inadequate housing,
- Department action plan for underprivileged persons (PDALPD),
- Program to eradicate insalubrious housing
- Reinforced action plan for social housing and emergency accommodation of homeless people (PARSA)
- National action plan for social inclusion (PNAI)
- Action plan against "sleep merchants"

The City of Paris has launched in 2002 a policy to eradicate low quality housing, which led to the destruction or rehabilitation of 1000 buildings between 2004 and 2010, created an Observatory, bought and renovated damaged buildings.

There is also a “no-disconnection from the water grid” policy for squatters or illegal tenants.

SEDIF provides collective water supply systems and its operator takes part to the buildings protection plans (*plans de sauvegarde*) to ensure that water facilities are taken into account, and can also participate to planned operations for the improvement of the housing environment (OPAH) that are implemented to rehabilitate damaged buildings in urban areas.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Official documents :

Public Health Code, articles R.1331 and 1334

Law n° 2000-1208 of 13 December 2000 on solidarity and urban renewal (art 187)

Decree n° 2002-120 of 30 January 2002 on characteristics of decent housing

Decree n°87-149 of 6 March 1987 on minimal conditions of comfort and decent housing

Water public service rules

PDALPD

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

High

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| 3.5.3 There is specific public funding to support access to water and sanitation by households living in neighborhoods with access | | X | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

The elimination of insalubrious housing policy and the housing policy are supported by public funding but there is no specific funding to support access to water and sanitation. Moreover, the renovation of accommodation is mainly under the responsibility of the owner, even if public subsidies exist.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

High

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| 3.5.4 There is an official diagnostic of the problem and a characterization of the different situations (e.g. illegal tenure, ethnic discrimination, low quality of rented accommodation) | | | | X |
|--|--|--|--|---|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

In Paris, for the rare dwellings with no access to water and/or sanitation, the problem comes from the age of the building, or size of the rooms. The most part of old buildings are today rehabilitated. But sanitary problems may still be found in small rooms built under the roof top (*chambres de service, chambres de bonnes*), or old apartments. These people often use the municipal bath and shower establishments.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| 3.5.5 There are integrated programs (involving different government departments) to address the symptoms and causes of the lack of access | | | | X |
|--|--|--|--|---|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

See 3.5.2.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

High

Please calculate the score for Area 3.5

1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0)
Divide the number of total points by 5

Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered (please mark one option) High ___ Medium __ _ Low ___

A question about the complaint mechanisms should be added.

Area 3.6 Persons without access to water and sanitation in their workplaces

Rationale. While many people spend most of their time in their workplaces, there are many cases of workplaces without adequate access to water and sanitation.

| | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
|--|----|---------------------|-------------------|-----|
| 3.6.1 There is data on lack of access to water and sanitation by workers in their workplaces | | X | | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) No data available from the water and sanitation services, but Labour inspection services control the compliance to water and sanitation obligations in the workplaces.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) Medium</p> | | | | |
| 3.6.2 There is a public policy to address the lack of access to water and sanitation by workers in their workplaces | | | | X |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) Under the French law, the employer should provide to workers the means to clean themselves, including changing rooms, sinks, toilets, and when necessary, showers. The regulation also includes technical prescription on gender separation.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Work Code, articles R.4228.1 and following</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| 3.6.3 There is specific public funding to support access to water and sanitation by workers in their workplaces | X | | | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) There is private funding from the employer.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Stakeholder consultation</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| <p>Please calculate the score for Area 3.6</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) 2. Divide the number of total points by 3 | | | | |
| <p>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered (please mark one option) High ___ Medium ___ Low ___</p> | | | | |

+ a question about the complaint mechanisms should be added

| Area 3.3.A Educational facilities | | | | |
|---|----|---------------------|-------------------|----------|
| | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
| 3.3.1.A There is data on levels of access to water and sanitation in educational facilities | | | | X |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p>It is compulsory for French schools to provide access to water and sanitation, according to national regulations.</p> <p>However, the National Observatory of Security and Accessibility of Schools (ONS) published a report in 2007 in which it pointed out that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In 29,5% of schools, sanitary blocs are not separated for boys and girls, - There is no soap in 12,8% of schools' toilets, - In 52,7% of schools, there is no access to water outside of sanitary accommodations, <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Official documents and stakeholder consultation Source : ONS Education - Les sanitaires dans les écoles élémentaires - rapport 2007.pdf</p> <p>+ In Paris : FCPE report : FCPE - enquête sur les toilettes scolaires à Paris - 2003.pdf</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| 3.3.2.A There is a public policy to ensure access to water and sanitation by users of educational facilities | | | | X |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p>French regulations stipulate the obligation to provide access to water and sanitation in all schools</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Official documents: article 5 of primary and secondary schools' regulation (July 2002)</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| 3.3.3.A There is specific public funding to support access to water and sanitation by users of educational facilities | | | X | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p>There is public funding in schools budgets, depending on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Municipalities for primary schools - Departments for <i>colleges</i> - Regions for <i>lycées</i> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) School budgets, local administration budgets</p> | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) | | | | |
| High | | | | |
| 3.3.4.A Educational facilities have relevant complaint mechanisms in place | | | | X |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) For all subjects, there are parents' association and student delegates who can complain to the school authorities.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Official documents: Decree n°2006-935 of 28 July2006 and Ministerial Circular n° 2006-137 of 25 August 2006 on parents' associations</p> <p>Education Code : articles R421-50, R421-51, D511-39, R421-27 and art. D 422-34 (student delegates)</p> | | | | |
| Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) | | | | |
| High | | | | |
| 3.3.5.A Educational facilities have separate toilets for males and females as well as adequate facilities for menstrual hygiene management | | | | X |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)</p> <p>The French regulation includes the necessity to have separate toilets for males and females (but we do not have the information for menstrual hygiene management) However, a 2007 report (see 3.3.1 A) note that sanitary blocs are not separated for males and females in 29, 5% of schools.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) ONS 2007 report</p> | | | | |
| Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) | | | | |
| High | | | | |

| Area 3.3.B Health facilities | | | | |
|---|----------|---------------------|-------------------|----------|
| | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
| 3.3.1.B There is data on levels of access to water and sanitation in health facilities | | | | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) Hospitals and health facilities have access to water and sanitation for obvious hygiene and sanitary reasons. These institutions are given priority in case of problem of water delivery.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Stakeholder consultation (Ministry of Health)</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) Medium</p> | | | | |
| 3.3.2.B There is a public policy to ensure access to water and sanitation by users of health facilities | | | | X |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) There is a national policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of Health Circular DGS/PGE/1 D n° 1248 of 2 July 1990 on sanitary protection of water delivery networks aimed at human consumption - Ministry of Health Circular DGS/VS4/93/n° 7 of 29 January 1993 for conception, implementation and maintenance of water delivery facilities aimed at human consumption - Water technical guide in health facilities: http://www.sante.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/Guide_technique_de_l_eau_dans_les_etablissements_de_s_ante_-_edition_2005.pdf <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Official documents</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| 3.3.3.B There is specific public funding to support access to water and sanitation by users of health facilities | X | | | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) There is no specific funding. It isn't necessary since these facilities have to consider these costs in their budgets and assure their payment.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Stakeholder consultation (Ministry of Health)</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| 3.3.4.B Health facilities have relevant complaint mechanisms in place | | | | X |

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

It's mandatory by law.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Stakeholder consultation (Ministry of Health)

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

High

3.3.5.B Health facilities have separate toilets for males and females as well as adequate facilities for menstrual hygiene management

X

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

The regulation is the same for all institutions, health facilities should be separated for males and females, but we do not have data on this topic.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Stakeholder consultation (Ministry of Health)

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

High

| Area 3.3.C Prison facilities | | | | |
|---|----|---------------------|-------------------|----------|
| | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
| 3.3.1.C There is data on levels of access to water and sanitation in prison facilities | | | X | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) Hygiene conditions in French prisons are described in several reports. They often focus on one establishment, or do not give a quantitative evaluation. Recurrent issues described in these reports are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No door or walls in sanitary facilities; - Lack of shower and toilet in prison cells; - Bad hygiene conditions. <p>The Ministry of Justice launched in 2000 an inquiry on hygiene and living conditions of institutionalized people in prisons.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Multi-stakeholder consultation and official documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - International Observatory on Prisons – report 2001-2002 - IGAS IGSJ report “ The organization of medical care for prisoners”, 2001 <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| 3.3.2.C There is a public policy to ensure access to water and sanitation by persons institutionalized in prison facilities | | | X | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) The inquiry launched by the Ministry of Justice led to the adoption of a multiannual action plan by ministries in charge of Justice and Health, including an objective related to hygiene conditions.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Official document: Action plan 2010-2014 : http://www.sante.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/Plan_actions_strategiques_detenus.pdf</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| 3.3.3.C There is specific public funding to support access to water and sanitation by persons institutionalized in prison facilities | | | X | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) A public funding is dedicated to the improvement of hygiene conditions in prisons (see action plan above-mentioned).</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Ministry of Justice</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| 3.3.4.C Prison facilities have relevant complaint mechanisms in place | | | | X |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) There are several complaint mechanisms in French prisons:</p> | | | | |

- On 30 October 2007, the French Parliament adopted the draft law creating a general controller of prisons;
- The Ombudsman (*Médiateur de la République*)
- Council for Evaluation of Prisons

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)
Official documents

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)
High

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3.3.5.C Prison facilities have separate toilets for males and females as well as adequate facilities for menstrual hygiene management | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

Prisons for males and females are independent, there is no sharing of any kind of services

We do not have any quantitative data for people in custody in police stations.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)
Multi-stakeholder consultation

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)
High

Section 4. Keeping water and sanitation affordable for all

| Areas of action | Relevant section in the “No One Left Behind” document |
|--|--|
| 4.1 Public policies to ensure affordability of water and sanitation services | Section 6.1 |
| 4.2 Tariff system | Section 6.2 |
| 4.3 Social protection measures | Section 6.3 |

Quantitative information on affordability

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>Please, provide the official definition of affordability (and/or target) in your country/region/city</p> | <p>In France, a weight of expenditure for water and sanitation services above a threshold of 3% of the total income of household is seen as unbearable.</p> <p>At national level, it is assumed that around 2 million people are above this threshold (source : IGAS-CGEDD report, july 2011)</p> | | |
| | <p>2011 or closest previous year (please indicate)</p> | <p>2006 or closest previous year (please indicate)</p> | <p>Source (please indicate whether this is an official source)</p> |
| <p>Amount of the average water and sanitation bill in the country/region/city (Euros/year)</p> | <p>3,96€/m³ (Obusass report for Paris and 297 municipalities).</p> <p>For a 4 people household (120 m³ consumption) : 480 €/an (zone SEDIF) et 380€/an à Paris</p> | <p>2008 : 3,69 euros/m³ for Ile-de-France</p> | <p>SEDIF City of Paris</p> |
| <p>Amount of the water and sanitation bill in the country/region/city for households in the lowest wealth or income group (please specify whether this refers to lowest quintile, lowest decile, or people under the national poverty line) (Euros/year)</p> | | | |
| <p>Average disposable household income (or expenditure) (Euros/year)</p> | <p>Average disposable household income in France : 35 220 € (2010)</p> | <p>N. A.</p> | <p>INSEE (Official source)</p> |
| <p>Average household income (or expenditure) for households in the lowest wealth or income group (please specify whether this refers to lowest quintile, lowest decile, or people under the national poverty line) (Euros/year)</p> | <p>Average income for households from the first quartile : 13 416 € (2009)</p> | <p>N.A.</p> | <p>INSEE (Official source)</p> |
| <p>Public financial resources spent in ensuring affordability of the water and sanitation bill (million EUR)</p> | <p>500 k€ + 90 k€ Housing solidarity fund (HSF) 2 995 000€ preventive water aid (Paris)</p> <p>340 000 € for people living in the four central departments (HSF)</p> | <p>N.A.</p> | <p>HSF reports « Water solidarity » report</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|------|---|
| | from SIAAP) 1,15 M€ (SEDIF) | | |
| Public financial resources spent in ensuring affordability of the water and sanitation bill (EUR per capita) | In Paris 80€ (corrective aid) + 68€ (preventive aid)/year/recipient SEDIF : 2€ per service subscriber SIAAP : 9 000 recipient households sharing the 340 000 € of HSF, in average 38€/household | N.A. | Assesment City of Paris SEDIF SIAAP. |
| Public financial resources spent in ensuring affordability of the water and sanitation bill (% of public budget for water and sanitation) | Paris : should be over 0,40% of total revenue water SEDIF : 0,5% private's operator water revenue SIAAP : around 0,3% of budget | N.A. | Contract goal City of Paris - EdP « Water solidarity » report SIAAP |

Area 4.1 Public policies to ensure affordability

Rationale. The water and sanitation bill (including wastewater treatment charges) may represent a high financial burden, particularly for the poorest households. Affordability is a common and increasing concern. However, in many cases, national local policies do not address this issue.

| | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
|--|----|---------------------|-------------------|----------|
| 4.1.1 There is data on affordability of water and sanitation services | | | | X |

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

This information is taken from IGAS-CGEDD report (2011) :

According to the National statistical institute (INSEE), the part of water charges representing on average 0,8% of households budgets. It remains steady for 15 years unlike electricity (3,8%) or telecommunication (2,4%) which are in constant growth.

To have a more concrete vision of the amount of water bill, the authority in charge of consumption assessed its average global amount to:

- 312 € /household/year(1999);
- 378 € (2009), around 1 euro /day/household, based on an annual consumption of 120m3 (cf FP2E's report « *Public water supply and sanitation services in France* » -march 2012).

In France, according to Mr. Henri SMETS, water charges for an isolated person with minimum social benefits represent 4,1% of the budget.

A survey about water access for people with minimum social benefits in Paris area was conducted by Obusass

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Official document: CGEDD-IGAS report, 2011

Stakeholder report: FP2E , Obusass study

Expert report: Henri Smets, La mise en œuvre du droit à l'eau. Les solutions à Paris

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

High

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| 4.1.2 Water and sanitation policy includes affordable access as one of its objectives | | | | X |
|--|--|--|--|----------|

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

The first article of the last water law in 2006 (law n°2006-1772) introduced the most emblematic disposal related to Human right to water: each individual for his diet and hygiene, has the right to access to safe drinking water in economically acceptable conditions for all (Environment code, art. L210-1) Public policies to ensure affordability are therefore precised in other legal texts than those related to water and sanitation policies (cf. 4.1.3)

The contract goals between the City of Paris and Eau de Paris in the chapter « Ensure access to water for users with the lowest incomes »:

Indicator « Commitment rate for social solidarity » (All the social solidarity expenditures of the public operator are taken into account: participation in HSF, education, access to water, partnerships reported to the amount billed water sales) : target of 0,40%

SEDIF :

Water Solidarity Program is for people who are temporarily or permanently, struggling to pay their water bills, especially when it exceeds 3% of their financial resources. 50% of the program is dedicated to the Emergency component which provides subscribers financial means (in compliance with Cambon's law)

SIAAP has given 340 000€ in 2012 to HSF of Paris and the three departments around.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Official documents : Code concerning social action and families

Law n° 2004-809 of 13 August 2004 on local freedoms and responsibilities

« Cambon » law n°2011-156 of 7 February 2011

Expert report: Henri Smets, La mise en œuvre du droit à l'eau. Les solutions à Paris

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

High

4.1.3 Social policy addresses affordability of water and sanitation services

x

Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer)

Social Action and Families Code also establishes disposals « ... *any person or family experiencing particular difficulties, particularly with regard to its heritage, the lack of resources or living conditions, are entitled to help from the community to have water supply, energy and telephone services in its housing* » (Social Action and Families Code, L115-3)

Social Action and Families Code also contains disposals relating to water disconnections. Thus, in case of unpaid bills, a warning is given and payment delays can usually be granted by the water operator (« *When a consumer has failed to pay the bill ... the water operator notifies by mail the time and conditions, laid down by decree, in which the supply may be reduced or suspended in case of default of paiement* » (SAFC, L115-3). Subscribers with outstanding water is invited to contact social services (HSF or CCAS) for assistance. Pending the HSF decides, disconnection of water is suspended (« *In case of non-payment of bills, the supply of energy, water and limited telephone service is maintained until it has been ruled on the request for assistance* »).

Law n° 2004-809 on local freedoms and responsibilities placed the housing solidarity funds under the responsibility of departments in 2005 and has expanded its aim taking in charge debts water.

“**Cambon**” law n°2011-156 on solidarity in the water supply and sanitation fields provides that water and sanitation services can allocate 0.5% of their revenues to housing solidarity fund (HSF). At the request of mayors, HSF can help households whose bill exceeds 3% of income to pay their debts.

CCSA may also give preventive aids as water checks for the Sedif area.

In Paris, the fifth action plan for housing for disadvantaged people (2010) provides that water debts for all people should be taken into account, including those who have an individual subscription. The "water" HSF for individual subscribers was created in 2012 in Paris.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Official document : Code concerning on Social Action and Families

Law n° 2004-809 on local freedoms and responsibilities

Cambon law n°2011-156

Action plan for housing for disadvantaged people

Expert report: Henri Smets, La mise en œuvre du droit à l'eau. Les solutions à Paris

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

High

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| 4.1.4 There is a policy to address affordability of self-provided water and sanitation services | | | | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) Irrelevant at Ile-de-France level.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)</p> | | | | |
| 4.1.5 There is specific public funding to address affordability concerns | | | | X |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) At national level, information from IGAS CGEDD report (2011) suggests that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HSF aid represent a little more than 300 million euros per year funded to 76% by the department benefiting from the compensation paid by the State for the transfer of social competence, 8% by energy service providers, 7% by the family allowance, the remainder coming from social landlords, CCSA and water operators. - HSF spending related to drinking water increased but remain marginal compared to other items (a little less than 10 million out of a total of 300 million). <p>At local level, water and wastewater operators funded HSF (for 2011) :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 500 k€ for Eau de Paris (Paris HSF), - 340 k€ for SIAAP (4 central departments) ; - 440 k€ for SEDIF/Veolia eau (Sedif area) <p>+ preventive aid measures (SEDIF water checks) and 3M€ housing aid devoted to water charges in Paris</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Official document IGAS – CGEDD report, 2011 Report from water and wastewater operators</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| <p>Please calculate the score for Area 4.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) _ 2. Divide the number of total points by 5 __ | | | | |
| <p>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered (please mark one option) High ___ Medium __ Low ___</p> | | | | |

Area 4.2 Tariff measures

Rationale. Tariff design offers several options to address affordability issues, such as through progressive tariff systems or through social tariffs. Preferential tariffs are mostly financed by higher tariffs on other users.

| | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
|---|----|---------------------|-------------------|----------|
| 4.2.1 Different options to address affordability issues through tariff measures have been analyzed | | | | X |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) For drinking water, there is no social tariff due in part to the numerous local authorities in charge of utilities, and so the numerous tariffs at regional scale, and to the impossibility to implement a fair and efficient pricing in collective social housing group (IGAS CGEDD report, 2011).</p> <p>EAU DE PARIS is presently studying different tariff structures for the water service (sanitation at this time is not in the field).</p> <p>At the SEDIF level, besides the general tariff of water which provides 2 blocks for the m3 price (block 1 from 0 to 180 m3 at 0.8088€/m3 and block 2 beyond the threshold at 0.9889€/m3), the syndicate introduced a progressive multi housing tariff which also incorporates two blocks. However, given the high percentage of users who are not direct subscribers, residing in collective housing, it appears that the "high consumption" tariff is the most interesting for families living in large housing estates, and the transition to a progressive tariff would increase the water bill in priority for these clients and public institutions.</p> <p>At national level, the last water law gives the opportunity to create different classes of customers (residential, non residential) but the social criteria could not be used to differentiate customers. A new law, from April 2013, introduces the right to experiment social tariffs (law n°2013-312)</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| 4.2.2 Tariff measures have been included in a strategy to address affordability issues | | X | | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) Collective metering for Paris and SEDIF has led to adopt strategies of indirect aid excluding tariff measures other than price reductions, and multi housing tariff established by SEDIF.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| 4.2.3 Tariff measures to address affordability issues have been implemented | | X | | |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) Stability of the overall price of water and sanitation in Paris in 2011 with a decrease of 8% of the water part of Eau de Paris 20% decrease of the water price in the SEDIF area since January 2011.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Official documents : Annual report on price and quality of water and wastewater utility (2011)</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| 4.2.4 Tariff measures implemented to address affordability issues are not damaging the financial sustainability of service provisions | | | | X |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) The financial balance of service is maintained</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion) Official documents Annual report on price and quality of water and wastewater utility (2011)</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| <p>Please calculate the score for Area 4.2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) _ 2. Divide the number of total points by 4 ___ | | | | |
| <p>Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered (please mark one option) High ___ Medium __ Low___</p> | | | | |

Area 4.3 Social protection measures

Rationale. Social protection measures offer several options to address affordability issues without modifying the design of existing water and sanitation tariffs. They can be aimed at avoiding non-payment of water bills (preventive) or at paying water debts (curative). They are mostly financed by general (local, regional or national) taxes.

| | No | To a limited extent | To a large extent | Yes |
|---|----|---------------------|-------------------|-----|
| 4.3.1 The impacts of different alternatives to address affordability issues through social protection measures have been analysed | | | | X |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) Paris : an analysis of the situation was conducted in 2009 by the social services and by the services in charge of water and sanitation for the City to determine what kind of action could be implemented to make water more affordable. In view of the Parisian household water consumption, various options were considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preventive aid measures distributed by the HSF; - Support for projects and installations to save water; - Aids backed to existing housing aids (measure chosen as best coverage) - Distribution of " water check " <p>At SEDIF level, implementation of a technical committee dedicated, composed of elected officials, and responsible for studying the implementation of the device "solidarity water" that was used to analyze the different situations of subscribers within the PPP contract. The components (emergency, assistance, prevention) of the Water Solidarity plan take into account the different situations of subscribers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Difficulty paying bills: water checks, waiver of claims (over indebtedness) Participation in HSF - Lack of information on water service: dedicated cell, mediation of local public services, outreach in neighborhoods - Obsolete equipment, risk major consumption: funds work to rehabilitate degraded condominiums facilities <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| 4.3.2 Social protection measures have been included in a strategy to address affordability issues | | | | X |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) The legislative framework (CGCT, Social Action and Families Code ...) allows municipalities and water utilities to implement preventive and curative assistance devices. Eg: Cambon law provides that service may spend up to 0.5% of its revenue to the HSF.</p> <p>Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)</p> <p>Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence) High</p> | | | | |
| 4.3.3 Social protection measures to address affordability issues have been implemented | | | | X |
| <p>Score justification (please provide brief explanation and/or examples that justify the answer) Paris : HSF and "Water HSF" established in 2012 for individual subscribers A share of aid to preventive housing is "labeled water" SEDIF : Grants are allocated directly via " water check " through the Housing Solidarity Fund (subscribers and non-subscribers) and through waiver of claims during the commission of</p> | | | | |

indebtedness.

Means of verification used: (e.g. official documents, multi-stakeholder consultation, expert opinion)

Reliability of the response: (i.e. high, medium, or low-level of confidence)

High

Please calculate the score for Area 4.3

1. Add the points obtained (Yes = 3, To a large extent = 2, To a limited extent = 1, No = 0) _9
2. Divide the number of total points by 3 __3

Given the number of High, Medium and Low responses, the average reliability for this area is considered (please mark one option) High Medium Low