

# **Ukraine country report of the piloting exercises on self-assessment**

**Anna Tsvietkova, UNENGO "MAMA-86"  
Iryna Rudenko, State SES of Ukraine**

**Second Meeting of the Expert Group on  
Monitoring Progress in Achieving Equitable Access to Water  
and Sanitation**

Paris, 15-16 May 2013

# The pilot exercise in Ukraine

## Objectives

- testing of the score card framework at the local and national levels and preparation of the situational analysis on equitable access to water and sanitation in Ukraine;
- organization of a national and local multi-stakeholder workshops;
- preparation of the country report on the pilot project and contribution to preparation of the National Summary Report on Protocol implementation progress, 2013.

**leading partners:** State Sanitary and Epidemiological Service (SSES) of Ukraine and Ukrainian National Environmental NGO (UNENGO)  
MAMA-86

Supported by the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine (MoE).

**scale of the project:** national + local (at level of city Sevastopol)

# Country profile

	2011	2009
Population (inhabitants)	45633,6	46143,7
Territory (km <sup>2</sup> )	603.6	
GDP (in Euro) per capita	2568	1825
% population below nat.poverty line	24.3	26,4
% (Mln) of urban population	68,77 % (31,4 Mln)	68.45% (31,5 %
of rural population	31,23 % (14,3 Mln)	31,55% (14,4 Mln)

Renewable freshwater resources about 2000 m<sup>3</sup> / capita

Surface WR are main sources of DW and main reservoirs for discharging of wastewaters, WR contamination

Water sector is under on going reforms since 1994 (decentralization, involvement PS, tariffs reforms, infrastructure ageing, access to improved WS is higher then access to improved Sanitation

% population without access to safe drinking water ?n/a (2% = 950 000 used transported water in 2011)

% population without access to wastewater collection - ? n/a (2-40% in cities, and about 91 % in rural)

In 2011 State financing plans for DW – 200.7 mln UAHs (about 20 Mln Euros) in reality it was financed only on 20% of plan.

# Organization of the self-assessment exercise

## Team composition:

### National pilot team 8 members:

- MAMA-86 – pilot coordination and administration,
- SSES - pilot partner co-organizer of the info collection at national level + oblast units of SSES
- MoE – political support and link to the Protocol on W&H reporting process
- 5 experts: on International Obligations + 4 main areas of SC:

Local pilot team: MAMA-86 Sevastopol + 4 experts on 4 main areas of SC

## Main steps of the process:

- Data collection at national (central executive bodies, regional units of SSES, international (WB, EBRD, SIDA, SDA) and NGOs) and local levels;
- Scorecard fulfilment by experts;
- Baseline analysis (BLA) Draft development by experts, based on SC completed;
- discussion of the BLA Drafts, self-evaluation results and future steps at Stakeholders Workshops: in Kyiv, March 1 and in Sevastopol, March 22 2013;
- finalization of the BLAs taking into account the stakeholders' discussion results, (National BLA was included into National Summary Report 2013 on Protocol implementation progress in Ukraine), preparation of the critical comments and recommendations to the Scorecard and the procedure of its application
- Self-assessment results presentation: Press events in Kyiv and Sevastopol

# Main findings regarding equitable access to WS: good practices and main gaps identified (1)

- Ukraine ratified 16 from 18 International Acts but there is a lack of systemic approach to implement its international commitments on W&S matters
- Ukraine has broad and developed legal framework (Laws, Programmes) but weak implementation mechanisms of them, low efficiency of sector reforms, lack of SMART goals of sector reforms, Eq Right to WS is not an aim of sector reforms, lack of transparent and relevant information to complete the BIA and useful for decision making process, to monitor progress and decision making
- Ukraine has geographical inequity on access to WS, especially to S. the existed legal framework and actions plans are not efficient as have no political priority and adequate resources, including financial, for implementation. State Program focused on WS of rural settlements existed since 2002 but no progress, in reality there is regress.
- Water quality is one of the core problems to ensure eq.right to WS and it has geographical specifics

# Main findings regarding equitable access to WS: good practices and main gaps identified (2)

- There is a lack of data to assess the size of main categories of marginalized & vulnerable groups (invalids, traveler (Roma), homeless others) and no possibility to assess problems with M&V groups' access to WS.
- One of the identified problems is access to WS of children. Some measures to improve situation with access to WS in schools, kindergartens and hospitals were implemented in 2011-2012 but the temps and resources are not adequate to the needs and plans.
- Information on public financial resources spent in ensuring access to W&S by vulnerable and marginalized groups is fragmentary, no possibility to estimate funds spent on the WS items for these groups.
-

# Main findings regarding equitable access to WS: good practices and main gaps identified (3)

- There is some progress on households' access to improved WS: in 2009 67.0% of HHs used cold water supply services and 49.0% of HHs used sanitation services and in 2011 correspondantly: 68.5% of HHs used cold WS and 50.7% of HHs used S services.
- In Ukraine there are different social aid mechanisms (housing subsidies, privileges for different categories of social groups) to support HHs to pay for housing and communal services. (In 2012, subsidies from State Budget for the privileges and housing subsidies to pay for electricity, natural gas, heat, water supply and sanitation, rent, removal of household waste and wastewaters were 701.14 million Euros!)., no special social aid instruments for WS services payment, there is no policy based on social tariffs (block tariffs). State has no any aid program/instruments to support HHs used decentralized Water Supply and/or Sanitation, mainly in rural areas.
- According to expert opinion, at macro-economical level ( national scale) average HH's payment for WSS services is about 50.1 Euros/Y and it is affordable for average HH in Ukraine.
- In Sevastopol in March 2013 about 1020 HHs were disconnected from Sanitation because of no payment for the WS. The payment for emptying of pit latrines (decentrilized Sanitation) are not affordable for pore HHs in city Sevastopol.

# Next steps

## National level:

- National State Authorities' awareness rising and promotion of Equal right to WS – oriented approach among the decision makers
- promotion and lobbying to put higher the Sanitation in national political agenda
- to promote and to legalize Water Safety Plans as an instrument of ensuring access to SAFE Drinking Water for all in Ukraine

## Local (Sevastopol city) level:

- To develop cooperation between city authority - local community- NGO-water utility for development of the social aid instruments for HHs with centralized Water supply and with not improved Sanitation to improve access to centralized sanitation in the frame of on-going program on canalization of the city Sevastopol;
- To initiate the development of the social aid instrument for ensuring the equal access to Improved Sanitation for all
- To lobby the incorporation of measures to ensure the decentralized water supply for garden cooperatives into the City Programm "Drinking Water of Sevastopol"



# Benefits obtained

- Scorecard testing pilot contributed in awareness rising on the equitable right to WS (concept and content) and Protocol on W&H at national and Sevastopol city levels
- Due to pilot inter-agencies' communication was improved and cooperation between state authorities, experts and NGOs was developed
- Stakeholders participation mechanisms used for verification/improvement of Baseline Analysis and self-assessment. It helped to develop common understanding of the situation and prioritize the problems
- Baseline study on Eq RtoWS was made firstly in Ukraine
- Pilot helped and contributed into inter-agencies cooperation for preparation of the Summary Report on Protocol implementation progress in Ukraine. BLA is a part of this Report

# and lessons learned

- Right to WS is unknown as theory and practice and needs active promotion and capacity building, including awareness rising at national-local levels actions.
- Lack of information or access to relevant information at national-local level.
- Scorecard is not easy instrument, its application needs a capacity to implement. It is possible to use this tool by different stakeholders (national/local authorities, NGOs or other stakeholders).
- For NGOs there are some difficulties to access the information needed for Scorecard fulfillment. Practical experience and skills to cooperate with stakeholders, especially with authorities and to work on Water sector items at local-national levels provide a good basis for such kind of exercise.
- Scorecard did not reflect the Water Quality aspects of the Right to WS, which is important principal provision of equal right to WS
- Scorecard provides basis for gap analysis, prioritizing the problems and stakeholder discussion of the efficiency of existed policy on the equal Right to WS.

**Thank you for your attention!**

[www.mama-86.org.ua](http://www.mama-86.org.ua)

