

sustainable sanitation alliance

SuSanA factsheet

Operation and maintenance of sustainable sanitation systems

April 2012

1 Summary

The aims of this factsheet are to introduce concepts of operation and maintenance (O&M) for sustainable sanitation systems and to give examples of O&M with their strengths and weaknesses.

Effective and efficient O&M is crucial for the sustainable implementation and long-term functioning of sanitation systems. However, issues related to O&M services are often neglected in the design and set-up of sanitation systems, and thus non-functioning O&M services are a widespread challenge in particular in developing countries and countries in transition.

The guiding principles for the design of sustainable O&M services are:

- The level of O&M is closely linked to ownership of a facility and the basic understanding of the technology and its functions.
- Every technology that is implemented in a sanitation system chain requires proper O&M to function.
- Different technologies at different steps in the sanitation chain need different people and different responsibilities for O&M.
- Clearly defined roles and accountabilities as well as appropriate support and training are essential for the management of O&M services.
- Institutional responsibilities as well as effective mechanisms for cost recovery are needed to ensure sustainable O&M.

To further explain the need for sustainable O&M this factsheet reviews examples of sanitation systems in various settings such as schools, in households, at public toilets, at institutional level in management of sewers etc. In case of decentralised solutions, O&M is the most crucial criterion for selection of a sanitation system during the technology selection process.

The factsheet is targeted at practitioners, researchers and policy makers as well as development practitioners who are less familiar with the topic of O&M of sanitation systems.

2 Introduction

Appropriate sanitation facilities can provide critical improvements in community health, education, poverty, environmental quality and many other interconnected issues. However, maximum benefits will only be achieved

when the sanitation facilities operate continuously and at full capacity in compliance with acceptable standards of quantity and quality. Therefore, O&M tasks must be carried out effectively and efficiently.



Figure 1: Two staff members from a service provider are emptying the faeces vaults of household UDDTs in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso (source: S. Tapsoba, 2009)¹.

Sadly, the O&M phase of sanitation systems usually receives little or no attention unlike the design and construction phases. Particularly in developing countries and countries in transition, O&M of decentralised sanitation systems is neglected to a great extent. As a consequence, poor or non-functioning sanitation systems may pollute the environment and affect people's health. Without proper O&M, even well designed and constructed infrastructure breaks down relatively quickly.

Reasons for non-functioning O&M services

Reasons for non-functioning O&M services include lack of ownership or delegated responsibility for O&M, lack of skilled labour, high operating costs, excessive repair and replacement expenses. Additionally, the technical options chosen are not always the best suited to the local environment in which they shall be operated. Other reasons are closely related to the set-up of projects, which often focus only on construction of hardware instead of management components because hardware installations

¹ For more photos from this project which was funded by the EU, and the link to the SuSanA case study see: www.flickr.com/photos/qtzecosan/sets/72157625719409533/with/5364060126/

can be implemented faster and with fewer complications than management systems. Consultation with the local stakeholders and users regarding the most appropriate system for the local conditions often does not take place adequately.

In most cases where the provision of sanitation services have failed, the root causes have been poor management, lack of planning, and failure to generate sufficient revenue to operate and maintain systems (Bräustetter, 2007).

It is obvious that the efficient and effective management of the system is essential for its proper functioning (Oldenburg et al., 2009). It is therefore indispensable that O&M of sanitation systems is seen in a holistic conceptual framework in sanitation planning. Tasks and responsibilities have to be made very clear and divided among the involved stakeholders e.g. between the municipality, CBOs (community-based organisations), users and the private sector. Governments and external support agencies need to recognise the importance of integrating O&M components in all development phases of water supply and sanitation projects (Brikké and Bredero, 2003).

3 What is O&M?

O&M in general refers to all activities needed to operate, maintain and manage a sanitation system, including the collection, transport, treatment, reuse or final disposal of the different sanitation products (Tilley et al., 2008).

According to Sohail et al. (2001), *operation* refers to the daily activities of running and handling infrastructure. It involves the technical and service activities required to run the infrastructure, as well as the correct handling and usage of the facilities by users. In the sanitation context, operation additionally includes the planning, control and performance of the collection, treatment and disposal or reuse of the excreta or wastewater flows.

Maintenance on the other hand involves the activities required to sustain existing assets in a serviceable condition (WHO, 2000) and includes three types according to Brikké (2000):

- **Preventive maintenance:** Systematic routine actions needed to keep the installations and equipment in a condition that will ensure they can be operated satisfactorily, function efficiently and continuously, and last as long as possible at lowest cost.
- **Corrective maintenance:** This range of activities starts with minor repairs and replacements as dictated by the routine examinations up to corrections of serious damages and malfunctioning.
- **Crisis maintenance:** Maintenance which is undertaken only in response to breakdowns or public complaints.

Effective and efficient operation and maintenance requires clear organisation and financial management with explicit responsibilities.

4 Every technology needs O&M

All technologies require some form of O&M, no matter if they are low or high tech. It can generally be presumed that increased levels of complexity of a sanitation system will also increase the demand for O&M. For example, the addition of pumps and other technical devices will increase the need for regular skilled maintenance and parts replacement. However, the most important issue to keep in mind is that the whole sanitation system (Figure 2) needs to be taken into account. O&M must be considered at each functional step from the user interface to the final reuse or disposal of the sanitation products.




Figure 2: Representation of the five functional groups of a sanitation system. Each functional group requires O&M that must be planned for and linked to a clearly defined responsible party (source: J. Wijkmark, VERNA).

Planning for and implementing a functional O&M procedure requires consideration and examination of the technical and institutional needs of each step in the system. There are a variety of technologies that can be used for each functional group in the sanitation system and each of these technologies will have their own O&M requirements (Tilley et al., 2008). For example, at the collection stage a complex vacuum toilet system would need specific O&M that would differ in technical complexity from the emptying and servicing schedules for urine diversion dehydration toilets (UDDTs).

The responsibility for O&M of each functional item may be assigned to different stakeholders. For example, maintenance of the toilet (user interface) is often the responsibility of the household, while the treatment process is usually run by a municipal authority. Clear delineation of O&M tasks and responsibilities is critical for achieving a sustainable system.

Regardless of the technology chosen, achieving proper O&M depends on integrating its requirements in the processes of planning, designing, implementing and managing. Particular emphasis should be given to the coordination of the respective responsible stakeholders, such as government, private agencies and users. The selection of technical designs and supporting institutional structures must always be matched to local conditions, both with respect to technical and socio-economic feasibility, and the management capacities and willingness of users and service providers (IRC, 1997).

5 Funding of O&M

Sustainable O&M requires planning and budgeting to carry out the necessary tasks. Decisions on who should fund sanitation O&M and how, receives far less attention than design and construction activities (Sohail et al., 2001). Traditionally, municipalities and utilities are responsible for the O&M of centralised wastewater treatment systems but research in the 1990s in India and Thailand (IRC, 1997) has already pointed out that municipal budgets often fail to earmark funds for O&M of sanitation systems. Funds are thus rather spent on activities which are more visible than regular maintenance of existing infrastructure.

It is recommended to allocate a separate budget line in municipal budgets for routine O&M including funds for major replacements, upgrades and extensions. Sourcing this budget requires financial resources and clearly defined roles and responsibilities along the sanitation chain which should be defined from the planning stage onwards.

Funding for day-to-day operation and basic maintenance (i.e. hiring a caretaker) can be sustainably sourced through revenue generating activities, as shown in the examples in Section 7 of this factsheet. This can be either directly or indirectly associated with the sanitation service, but needs to be clearly defined prior to implementation. Examples in this factsheet include user fees, cost recovery through pit emptying and total service packages. Another example comes from the Aga Khan foundation in India which assists communities in establishing shared bank accounts where the community members deposit funds for O&M of shared infrastructure (AKPBSI, 2007).

However, crisis maintenance and large scale repairs may require substantial funding beyond day-to-day turnover and can place high demands on limited budgets. Funds are not always readily available for this, in which case, microfinance institutions may be used to enable access to credit.

6 Responsibilities for O&M

For a well working sanitation system it is important to clarify and agree on roles and responsibilities already during the planning stage. During planning and design, division of responsibilities and definition of tasks and accountability require ample consideration and agreement between stakeholders. Creating conditions in which responsibilities can be implemented as intended, may require awareness raising, motivation and incentives both for the agencies and the users (IRC, 1997).

Furthermore, there are more stakeholders in the sanitation system beyond the municipality. Small scale providers, communities and households also play an important role in O&M. The choice of the management model is influenced by several framework conditions like capacity of community organisations, community skills, capacity of the private sector, etc. (Brikké, 2000).

In larger towns a town-wide management system may be installed for the overall coordination. In Vienna (Austria) for

example, a municipal department is responsible for O&M of the sewer system while a holding company operates the central treatment plant through a mandate from the municipality. Decentralised systems on the other hand may have localised daily operations but should be monitored by higher level institutions. For example a school sanitation system may be managed by the school management but monitored by a national authority.

7 Development of service chains in practice

The following examples describe the set-up for O&M for some small-scale sanitation systems to demonstrate how O&M can be organised in different ways.

a) The Kalungu Girls Secondary School (Uganda)

The boarding school of the “Sacred Heart Sisters” is located near Kalungu, a small village in Southwest Uganda. Around 450 girls between 14 and 18 years are attending the school and about 50 teachers and sisters are employed. Further staff members are responsible for diverse housekeeping duties, like O&M of the sanitation system, gardening, animal keeping, etc. A detailed description of the system is available in a SuSanA case study (Müllegger et al., 2009).

The sanitation system of the school, which is in operation since 2003, consists of:

- 45 single vault urine diversion dehydration toilets (UDDTs) for the pupils,
- One UDDT for teachers and visitors,
- One drying shed for further dehydration and storage of faeces,
- One horizontal sub-surface flow constructed wetland for treatment of greywater and blackwater.

Responsibilities for O&M activities

O&M activities are entirely managed by the school. The school administration has employed a caretaker who is responsible for most of the O&M activities. Furthermore, students are fully involved in O&M. They are organised in groups which have different tasks such as cleaning the toilets, removing containers from the UDDT vaults and fertilising of plants. Teachers are responsible for training and awareness creation among pupils.



Figure 3: Drying shed for faecal matter from UDDTs at Kalungu School, Uganda. The caretaker has to take the containers with faeces from the UDDTs to this shed (source: EcoSan Club, 2009).

A detailed description of the O&M responsibilities for collection and storage, pre-treatment, transport, treatment and use are given by Müllegger and Freiberger (2010a).

Income generation

Since the sanitation system has been implemented, the school became famous for its innovative sanitation concept. Delegations from all over the country and from abroad, are coming to see the school toilets. The number of students increased to their maximum capacity from 350 to 450 over the last few years. Furthermore, the school administration even introduced a visitor's fee of 20 to 40 EUR, depending on the type of visiting delegation. This fee is used to maintain the sanitation system.

b) Lessons learnt from the ROSA project funded by the EU (East Africa)

Sanitation systems in which the products of the UDDTs can be treated and used on-site are the simplest examples of closed loop systems. However, in many cases, like densely populated areas, storage and reuse on site is not possible, therefore collection and transportation systems have to be implemented. Thus within the frame of the ROSA project (Langergraber et al., 2010) one focus of research was on O&M of resource-oriented sanitation systems (ROSA stands for "Resource-Oriented Sanitation concepts for peri-urban areas in Africa").

The main goal was to develop sustainable O&M management strategies for peri-urban areas. The following is a summary of the research results from Nakuru (Kenya) and Arba Minch (Ethiopia). More information on O&M research in ROSA is available in Müllegger and Freiberger (2010b) and also in the SuSanA case studies on the ROSA project.²

Willingness to pay

A baseline study carried out in Nakuru showed that 86% of the surveyed residents are interested to use UDDTs if they do not have to be responsible for O&M (Muchiri et al., 2010). This figure was later confirmed with further results showing that stakeholders - mainly landlords and owners of UDDTs - preferred to use a private operator and were willing to pay for this O&M service.

Collection and transport, involvement of the private sector

MEWAREMA (Menengai Waste Recyclers Management), a local CBO in Nakuru, is engaged in solid waste collection and composting. They used to offer services for collection, transportation and composting of faeces and urine for a fee of 1 to 3 EUR depending on the amount to be collected and distance of transport. This fee was per trip or per emptying event and was negotiated with the clients.

However, this excreta collection system is currently not in place anymore. Due to various reasons, MEWAREMA stopped offering sanitation services, which left toilet owners

not knowing what to do with the full containers in their single vault UDDTs. The follow-on project from ROSA (called CLARA and also EU funded) will attempt to improve the situation and will look for sustainable solutions to have at least a working emptying service in place.

In Arba Minch by 2010, the ROSA project team had constructed and supported seven Arborloos, 15 UDDTs, and 30 Fossa Alterna toilets for households. Two solid waste collection associations - the "Wubet le Arba Minch Solid Waste Collectors Association" and the "Engan New Mayet Compost Production Youth Association" - using donkey carts are engaged in transporting and treating human faeces and urine. About 50% of households that currently have a UDDT make use of the collection service. The users are paying 0.3 to 2 EUR per trip or emptying event, depending on the amount of urine produced and distance to the composting site. The main problem is the cost of the urine/faeces transportation by donkey carts. This is due to the large volumes of urine and the long distance to the composting site.

Treatment and reuse

In Nakuru the collected material was to be co-composted with organic solid waste at the dump site and afterwards sold to NAWACOM, an umbrella NGO for local CBOs involved in composting. They buy compost from local producers, further process the material, pack it and sell it as "Mazingira organic fertiliser" to farmers. However, NAWACOM has encountered problems in creating a market for organic fertiliser, moreover they refused to buy faecal co-compost due to hygiene reasons. Within the frame of the CLARA project it is planned to develop a concept for the co-composted material, for example working together with tree nurseries.

In Arba Minch the faeces, urine and organic solid waste is used for co-composting by the "Engan New Mayet Compost Production Youth Association". Since no local market existed at the start of the project, demonstration plots were installed to convince farmers to use faecal compost, and the compost was given to them for free. Since the beginning of 2010, co-compost is sold for 4-8 € per 100 kg. Prices depend on the client's ability to pay, whereby small scale farmers pay less. Compost, which is not sold, is used by the association for their own tree nursery and vegetable farm.

Financial considerations and up-scaling

The main challenge in involving private businesses is to make the business profitable. In Nakuru and Arba Minch, existing companies involved in solid waste transport have been involved in O&M services of sustainable sanitation systems. This reduced the financial risk for the companies compared to new companies exclusively offering services for e.g. UDDTs. Grambauer (2010) made a business plan for MEWAREMA in Nakuru and concluded that the emptying of UDDTs can only be profitable when a minimum number is exceeded. This number is dependent on the specific local boundary conditions and cannot be generalised.

² There are 12 case studies on the ROSA project in Kenya, Ethiopia, Uganda and Tanzania: www.susana.org/case-studies (enter "ROSA" into the search field). Three of these case studies are about installations in Nakuru: www.susana.org/library?search=nakuru



Figure 4: Sieved co-compost at the composting station of "Engan New Market Compost Production Youth Association" in Arba Minch, Ethiopia, ready to be used in the tree nursery or sold as organic soil conditioner (source: EcoSan Club, 2009).

c) The "Sanitation as a Business" program (Malawi)

The "Sanitation as a Business" program of Water For People, as described by Bramley and Breslin (2010) aims to combine the provision of new toilets with the introduction of O&M business for sanitation systems. The business concept starts with the household purchasing a "composting toilet" (Fossa Alterna or UDDTs) on loan from a sanitation entrepreneur. The entrepreneur constructs the toilet and afterwards collects the compost or dried faeces from the toilets. The household repays their loan with the compost. After the loan is repaid the household receives small, regular payments for the compost they produce.

The entrepreneur further treats the compost and finally sells it to farmers, thus creating an income. Since the main aim of the entrepreneur is selling the final product, i.e. the compost, he or she has to make sure that the toilets are producing their raw product in a good quality, i.e. that the households are using the toilets in the right way and that the toilets are properly maintained. The sanitation entrepreneur wants to attract large-scale compost buyers and thus needs to find new customers, i.e. build new toilets on a loan basis as described above.




Figure 5: The rural "Sanitation as a Business" model in Malawi (source: Bramley and Breslin, 2010).

d) Institutional management of condominal sewers, Brasilia, Brazil

Since 1993 the federal district of Brasilia (population of 2.1 million) has been implementing condominal sewerage systems as a low-cost means of achieving universal sanitation coverage. These simplified sewerage networks serve more than 650,000 people and have been built in the city of Brasilia, as well as the surrounding peri-urban neighbourhoods and satellite cities. The basic function of the condominal sewers is to collect mixed wastewater from homes and transport it to a centralised treatment plant. Household connection pipes are grouped into block sewers before they feed into street sewers which are then pumped to treatment plants. The system is cheaper than conventional sewerage since pipe sizes are smaller and sewer laterals are installed under sidewalks or yards instead of streets (Melo, 2006).

The initiative for construction and expansion of the condominal sewerage system came from the Brasilia Water and Sewerage Company (CAESB) with the strong support of the local authorities. CAESB is responsible for construction and maintenance of water and sewerage systems within the city, as well as the wastewater treatment plants. CAESB oversees all activities related to planning and implementation of the systems, including organising neighbourhood meetings and establishing an elected body of residents responsible for facilitating agreements and inspecting the works. Once the system is in place, responsibility for maintenance of the branch pipes is divided between the users and the utility.

Households are offered three alternatives for routing the branches of the condominal sewers: through the backyard, front yard or sidewalk. The backyard and front yard options are cheaper to construct, but also mean that responsibility for maintenance of that part of the system falls on the household. Users opting to assume maintenance responsibility of their connection receive a 40% discount on the standard user fees. The remainder of the network is the responsibility of the utility.

One inspection box was installed for each connection to the network which allowed for easy access for monitoring and removal of blockages. Comparison of the condominal and conventional sewerage networks in Brasilia found that there were fewer maintenance incidents per customer for the condominal system. It is speculated that this is because the condominal branches are less prone to obstruction or that users are better placed to resolve simple blockages on their own. Success of the condominal system in Brasilia is also due to the ability of the utility (CAESB) to make firm policy decisions and clearly communicate them to their customers.

e) Public toilet served by a privatised water utility in Naivasha, Kenya

The provision of public toilets at markets, bus stops and other public places in Kenya is under the responsibility of municipal councils and the corresponding Ministry of Local Government. The use of the toilets is usually free of charge. The quality of services is generally very poor and insufficient in terms of daily cleaning and maintenance, resulting in odour, dirty toilets, no repairs and broken water supply pipes.

One of the main reasons why municipal councils do not show any interest in these facilities is the lack of revenue produced by them. In response to this problem, the newly structured and reformed water sector with the Water Services Trust Fund has started to provide financial support for improved access to water and sanitation in areas without adequate services (Onyango and Rieck, 2010).

The Naivasha public toilet was financed by the Water Services Trust Fund is owned by the public Regional Water Services Boards and run by the local water services provider (privatised water utility). The utility has contracted a private operator to run and operate the toilet on a day-to-day basis. The public toilet consists of flush toilets connected to a biogas plant which discharges the pre-treated wastewater to a sewer.



Figure 6: Naivasha public toilet with water kiosk. In front is the water kiosk that functions as an operator room. Customers pay at the side window, where the two people are standing. Behind them the gents section of the toilet can be seen (source: C. Rieck, 2008)³.

The operator is obliged to pay for the water bill (a subsidised water tariff), sewer discharge fee, energy, rent and other expenses like toilet paper as well as minor repair works. The earnings and the expenditures made by the operator allow the employment of two permanent staff members to run the facility. At the same time the utility receives revenue through the water tariff, rent and a small amount of biogas sales which is sufficient for maintaining the facility.

Consequently this service model of shared responsibilities, with operation being carried out by private entrepreneurs and maintenance under the responsibility of utilities seems economically viable and promising in terms of good quality of service delivery.

f) Sustainable sanitation in Kyrgyzstan, Central Asia

In 2006, UDDT technology was introduced in Kyrgyzstan to establish starting conditions for nationwide introduction of sustainable sanitation in Kyrgyzstan (Jorritsma et al., 2009).

Since then, more than 100 individual UDDTs have been installed in different parts of the country. The methodology was as follows: (1) knowledge transfer and gathering of practical experience, (2) construction and monitoring of demonstration objects, and (3) creating publicity and tools for up-scaling. The projects focused on demonstrating, testing, and monitoring.

The barriers and level of acceptance were analysed two years after the start up. The following issues were identified to be crucial for the acceptance of UDDTs (Jorritsma et al., 2009):

- smell prevention is assured,
- persons who use the toilet were also involved in the construction of the toilet,
- all persons who use the toilet were trained to do so,
- number of vaults for storing faeces should be two,
- the higher the financial contribution of the UDDT owner, the higher the acceptance of the toilet, and
- UDDTs are favoured in areas with high groundwater tables.

Many critical issues related to O&M do not become apparent in the first few years of an implemented project but rather much later, sometimes after the project monitoring has stopped.

In some families in Kyrgyzstan, women were reluctant to embrace the new sanitation system because it requires regular cleaning. They had previously never cleaned their pit latrines – the need to clean the UDDT had to be well explained in awareness raising campaigns and trainings.

The handling of urine and faeces by the household for the application to plants provoked some scepticism. People were especially reluctant to apply the UDDT products to edible plants because of perceived health and hygiene risks. The local NGO could solve these problems by raising more awareness for the reuse aspects and by organising a farmer who was willing to take the toilet products.

Another success factor that was identified for O&M was that the Kyrgyz NGO KAWS worked together with existing community based water users unions (CDWUU) in each village and supported the introduction and up-scaling of sustainable sanitation from the beginning. CDWUU provides trained expert staff that helped people to construct their own toilet. Furthermore, CDWUU have a pump and offer the service to remove the urine from the tanks and apply it on the fields. They also offer the service to maintain the toilet facility.

The urine diversion seat most commonly used is made of concrete and must be re-painted from time to time. If there is a smell problem, the staff members from the CDWUUs are able to diagnose the root cause of the problem and solve it. For all these services, they require a small fee to cover their costs. Even poor people pay these fees to have a well maintained toilet. Some CDWUUs started recently to construct resource centres in the villages where they can even better support the construction and the O&M of the sanitation facilities.

³ For more photos of this project see: www.flickr.com/photos/qtzecosan/sets/72157623254082278/with/4918863019/



Figure 7: Cleaning a UDDT in a public cultural house in Stara Zagora, Bulgaria. Project was implemented by Earth Forever Foundation and WECF (source: WECF, M. Torres, 2008).

Such an institution which is accepted and recognised by the community and which assists with the O&M tasks ensures the long term success of sustainable sanitation.



Figure 8: Inspection of the faecal chambers of a UDDT school toilet block in Nizhyn, Ukraine, constructed by the local NGO Mama86 (source: WECF, C. Wendland, 2010).

8 Conclusion

The attention given to O&M of sanitation systems especially in developing and transition countries is usually little or no attention compared to the design and construction phases. The result of this is poor or non-functioning sanitation systems which pollute the environment and affect people's health. This situation has been attributed to several reasons which includes among others; lack of ownership and skilled labour, high maintenance cost, and unsuitable technical options due to lack of consultation with the local stakeholders and users.

It is therefore important that O&M of sanitation systems is considered holistically during sanitation planning, designing, implementing and managing with clearly laid down tasks and responsibilities divided among the stakeholders along

the whole sanitation chain. In doing this, it is equally important to allocate separate financial resources for routine O&M on sanitation systems. These financial resources must be explicitly determined from the planning stage and can be sustainably sourced through direct or indirect revenue generating activities.

9 References

- AKPBI (2007) Planning and Building Activities in India, AKPBI (Aga Khan Planning and Building Service in India), www.akdn.org/india_building.asp
- Bramley, S., Breslin, E. (2010) Sanitation as a Business: A new spin on the challenge of sanitation Operation and Maintenance. *Sustainable Sanitation Practice*, 4, pp. 10-14, www.susana.org/lang-en/library?view=ccbctypeitem&type=2&id=1040
- Braustetter, A. (2007) Operation and Maintenance of Resource-Oriented systems for peri-urban Areas. Diploma thesis, Fachhochschule Weihenstephan Abteilung Triesdorf, Fakultät Umweltsicherung, Triesdorf, Germany, www.susana.org/lang-en/library?view=ccbctypeitem&type=2&id=962
- Brikké, F. (2000) Operation and maintenance of rural water supply and sanitation systems: A training package for managers and planners: World Health Organization (WHO), Geneva, Switzerland. www.susana.org/lang-en/library?view=ccbctypeitem&type=2&id=231
- Brikké, F., Bredero, M. (2003) Linking technology choice with operation and maintenance in the context of community water supply and sanitation. A Reference Document for Planners and Project Staff. World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, <http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2003/9241562153.pdf>.
- Grambauer, F. (2010) Community-based, resources-oriented management of separated human waste in peri-urban areas in Nakuru, Kenya. *Sustainable Sanitation Practice*, 5, pp. 10-15, www.susana.org/lang-en/library?view=ccbctypeitem&type=2&id=1042
- Jorritsma, J., Fedtke, G., Ergünzel, A., (2009) Introducing Sustainable Sanitation in Kyrgyzstan. An analysis of success factors and barriers. Women in Europe for a Common Future (WECF), The Netherlands, Germany, France, www.susana.org/lang-en/library?view=ccbctypeitem&type=2&id=1140
- IRC (1997) Operation and Maintenance of Sanitation Systems in Urban Low-Income Areas in India and Thailand. Report on a joint research programme, 1989 – 1993. IRC, Delft, the Netherlands, www.irc.nl/page/1871
- Langergraber, G., Lechner, M., Müllegger, E. (eds., 2010) The ROSA project. *Sustainable Sanitation Practice*, 4, www.susana.org/lang-en/library?view=ccbctypeitem&type=2&id=1040
- Melo, J. C. (2006) The Experience of Condominial Water and Sewerage Systems in Brazil: Case Studies from Brasilia, Salvador and Parauapebas. Water and Sanitation Program Latin America, Lima, Peru, <http://water.worldbank.org/water/publications/experience-condominial-water-and-sewerage-systems-brazil-case-studies-brasilia-salvador>

- Muchiri, E., Mutua, B., Müllegger, E. (2010) Private sector involvement in operating sanitation systems with urine diversion dry toilets in Nakuru, Kenya. *Sustainable Sanitation Practice*, **2**, pp. 21-25, www.susana.org/lang-en/library?view=ccbktpeitem&type=2&id=1045
- Müllegger, E., Freiberger, E. (2010a) Operation and maintenance of sanitation systems in two public institutions: Experiences from Uganda. *Sustainable Sanitation Practice*, **2**, pp. 15-20, www.susana.org/lang-en/library?view=ccbktpeitem&type=2&id=1045
- Müllegger, E., Freiberger, E. (2010b) The importance of operation and maintenance – Lessons learnt from the ROSA project. *Sustainable Sanitation Practice*, **4**, pp. 21-25, www.susana.org/lang-en/library?view=ccbktpeitem&type=2&id=1040
- Müllegger, E., Schlick, J., Werner, C. (2009) UDD toilets at a rural secondary school Kalungu, Uganda - Case study of sustainable sanitation projects, Sustainable Sanitation Alliance (SuSanA), www.susana.org/lang-en/library?view=ccbktpeitem&type=2&id=141
- Oldenburg, M., Ayele, W., Hartmuth, N. (2009) Urine Diverting Dry (UDD) Toilet at Adama University. Part I – Concept, Design, Operation and Maintenance & Construction of the Demonstration Project. University capacity building program, Ethiopia and GTZ, Germany. www.susana.org/lang-en/library?view=ccbktpeitem&type=2&id=725
- Onyango, P., Rieck, C. (2010). Public toilet with biogas plant and water kiosk Naivasha, Kenya - Case study of sustainable sanitation projects. Sustainable Sanitation Alliance (SuSanA), www.susana.org/lang-en/case-studies?view=ccbktpeitem&type=2&id=131
- Richert S. A., Jönsson, H., Schöning, C., Hinkkanen, K., Kvarnström, E., Ganrot, Z., Samwel, M., Gabizon, S., Mohr, A. (2007) Urine diverting toilets in climates with cold winters. Technical considerations and the reuse of nutrients with a focus on legal and hygienic aspects. Women in Europe for a Common Future (WECF), The Netherlands, Germany, France, www.susana.org/lang-en/library?view=ccbktpeitem&type=2&id=807
- Sohail, M., Cavill, S., Cotton, A. P. (2001) Operation, maintenance and sustainability of services for the urban poor: Findings, lessons learned and case studies summary and analysis. WEDC, Loughborough University, UK. <http://wedc.lboro.ac.uk/knowledge/bookshop.html>
- Tilley, E., Lüthi, C., Morel, A., Zurbrügg, C., Schertenleib, R. (2008) Compendium of Sanitation Systems and Technologies. Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology (EAWAG), Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC), Duebendorf, Switzerland, www.susana.org/lang-en/library?view=ccbktpeitem&type=2&id=454
- WHO (2000) Tools for assessing the O&M status of water supply and sanitation in developing countries. World Health Organization. Geneva, Switzerland, www.who.int/entity/water_sanitation_health/hygiene/om/ToolsAssess.pdf.

Authors and contributors

Main authors:

- Elke Müllegger, EcoSan Club, Austria (elke.muellegger@ecosan.at)
- Elisabeth Freiberger, EcoSan Club, Austria (elisabeth.freiberger@ecosan.at)
- Jennifer McConville formerly SEI, Sweden (jennifer.mcconville@cit.chalmers.se)
- Margriet Samwel, WECF, Germany (margriet.samwel@wecf.eu)
- Christian Rieck, GIZ, Germany (christian.riek@giz.de)
- Pippa Scott, formerly WEDC, UK (pippa.scott@gmail.com)
- Günter Langergraber, University for Natural Resources and Life Sciences (BOKU University), Austria (guenter.langergraber@boku.ac.at)

Acknowledgements are given to the following persons for their valuable contributions:

Jonathan Parkinson (IWA, UK), Elisabeth von Münch (GIZ, Germany).

For questions or comments please contact the SuSanA secretariat at info@susana.org or susana@giz.de. We invite you to join the SuSanA discussion forum: www.forum.susana.org. This document is available at www.susana.org.

© All SuSanA materials are freely available following the open source concept for capacity development and non-profit use, as long as proper acknowledgement of the source is made when used. Users should always give credit in citations to the original author, source and copyright holder.