

Baseline Study on WASH for Community Development in Banglabazar, Gazipur



Prepared by

Golam Mahiyuddin
Manzuma Ahsan, Faisal M. Ahamed,
Md. Abdus Sobhan, Nurunnahar



Human Development Research Centre

www.hdrc-bd.com

Study undertaken for



Dhaka: 21 May, 2017

Baseline Study on WASH for Community Development in Banglabazar, Gazipur



Prepared by

Golam Mahiyuddin^{1>}
Manzuma Ahsan^{2>}, Faisal M. Ahamed^{2>}
Md. Abdus Sobhan^{3>}, Nurunnahar^{3>}



Human Development Research Centre

www.hdrc-bd.com

Study undertaken for



Dhaka: 21 May, 2017

¹Team Leader, and Senior Consultant, Human Development Research Centre (HDRC)

²Consultant, Human Development Research Centre (HDRC)

³Research Associate, Human Development Research Centre (HDRC)

SUMMARY TABLE OF KEY FINDINGS

Topic	Indicator	Value in %	N
WASH at Household Level			
Water Supply	Access to improved drinking water facilities	69.8	225
	Water facilities with broken or no platform and loose base	30.2	225
	Household with access to bacteria (Coliform) free drinking water source [TC(< 10CFU)/100ml]	88.5	96
	Household with access to free of excess amount iron in drinking water (Fe < 1 mg/L)	100.0	96
	Household with access to free of excess amount arsenic in drinking water (As < 0.05 mg/L)	100.0	96
	HHs with access to safe source of drinking water facilities	88.5	96
	HHs with effective use of WSP	7.1	225
	Sanitation	Access to improved (not shared) sanitation facilities	27.6
Access to shared latrine otherwise improved		50.7	225
Cleanliness of latrine		53.8	225
HHs with hand washing place with water at or near the latrine		87.1	225
Hand-washing place with soap and water near to latrine		57.7	196
Hand-washing place with water near to Kitchen		80.0	225
Knowledge of hand-washing at critical times			225
Before taking food		87.7	
Before preparation/cooking of food		48.9	
After using latrine		98.7	
After cleaning baby's bottom		30.2	
Before feeding baby		15.6	
Before serving food	11.6		
Practice of hand-washing at critical times		225	
Before taking food	69.8		
Before preparation/cooking of food	37.8		
After using latrine	96.9		
After cleaning baby's bottom	12.4		
Before feeding baby	4.0		
Before serving food	0.9		

Topic	Indicator	Value in %	N		
Topic Menstrual management	Safe disposal of child's faeces into improved latrine	78.0	444		
	Indicator	Value in %	N		
	Knowledge on appropriate material to be used during the period	Rag of clothes	57.8	225	
		Sanitary napkin	26.7		
		Others	2.2		
		Menstruation sopped	13.3		
	Material commonly used during the period	Rag	72.8	195	
		Sanitary napkin	23.6		
	Waste disposal	Disposal of sanitary pad	Waste basket	17.6	51
			Drain	23.5	
Latrine			13.7		
Buried			13.7		
Pit/hole			31.4		
Availability of place of disposal at work place		85.2	115		
Waste disposal	Disposal of solid waste	Specific place	15.1	225	
		Randomly around	4.9		
		In the open field	4.4		
		Taken by private sweeper	4.9		
		Ditch/drain /canal	9.3		
		In a specific pit with or without lid	60.9		
Disposal for faecal sludge/liquid waste	Canal/bill/marshy land	83.6	225		
	Pit/hole/soakage pit	16.4			
WASH Situation at Schools					
Water supply	Access to improved drinking water facilities	33.3	15		
	Water facilities with broken platform	44.4	9		
	School with access to bacteria (Coliform) free drinking water [TC(0CFU)/100ml]	73.3	15		
	School with access to free of excess amount iron in drinking water (Fe < 1 mg/L)	100.0	15		
	School with access to free of excess amount arsenic in drinking water (As < 0.05 mg/L)	100.0	15		
	Distance of drinking water source from the latrine	Less than 30 ft	66.7	9	
Sanitation	Access to improved sanitation facilities	26.7	15		
	Clean latrine	73.3	15		

Topic	Indicator	Value in %	N	
Hygiene	School having hand-washing facility	86.7	15	
	Hand-washing facility with soap and water	46.2	13	
	Distance of hand-washing place from latrine Less than 10 steps	66.7	15	
	Observed practice of washing both hands with soap and water after using latrine	Boy	9.9	161
		Girl	9.9	191
	Observed practice of washing both hands with soap and water before taking food	Boy	13.0	161
		Girl	3.1	159
Environment	Cleanliness of the class room	93.3	15	
	Cleanliness of the school premises	73.3	15	
WASH Situation at Community Clinics				
Water supply	Access to improved drinking water facility	0.0	2	
	Distance of drinking water source from the latrine	<30ft	NA	
Sanitation	Access to improved/sanitary sanitation facilities	1	2	
	Clean of the latrine	1	2	
	Separate latrine for	Staff	No	2
		Male patients	No	
Female patients		No		
Hygiene	Hand-washing facility with soap and water for	Staff	No	
		Male patients	No	
		Female patients	No	
Waste management	Mode of solid/medical waste management	Burning	2	

Acknowledgements

WaterAid, is working in Bangladesh for improving access of the poor and marginalised population to safe drinking water, sanitation and hygiene since 1986. Recently, WaterAid Bangladesh together with other development partners and Universities have selected Banglabazar to address the dire WASH situation of the area.

We express our deep gratitude to the relevant officials of WaterAid, Bangladesh for entrusting Human Development Research Centre (HDRC) to carry out this important survey to measure WASH situation in the project areas.

We owe our profound gratitude to Dr. Md. Khairul Islam, Country Director of WAB for his very timely decision about the urgency to conduct the assessment WASH situation of poor and marginalised population in Banglabazar, Gazipur study and for his unstinted support extended throughout the study.

We are true grateful particularly to Mr. Aftab Opel, Head of Programme, Ms. Amina Mahbub, Manager, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Mr. Md. Muktadirul Islam Khan, Programme, Officer, WaterAid for their valuable inputs at different stages of this Study, including finalization of methodology and data collection instruments and strategic guidance. We are also thankful to Mr. Sanjoy Mukherjee, Programme Manager-Urban, WaterAid for ensuring support from partner side.

We gratefully acknowledge the cooperation from Gazipur City Corporation officials, and Ward Commissioner of Ward 22, Beat Officer, Forest Department Gazipur, Aslam Khan, Project manager, DSK for supporting during field data collection and providing us with required information. We are overly indebted to the respondents who have allowed us to interview them and provided support through their time and cooperation during the process of data collection. We are grateful to FGD participants as well who provided us with lot of valuable information during the process of interview.

We are thankful to the field team members of HDRC for their commendable work done with utmost sincerity in study areas.

We also acknowledge all the in-house staff of HDRC whose constant support and sincere efforts helped compilation of scattered and raw data and information into a research in order to deliver this report.

Should the analysis presented in the study be useful in understanding not only a particular water, sanitation and hygiene project led by WaterAid in Bangladesh, but also the multidimensional and complex real life issues of water, sanitation and hygiene in a newer horizon, our efforts put in the study would be considered worthwhile.

Golam Mahiyuddin,

Manzuma Ahsan, Faisal M. Ahamed, Md. Abdus Sobhan, Nurunnahar

Dhaka: April, 2017

ACRONYMS

DTW	Deep Tube-well
GCC	Gazipur City Corporation
HDRC	Human Development Research centre
HH	Household
JMP	Joint Monitoring Programme
KII	Key Informant Interview
LGI	Local Government Institution
MHM	Menstrual Hygiene Management
NGO	Non Government Organization
PSU	Primary Sampling Unit
STW	Shallow Tube-well
SWM	Solid Waste Management
TTC	Thermotolerant Coliform
UNDP	United Nation Development Programme
WASH	Water Sanitation and Hygiene
WSP	Water Safety Plan

CONTENTS

Sl. No.	Title	Page #
	<i>Summary Table of Key Findings</i>	
	<i>Acknowledgements</i>	
	<i>Acronyms</i>	
	Executive Summary	i-iv
	CHAPTER-1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Background	1
1.2	Project Overview	2
1.3	Study Objective	2
1.4	Organization of the Report	3
	CHAPTER-2: METHODOLOGY	4
2.1	Study Methodology.....	4
2.1.1	Quantitative Survey Design for HH survey	4
2.1.2	Sample Size for Quantitative Survey	4
2.1.3	School Survey	5
2.1.4	Community Clinics Survey.....	5
2.1.5	Survey for Water Quality Testing.....	5
2.1.6	Qualitative Data Collection.....	5
2.2	Document Reviewing.....	6
2.3	Summary of survey	6
2.4	Key Indicators against the Study Objectives	6
2.5	Water Quality Testing.....	8
	CHAPTER-3: BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS	10
3.1	Background Characteristics of the Respondents.....	10
3.1.1	Education	10
3.1.2	Marital status	10
3.1.3	Housing characteristics	10
3.1.4	Living condition and entertainment	10
3.1.5	Monthly household income.....	11
3.1.6	Monthly household expenditure	11
3.1.7	Savings	11
	CHAPTER-4: SITUATION OF WATER FACILITIES	12
4.1	Introduction	12
4.2	Situation of Water Supply.....	12
4.3	Sources of Drinking Water	12
4.4	Sources of Water for Other Domestic Need	12
4.5	Availability of Water	13
4.6	Availability of Water and Gazipur City Corporation.....	14
4.7	Condition of the Water Source	14
4.8	Time Spend To Collect Water	15
4.9	Distance of Water Point from Dwelling House	15
4.10	Access to Drinking Water	15
4.11	Adequacy of Water	16
4.12	Ownership of the Water Source.....	16
4.13	Cost for Water Use and Repair of Water Source	16
4.14	Water Safety Plan	16
4.15	Physical, Chemical and Microbiological Quality of Drinking Water.....	17
4.15.1	Perception and status of physical quality.....	17
4.15.2	Status of chemical quality.....	18
4.15.3	Status Microbiological quality in drinking water.....	18
4.16	Collection of Water and Household Treatment of Drinking Water	19

Sl. No.	Title	Page #
CHAPTER-5: SITUATION OF SANITATION FACILITIES		20
5.1	Introduction	20
5.2	Type of Latrine Used	20
5.3	Status of Sanitation Facility	20
5.4	Sharing of Latrine	21
5.5	Ownership of Latrine	21
5.6	Cost for Use and Maintenance of Latrine	22
5.7	Year Round Access to Latrine	22
5.8	Cleanliness of Latrine	24
5.9	Distance of Latrine from Household: Safety and security	24
5.10	Access to Improve Sanitation	24
CHAPTER-6: SITUATION OF HYGINE: KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICE		25
6.1	Hand-Washing Place	25
6.2	Hand-Washing Practice after Use of Latrine	25
6.3	Self Reported Knowledge and Practice of Hand-Washing at Critical Times	25
6.4	Disposal of Child Faeces	26
6.5	Awareness About Materials is Likely Use to Protect Menstrual Flow	27
6.6	Practice of Menstrual Management	27
6.7	Washing, Drying and Storing of Reusable Absorbent Material	27
6.8	Disposal of Sanitary Pad/Napkin	28
6.9	Personal Cleaning and Changing	29
6.10	Status of Waste Disposal	29
6.11	Capacity of LGI/WASH Service Providers and Duty Barriers	31
6.12	Role of Forest Department Environmental Development in Banglabazar Area	31
CHAPTER-7: SITUATION OF WASH in SCHOOLS		32
7.1	Introduction	32
7.2	Source of Water Supply	32
7.2.1	Type of water facility	33
7.2.2	Status of platform and cleanliness around the water source	33
7.2.3	Access to drinking water source	34
7.3	Chemical and Microbiological Quality of Water	34
7.3.1	Physical quality of drinking water	34
7.3.2	Status of Arsenic and Iron level in drinking water	34
7.3.3	Status of pathogenic bacteria in drinking water	35
7.4	Distance of Water Source from the Latrine	35
7.5	Status of Sanitation Facilities	35
7.6	Access to Sanitation Facility	36
7.6.1	Distance of latrine from school building and safety and privacy	36
7.6.2	Distance of hand-washing place from the latrine and availability of soap	37
7.7	Hygiene: Knowledge and practice	37
7.8	Status of Cleanliness	38
7.9	Disposal of Solid Waste and Storm Water	38
CHAPTER-8: SITUATION OF WASH IN COMMUNITY CLINIC		39
8.1	Introduction	39
8.2	Source of Water Supply	39
8.2.1	Water quality of the neighbourhood water source	39
8.2.2	Distance of water source from the latrine and hand washing place	39
8.3	Status of Sanitation Facilities	40
8.3.1	Distance of latrine: Safety and privacy	40
8.4	Status of Cleanliness of the Clinics	40
CHAPTER-9: Recommendations		41

List of Tables

Table 2.1:	Sample size of random households	5
Table 2.2:	Key indicators.....	6
Table 3.1:	Percentage distribution of households by average monthly income (in Taka).....	11
Table 3.2:	Percentage distribution of households by average monthly expenditure (in Taka).....	11
Table 4.1:	Percentage distribution of HHs by main source of drinking water	12
Table 4.2:	Percentage distribution of households by availability of water from the water facility throughout the year.....	13
Table 4.3:	Percentage distribution of households with access or effective coverage to drinking water	15
Table 4.4:	Percentage distribution of the respondents by practicing of WSP	17
Table 4.5:	Percentage distribution of households by effective practice of WSP.....	17
Table 4.6:	Percentage distribution of respondents by quality of drinking water	17
Table 4.7:	Percentage distribution of household by level of arsenic and iron in the stored sources of drinking water.....	18
Table 4.8:	Percentage distribution of household by TC (CFU) in drinking water	19
Table 4.9:	Percentage distribution of households by microbiological quality TC (< 10CFU/ 100 ml) of stored drinking water	19
Table 5.1:	Percentage distribution of households by access to type of latrine	20
Table 5.2:	Percentage distribution of HHs by number HHs share the latrine	21
Table 5.3:	Percentage distribution of households of the respondents by cost of maintenance of latrine and sharing of maintenance cost	22
Table 5.4:	Percentage distribution of households by duration of inability to use latrine	22
Table 5.5:	Percentage distribution of respondents by status of having problem in using latrine and type of problems	23
Table 5.6:	Percentage distribution of HHs by status of cleanliness of latrine	24
Table 5.7:	Percentage of households by access to improved sanitation	24
Table 6.1:	Percentage distribution of households by hand-washing place	25
Table 6.2:	Percentage distribution of respondents by washing-hands practices after defecation.....	25
Table 6.3:	Proportion test for knowledge and practice on hand-washing at critical times and sharing of maintenance cost	26
Table 6.4:	Percentage distribution of HHs by place of disposal of child faeces	26
Table 6.5:	Percentage distribution of the respondents by practice of cleaning material in case of reuse of rag [cloth] as absorbent material during the period.....	27
Table 6.6:	Percentage distribution of the respondents by place of drying washed rag [cloth] after cleaning during the period.....	28
Table 6.7:	Percentage distribution of the respondents by place of storage of washed rag [cloth] before reuse	28
Table 6.8:	Percentage distribution of the respondents by place of disposal of absorbent material during the period	29
Table 7.1:	Distribution of schools by observation of individual and overall key WASH situation ..	32
Table 7.2:	Percentage distribution of school by availability of own sources of drinking water.....	33
Table 7.3:	Percentage distribution of school by type of source of drinking water	33
Table 7.4:	Percentage distribution of school by status of having platform if the source of water is tube well	34
Table 7.5:	Percentage distribution of school by access to drinking water source	34
Table 7.6:	Percentage distribution of the surveyed school by Arsenic and Iron level in drinking water	34
Table 7.7:	Percentage distribution of surveyed school by Total Coliform (TC) level of drinking water	35
Table 7.8:	Percentage distribution of school by distance of drinking water sources from latrine in feet	35

Table 7.9: Average number of students per latrine/urinal for students 36
Table 7.10: Percentage distribution of schools by access to sanitation facility..... 36

Sl. No.	Title	Page #
Table 7.11:	Percentage distribution of school by place of hand-washing with soap	37
Table 7.12:	Percentage of students by their observed hand-washing practices after using latrine and before taking food	37
Table 8.1:	Percentage distribution of the surveyed alternate neighbourhood source of the community clinic by Arsenic, Iron, and bacteria level in drinking water	39
Table 8.2:	Percentage distribution of community clinic by distance of alternate (neighbourhood) drinking water sources from neighborhood latrine in feet	39

List of Figures

Figure 4.1:	Distribution of source of drinking water by status of platform around base of water sources	14
Figure 4.2:	Distribution household by average time required to collect drinking water (in%)	15
Figure 4.3:	Distribution of households by sharing of main drinking water point (in %)	16
Figure 5.1:	Distribution of by access to sanitation facilities (in %).....	21
Figure 5.2:	Distribution of HHs by ownership of the latrine (in %).....	21
Figure 6.1:	Distribution of respondents by practice materials during period (in %).....	27

Annexure

Annex 1:	Survey Based Data Tables	43-70
Annex 2:	Data Collection Instruments (DCIs).....	71-99
Annex 3:	DPHE Zonal Laboratory, Tongi Water Test Report of Human Development Research Centre (HDRC)	100-102
Annex 4:	WaterAid: Name of the Schools and Madrashes	103-104
Annex 5:	Name of the Key Informants.....	105-106
Annex 5:	Members of the Study Team	107-108

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background: Banglabazar is one of the nine wards in Gazipur City town, a growing industrial area on the outskirts of Dhaka City where the number of slums and low income settlements are increasing as a result of growing number of factories. It has a population of more than 100,000. Living conditions in Banglabazar is poor, not least in relation to water and sanitation and hygiene (WASH). Overall environmental sanitation (waste management, faecal sludge management, drainage, public sanitation facilities) is dire or almost non-existent. Hygiene practices are also very poor. WaterAid Bangladesh together with H&M Bangladesh, Mohammadi Group (owner of factories supplying H&M), UN Women, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Solidarity centre, Warwick University and Dhaka University have selected Banglabazar to address the dire WASH situation in Banglabazar community. The selection is based on its manageable size, strong industrial growth, and harsh living conditions for the rapidly increasing number of residents.

Objectives: The broad objective is to understand and analyse present WASH situation of Banglabazar. The specific objectives are to – (i) know the proportion of households have access to safe drinking water facilities, (ii) find out the level of Thermotolerant Coliform (TTC), Iron and Arsenic in the water of the facilities, (iii) know the proportion of households have access to improved sanitation facilities, (iv) understand the proportion of households are practicing water safety plan (WSP) (v) know proportion of households have hand-washing facilities with soap and water near the latrine and kitchen, (vi) measure knowledge and practice of the target population regarding hand-washing at critical times, (vii) know proportion of households dispose faeces of under five children safely, (viii) measure the knowledge and practice of the female of reproductive age about Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM), (ix) understand the Solid Waste Management (SWM)⁴ practices of HHs and communities (x) know the present situation of faecal sludge management in the project target area, (xi) assess the WASH situation of 2 Community Clinics in the project targeted area, (xii) analyze WASH situation at 15 schools in the project targeted area, and (xiii) understand present capacity of LGI, WASH service providers and duty bearers to deliver WASH service effectively.

Methodology: The study design is a combination of quantitative and qualitative techniques. Data were primarily collected through individual interviews at household level for quantitative survey. Qualitative techniques were four focus group discussions (FGD), and eight key informant interviews (KII), check lists for fifteen schools and two community clinics survey. In addition water samples were collected from selected water sources and corresponding households in community and water source from all surveyed schools and community clinics to understand the level of Total Thermotolerant Coliform (TTC), Iron and Arsenic.

In the project area, targeted 2,500 households were listed using a household listing format. The households were then segmented into a group of 100 HHs yielded a total of 25 segments/clusters. These clusters were considered as Primary sampling Units (PSU) or cluster. From each selected cluster, 9 households (Total 225) were selected following systematic random sampling using household list prepared prior to survey.

Key findings

Background characteristics: Some 31.1 percent of respondents is either illiterate or has non-formal education. A 12.5 percent respondents is primary passed and 14.7 percent has passed SSC or higher. Reportedly, 92.9 percent is currently married. A 52 percent of surveyed households are made of brick and cement with tin on roof and 41.8 percent is made of tin exclusively. Some 47.1 percent respondents live in own houses and others in rented houses. Almost all households are connected to electricity and 62.7% has TV, that mostly watch “STAR Jalsha” channel and enjoy Indian bangle drama/serial accounts 84.4 and 85.8 percent respectively. Half of the respondents use mobile phone, 15.8 percent of those are smart phone. Average monthly income and expenditure of the households are Tk. 18,244 and 17,530, where 60.4 percent can save portion of their income.

Water supply facilities: All (100%) of the surveyed households use improved source of water for drinking as well as for other domestic use. However, 30.2 percent of the tube-wells either have no platform or broken platform or weak/loose at base, which are at risk to contaminate the source water. Access of the households to improved source of drinking water 69.8 percent. The most (96%) pronounced source is shallow tube-well without marking. Water sources are largely (61.3%) owned by landlords and shared with other households.

Access to safe water: Water sample of 11 randomly selected water sources demonstrates that none of the households are likely to collect water from these 11 sources, and are exposed to excess amount of arsenic and/or iron. However out of 11 water sources water sample 2 sources were found microbiologically contaminated, thus 11 households of 96 beneficiary are exposed 2 contaminated water sources reportedly fails to meet WAB standard of coliform (CFU < 10/100 ml of water) and is microbiologically contaminated water.

Water safety plan (WSP): Considering indicators of WSP as container is cleaned with drinking water before collection of water for drinking, lid of the container is in place while transportation to home, the water is stored at home in a clean and covered container and rest the container in a little elevated place, and finger or part of the hand is not dipped into water while drinking and serving the water. Thus estimated percentage of households with effective practice of WSP is 7.1.

Adequacy of water: All (100%) households of the surveyed respondents have access to adequate (≥ 20 liters per person per day) amount of water to meet their different domestic basic need like drinking, cooking and cleaning up, maintaining personal hygiene, and washing clothes.

Time spend for water collection: Average time taken for water collection (travel and queue) is 2.6 minutes. In 43.1 percent households, water point is either inside the dwelling, yard or plot. Another 41.8 percent households takes less than 5 minutes to collect water. It is less than 10 minutes to others.

Hand washing place: In 87.1 percent households, water is found in hand washing place at or near the latrine and in 80 percent of hand-washing place at or near to kitchen. Among the households having hand-washing place, soap at or near the hand-washing place for latrine and kitchen is observed in 57.7 and 80 percent households respectively.

Hand-washing at critical times: The most widely known critical times of hand washing are after using latrine (98.7%) and before taking food (87.6 %); and to some extent after cleaning baby's bottom (48.9%). On the other, reported common practice of hand-washing are 96.9 percent after use of latrine and 69.8 percent before taking food. Reportedly, 89.9 percent of the respondents wash their hands with soap and water after use of latrine.

Disposal of child faeces: Percentage of households likely to dispose child faeces safely into improved latrine is 78.

Menstrual hygiene management (MHM): The most familiar absorbent material during menstruation known to the respondents is re-usable rag (57.8%), followed by sanitary pad/napkin (26.7%). However, 72.8 percent of the respondents uses rag and sanitary napkin/pad by 23.6 percent. Among rag users, 98.7 percent wash the rag with soap and water before the next use. Some 42.9 percent dry the washed rag under sun by placing beneath a cloth, others do it in a hidden place inside room. Napkin users dispose of the pad indiscriminately into drain, waste basket/bin, pit/ditch and latrine.

Sanitation facilities: Overall, 78.3 percent households uses sanitary means of excreta disposal. However, 50.7 percent households shares the latrine with two or more households. Thus adjusted percentage of households using improved (not shared) sanitation facility is 27.6 percent.

Access to sanitation facility: A 14.7 percent households cannot use latrine during rainy season due to water logging. Household having access to improved sanitation has been estimated as 66.2 percent.

User friendliness of latrine: Latrines are not user-friendly to 32.9 percent households because of dirty/filthy condition. Males and females have to stand in queue together at the same line and get little time to complete the task due to overcrowding.

Disposal of solid waste: Largely (60.9%), households dump the solid waste into ditch/marshy land. Nevertheless, 15.1 percent households dispose of the solid household waste in a specific place and in 4.9 households, waste are removed by locally paid carrier.

Liquid waste is usually drained out indiscriminately to surrounding land and canal/marshy land (83.6%). Few (13.8%) drains the household liquid waste to a nearby pit.

Capacity of LGI/WASH service providers and duty bearers:

As regard to capacity of delivering WASH services, at present GCC is experiencing challenges in solid waste management, water supply, water logging due to lack or absence of proper drainage system, land crisis for dumping solid waste, and inadequate fund. For the first time GCC has proposed Taka 1,00.00 lakh for 100% Sanitation Programme in its annual budget for Year of 2016-2017. Therefore, GCC is not in a capacity to extend the WASH services to a new area other than Tongi and Gazipur proper. According to them it will take time to initiate WASH services in Banglabazar.

WASH in school: Physically 33.3 percent of the surveyed schools has own improved source of drinking water within the school premises. However, 28.6% platform of the water source in 4 out of 14 are broken and potentially at risk for source water contamination. Shallow tube-well

is the most widely observed source. Regarding access to safe drinking water source, tested water source of all the surveyed schools is devoid of excess level of arsenic and iron. However, water source of 5 (26.7%) schools are contaminated with coliform group of microorganism. Distance between the water source and latrine is less than 30 feet in 66.7 percent of the schools having own water supply source. Among the surveyed schools, 99.3 percent of the schools have latrine for the students within their campus and improved in nature. On average there is one functional latrine and/or urinal for 99 students in the surveyed schools against the national standard of 50-60 students for one latrine or urinal. In 86.7 percent schools, hand-washing place is less than 10 steps from the latrine and soap was observed in 46.2 percent of hand-washing places. Regardless one or both hands, direct observation reveals that 23 percent boy and 33.5 percent girl washes their hands with soap and water after use of latrine. Corresponding figures are 21.1 percent and 13.2 percent for the boys and girls before taking food. Except one, class room of the other surveyed schools is found neat and tidy. Solid waste, largely rubbish, is usually disposed of beside the schools or nearby pit/ditch. Most of the schools have no formal drainage system.

WASH in community clinics

None of the observed community clinics (CCs) have functional source of water supply. Both the clinics use neighborhood water source. There is an improved functional latrine in one community clinic but not in use due lack of water. In other community clinic none of the latrines are suitable for defecation as one is found blocked and exit pipe other latrine found ruptured.. Irrespective of staff and patients, no hand-washing place is seen with water and soap. At both clinics, medical waste is disposed of incinerator. None of the community clinics have formal drainage system to pass the storm water from the courtyard.