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The survey process began with inception meetings where awareness of the impending consumer perception survey was initiated to bring on board the communities, the service providers as well as the local leaders. While collecting data, both quantitative and qualitative research methods were employed and 801 household questionnaires were pretested and finally administered. The process of data collection involved conducting interviews, focus group discussions and observation. The questionnaires were coded and entered into an interface designed with Ms Access. The data was then analysed using SPSS and presented in this CRC. The sharing and dissemination of this report card is one way of amplifying the citizens’ voices for action in water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) service delivery.

Only about half the population of Uganda’s towns and cities has access to drinking water and a mere 8% are connected to the sewerage system. Particularly, the poorer residents of the rapidly expanding urban peripheries have inadequate access to clean and reliable drinking water as well as sanitation services. This is mainly as a result of ageing infrastructure, inability of poorer citizens to pay for the services, high rate of population growth, inadequate institutional and regulatory capacities, poor management skills and the impacts of climate change.

Water supply services management in the Urban councils is a shared responsibility of large towns managed by NWSC and small towns managed by Town and Municipal councils as water authorities.

MWE coordinates the construction and management of piped water supply and public sewerage and sanitation systems for domestic, industrial and commercial uses in small towns, large towns and cities in Uganda. NWSC currently operates piped water supplies in 23 areas covering Kampala Capital City and many others. The management of water supply services in small towns is through performance contracts between MWE, Water supply and Sewerage Boards that are responsible for a gazetted water supply and sewerage area.

Urban sanitation is governed by the Public health Act, 2000 which is reinforced by the environmental health policy of 2005. Provision of urban sanitation is highly fragmented, often with unclear responsibilities between the District Local Government and Urban Council. In small towns and rural growth centres, the MWE mandate is on public sanitation facilities and most people in urban areas depend on – site sanitation.

Sanitation development in these areas is hampered by multiple land tenure system with many tenants not having a right to the land and therefore not able to construct permanent facilities. Further more, there is no comprehensive national urban policy and the institutional frame work to regulate and support urban development is weak. The present legal framework under the public Health Act (2000) does not allow pit latrines in Urban areas making sanitation in small towns with lack of urban planning a major challenge.

Kibuye I parish has the highest population density and has about 45% of the households collecting water from unprotected springs. The parish comprises of 11 zones namely; Nkere zone, Nabisaalu zone, Barracks zone, Jjuuko zone and Waswa zone with a population of 24,302 of which 11,479 are males and 12,823 are female.
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1.0 FORWARD

I extend warm greetings from the CIDI family to all our development partners. Community integrated Development Initiatives with support from the CSO (DANIDA) fund through NET-WAS Uganda is implementing a policy and advocacy project under the name “WASH Community Action Project (WACAP)” in Kibuye I parish, Makindye Urban Council. The project is aimed at empowering communities to demand for equity, transparency and accountability from the duty bearers but not forsaking their responsibilities as citizens. CIDI strongly believes that if citizens are empowered, they will become more responsive and concerned with what is not going right in the WASH sector within their localities and as a result come out strongly to advocate and lobby for improvement. Under this citizens led approach; CIDI is facilitating the urban poor in the parish of Kibuye I to take the mantle in causing change in service delivery as well as advocate for pro-poor/people policies within the WASH sector.

In implementing this project, CIDI employs a number of advocacy tools to be taken up by communities amongst which is the consumer perspective survey which results into generation of a citizens report card. The citizens’ report card provides feedback to the service providers from the consumers on the levels of satisfaction as far as WASH is concerned.

At this juncture, I take this opportunity to introduce to you the findings of the consumer perception survey of Kibuye I parish which was conducted in June, 2012. The findings clearly indicate that strides have been made in some aspects but there is still a lot to be done as pointed out in this publication. The process of generating this publication was greatly contributed to by the community members of Kibuye I therefore, the views and opinions expressed in this publication are explicitly those of the people of Kibuye I parish.

Through seeking the peoples feedback on what they perceive of performance, quality, adequacy, cost among other areas concerning WASH service delivery, these findings provide a strong basis of engaging service providers, policy makers and other relevant stakeholders to improve delivery and good governance in the WASH sector.

Wishing you a nice reading of this inaugural publication for Kibuye I parish.

Dr. Fulgensio Jjuuko
Executive Director - CIDI

---

Editorial Team
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</tr>
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2.0 Contributing stakeholders:

**DANIDA/NETWAS**
DANIDA under the CSO fund through NETWAS Uganda provided the funds and context to carry out the survey and eventually generate the Citizens report card.

**CIDI**
Has a long history of working with the urban poor in the informal settlements of Kampala. In the survey CIDI worked closely with the community members to carry out the exercise in the 11 zones of Kibuye I parish. The communities owned the process of compiling data with CIDI providing technical support to capture the data and produce the report with close consultation with the community.

**KCCA**
The leadership at the Division accorded CIDI tremendous support for the smooth implementation of the project. Special thanks go to the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Wycliffe of Kibuye I Parish, Dr. Walyomo the DMO and all leaders of the parish.

**The Community**
The community enthusiastically participated in the exercise and gave appropriate and sincere feedback. The community members selected from the respective zones participated in the gathering and collecting of data.

Special thanks also go to all the community persons who acted as data collectors and mobilisers. We cannot forget the great team that participated in the validation of the findings. We recognize the contribution of the project officer Claire Nalweyiso for steering all the field related activities. Last but not least the Makindye Urban Council leadership for providing an enabling environment to conduct the study.

2.1 Glossary of Key Terms

**Garbage skip:** A metallic bin usually raised from the ground and placed at convenient places/locations to hold household rubbish until it is collected by urban authorities or their contracted persons.

**Water mains:** All connections to the water utility network, whether private in the residence or compound or shared in the compound or block of flats.

**Toilet:** A place for human waste (faeces) with at least a hole cover, door and roof where human faeces cannot be exposed.

**Stand Tap:** A connection to the water mains where community people collect water.

**Safe Water:** Water that can be consumed or used by human beings with low risk of immediate or long term harm.

**Unprotected Water Sources:** These include sources of water like open wells and surface water (streams and ponds) which are more likely to be contaminated than protected sources like covered wells.

**Water Kiosk:** A connection to the water mains where community people collect water with some kind of shelter to house the water connection.

**Urban:** In Uganda the term urban refers to all gazette cities municipalities and town councils.
3.1 Why Prepare a Citizen Report Card?

This Citizens Report Card (CRC) acts as a tool providing water, sanitation and hygiene service providers and policy makers with feedback from citizens – the service users. The information provided here is very helpful to utility managers, policy makers, investors, civil society and all development partners about the adequacy and quality of water sanitation and hygiene services. It can be used to guide planning for services that reach the poor; it highlights the existing services and areas that need urgent attention and investment.

Most importantly, the information provided in this report is useful – it forms the evidence which can be utilised in community led advocacy initiatives who often times information to engage their service providers in meaningful dialogue.

The report is not a technical sector over view written for specialist audiences and does not include figures from the service providers. All information is based on consumer perception to the services they receive, focusing mostly on levels of citizens’ access and satisfaction with services. As end users, community members point out areas where service providers are succeeding and areas that need improvement. When prepared regularly, CRCs may be used as a combined advocacy or benchmarking tool.

The urban poor in Kibuye 1 Parish as users of WASH services definitely know best how responsive or reliable a service provider is and what costs are attached to the service or what policies are adding other barriers in accessing services.

The report therefore provides citizen’s feedback on key public services in access to safe water, solid waste management, toilets and drainage systems.

- The thematic areas investigated include:
- Access to and utilization of services
- Reliability of services

3.0 Introduction

This is a Citizen Report Card on water and sanitation services for Kibuye 1 Parish, Makindye Division, Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA), Uganda. Makindye Division is one of the six (06) KCCA’s local government administrative units (divisions) and is located in the central part of the country with in the capital city.
• Quality of service.
• Overall satisfaction with the service

Incidence of problems
The report therefore, provides the basis for policy debates and dialogue between service providers, policy makers, and service end users for meaningful action to ensure access to and utilisation of improved Water Sanitation and Hygiene services.

3.2 Methodology of Data Collection and Report Card Preparation
The survey process began with inception meetings where awareness of the impeding consumer perception survey was initiated to bring on board the communities, the service providers as well as the local leaders. While collecting data, both quantitative and qualitative research methods were employed and 801 household questionnaires were pretested and finally administered. The process of data collection involved conducting interviews, focus group discussions and observation. The questionnaires were coded and entered into an interface designed with Ms Access. The data was then analysed using SPSS and presented in this CRC. The sharing and dissemination of this report card is one way of amplifying the citizens’ voices for action in water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) service delivery.

3.3 Context of Uganda’s Urban WASH sector
Only about half the population of Uganda’s towns and cities has access to drinking water and a mere 8% are connected to the sewerage system. Particularly, the poorer residents of the rapidly expanding urban peripheries have inadequate access to clean and reliable drinking water as well as sanitation services. This is mainly as a result of ageing infrastructure, inability of poorer citizens to pay for the services, high rate of population growth, inadequate institutional and regulatory capacities, poor management skills and the impacts of climate change.

Water supply services management in the urban councils is a shared responsibility of large towns managed by NWSC and small towns managed by Town and Municipal councils as water authorities.

Urban sanitation is governed by the Public health Act, 2000 which is reinforced by the Environmental Health Policy (2005). Provision of urban sanitation is highly fragmented, often with unclear responsibilities between the District Local Government and Urban Council. In small towns and rural growth centres, the MWE mandate is on public sanitation facilities and most people in urban areas depend on on – site sanitation.

Sanitation development in these areas is hampered by high population increase due to rural urban migration, multiple land tenure system with many tenants not having a right to the land and therefore not able to construct permanent facilities. Furthermore, there is no comprehensive national urban policy and the institutional framework to regulate and support urban development is weak. The present legal framework under the Public Health Act (2000) does not allow pit latrines in urban areas making sanitation in small towns with lack of urban planning a major challenge.

3.4 The study area
Makindye Division is one of the five divisions that constitute Kampala District. Makindye Division is located in South Eastern part of Kampala District and is approximately 3 kilometres from the city centre. It covers a total area of 4077.80 Hectares. The division has a population of three hundred and fourteen thousand, three hundred people (314,300). It has twenty parishes namely Nsambya Railways, Nsambya Central, Nsambya Estate, Makindye I, Makindye II, Kibuye I, Kibuye II, Kasanga, Kabalagala, Lukuli, Luwafu, Katwe I, Katwe II, Kibuli, Wabigalo, Bukasa, Kisugu, Ggaba, Buziga and Salama. The Division is mainly a residential area, housing 26% of the city population. The hilly tops of Buziga, Muyenga, Konge and Katuso are inhabited by medium to high income groups, while the parishes of Namuwongo, Wabigalo, Kibuye and Katwe house the low income groups in poor living conditions that include tenements and go downs of garages. There is a high demand for services including housing, health care,
waste management among others.

Estimated by the extrapolation from Kampala sanitation study for the master plan (Beller Consult)2003, toilet coverage stands at 86%, however, a healthy profile survey (March 2005) by the Public Health Department at the Division put estimates at 76%. Reasons advanced during survey data analysis being that a number of households like for example thirty tenants were found sharing 2 to 3 stances including the high cost of payment for use.

Kibuye I parish has the highest population density and has about 45% of the households collecting water from unprotected springs. The parish comprises of 11 zones namely; Nkere, Nabisaalu, Barracks, Jjuuko, Masaku, Kapeke, Wanyana, Kanakulya, St.Benedicto, Nsuwa and Waswa zone with a population of 24,302 of which11, 479 are males and 12823 are female.

3.5 Demographic characteristics

The majority of the respondents in the households surveyed in Kibuye I parish were women; that is 458 out of 801 or 57.2% and 32.8% (343) were men. The family sizes in the survey areas are relatively big with 40% of the households consisting of 4-6 persons and 42% consisting of 1--3 and 14% consisting of 7-10 persons per household. In relation to household status 69% of the households surveyed are tenants which has a bearing on their control of land and land rights therein and subsequently the ability to invest in WASH improvement in their area.

The residents of Kibuye are generally transient, 38% of the people interviewed stay in an area between 1- 3 years and 28% between 4-7 years. This makes sustainability of the intervention programmes more challenging and therefore community sensitisation has to be continuous. Majority, 49.9% of the people interviewed had attained secondary (ordinary) level education while 26.2% had primary level education implying most people in the area can read and write at least in their local languages.

3.6 Limitations of the study

The biggest challenge met was attitudinal in that most of the respondents indicated that they are tired of studies which do not result in better service provision. Further still the people seem to have lost faith in their government as they seemed to show disgust when asked about what should be done.

Conclusions symbolised:
The perceptions of the citizens have been indicated through symbols as below:

- Satisfaction 😊
- Dissatisfaction 😞

- Challenges of equity between different social groups require attention (weighing balance)
4.0 WATER SERVICES
This CRC sought to examine citizen satisfaction and experiences in the areas of Water, Sanitation, Solid waste management. Under water services key parameters such as access to and cost of water services, water quality and reliability are considered.

4.1 Availability, access and usage of water sources

Overall access to water stands at a paltry 24% being connected to piped water mains leaving the majority of the people using water from public stand pipes and spring wells notwithstanding the health hazards it poses. The access and usage is made complex further with 71% of the households paying 100 shillings and above which is much higher than the recommended utility cost of 30 Shs. per a 20 jerry can.

4.1.1 Connection to water mains

Only 24% of households are connected on water mains, this means majority households have to buy water for their domestic consumption from public stand pipes or from spring wells yet according to health authorities water from such sources is contaminated with faecal matters. The main reasons given why majority (76%) of the residents are not connected to water mains include; majority the residents in the area are tenants with limited land rights to connect water, others say it is costly and time consuming to go through the water connection processes. It is also coming out clear that people do not seem to understand the processes coupled with having to part with some money from unscrupulous people in the guise of helping out with the connections.
4.1.2 Payment at water source

Majority of households interviewed access water for their household needs from stand pipes. This is evidenced by the fact that majority 77% of the area residents have to buy water at the source. This is due to the fact that majority are tenants with limited land rights to apply for their own private water connections.

4.1.3 Distance to water source:
79.5% of the respondents in Kibuye I parish say that they don’t have to walk long distances in search for water because water points are very near their residences. Most water sources are in a walking distance of less than 600 metres. This is quite impressive because majority fit into the stipulated ministry standard which clearly stipulates that a consumer in the urban should not move for more than ½ a kilometre in pursuance of collecting water.

4.1.4 Flow of water at the source:
The water pressure in the area is very good, 62% of households reported that the flow of water at the source was fast taking less than three minutes to fill a 20 litre jerry can and 29% reported that it takes between four to seven minutes.

4.1.5 Time spent when collecting water:
In Kibuye parish, majority of people (67%) spend less than an hour while collecting water. This implies, they have ample time to do other economic and household activities.
4.2 Consumer perceptions on quality and reliability of water service

4.2.1 Water quality:
71% of households said that the quality of water they collect is good, 12% said the quality is very good, 15% said it is poor and 2% said it is very poor. The figures above are a clear indication that the consumers are generally satisfied with the quality of water they access.

4.2.2 Reasons for satisfaction:
87% of the respondents reported that the water they access was very clear – it did not have any colour or smell thus very good for human consumption. However using the colour and smell parameters to assess the quality of water is not enough, health authorities say over 90% of natural spring well are contaminated with human waste therefore not good for human consumption. Following the water quality testing and analysis on selected water points in Kibuye I\(^1\) clearly showed that 8% of the water sources and specifically spring wells in Nabisalu are contaminated and more so, majority of those who expressed satisfaction with the water quality made this conclusion basing their judgement on what they see with the eyes particularly the colour.

The people who contested the quality of water cited reasons like the pipes being very old and not being changed since the time they were put in place. This implying that they have got leakages thus the water coming being rusty and causing variations in quality.

> “The water is good but after three days even tap water changes smell but for some spring wells especially Nabisalu, living organisms are seen moving in water even with your naked eye.”
> Tadeo Babumba Village Health Team

4.2.3 Reliability of water services:

Frequency of interruptions in the water supply: 61.8% of households often experience interruptions in the flow of their water mainly due to stoppages by the National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC). Only 29.6% of respondents reported to have constant flow of water supplies all the day. As a coping mechanism, residents have to collect more water and stock for use when it is not flowing and as observed, the quality changes after some time.

4.2.4 Notification of interruptions in the supply of water:
60% of households reported that they receive notice for the interruption of their water supply while 40% reported not to be informed of such water supply interruptions. The notifications usually came with the water bills or from the radios.

4.3 Affordability: costs incurred in accessing water

Although the utility recommended price of 20 litres of piped water is 30/= a big majority of the residents (46%) pay 100/= while 25% of the residents pay 200/= and above to access 20 litres of water. The summation of these figures is evidence that the urban poor are on average paying three times more than the water utility recommended tariff.

---

\(^1\) Water quality testing and analysis report Kibuye I parish, 2012
How much paid per Jerry can

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 shs</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 shs</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 shs</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 shs</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and above</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7 Payment per Jerry can

The variations in water costs is contributed to by the fact that most of the water points are privately owned by landlords who have a very big say on the prices they charge.

4.4 Transparency of Service Provision

4.4.1 Receiving water bills:
When asked if they receive water bills 71.3% of the respondents said this question is not applicable to them. This is due to the fact that they are not connected to private water connections; rather they buy water from stand pie owners. However 16.1% said that they receive water bills monthly and 3.1% said once in a while. Notably, the biggest percentage of residents of Nkere said they had gotten bills once in a while.

How often are water bills received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once in 2 months</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once in a while</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8 Frequency of receiving water bills

“It’s true some of the residents of our areas cannot receive water bills because of inaccessible roads to their houses they cannot be easily reached mapped by the service providers, for instance Nkere and Nabisalu…” Fredrick Ssalongo, Area local leader.

4.4.2 Accuracy of Water Bills:
When asked about the accuracy of water bills majority of the respondents (72%) said this question is not applicable because they don’t have private water connections. 15.2% of respondents said they are not satisfied and only 3.6% said to be satisfied with the accuracy of their water bills. The main reasons given for not being satisfied is that they think to be over charged or the water bills are just estimated.

“Upper zones like Wasswa, Barracks, Jjuuko and Masaku have access to taps which are privately owned. But for the lower ones piped water is very expensive even in some instances spring water is sold like in St. Benedicto where a Jerry can of spring water goes for Shs. 100/- “Keya Joy-Parish Development Committee

“In my place, the people who stay uphill sell their water expensively than those downhill. This is simply because; there is an alternative of spring water though not safe for human consumption”. Joy-VHT

4.3.1 Water quantity:
63% of households said that the water quantity they collect is not enough for their household needs and 37% said it was enough.

4.3.2 Reasons for water insufficiency:
63% of households said that the cost of water was too high, 21% said that water a bit far, 9% faced long queues at water sources and 7% any other reasons.
4.4.3 Water supply complaints:
The idea of complaining in regard to poor water service delivery is not applicable because majority of the respondents (74%) do not have private water connections they buy from stand pipe owners. However 17% of the respondents said they do not complain while 9% do complain.

![Figure 9 Water supply complaints](image)

Since the majority of the respondents just buy water from stand pipe owners, when they experience problems related to water they do not complain but look for another source. 80.1% of the respondents said they do not take their complaints to anyone, 9.7% complain to the water utility (National Water and Sewerage Corporation) and 0.9% took their complaints to the stand pipe owners.

4.4.5 Addressing the complaints:
When asked if their complaints were addressed, a big majority (77.7%) responded that the question was not applicable because they do not take their complaints to anyone, 10.1% said their complaints are not addressed and only 3% said the water utility addresses their complaints.

![Figure 10 Complaints addressed](image)

The problem could be as a result of the people providing inadequate information coupled with wrong directions to officials of NWSC.

Direct complaints to NWSC are often delayed especially if the complaint is a direct one. However, if one deals with individuals, they move faster in responding to the problems. The only time where NWSC reacts fast is when the issue is to do with the mains.

4.4.6 How satisfied are households with the overall provision of water?

82% of households are not satisfied with the delivery and management of water services because they are being exploited by the stand pipe owners who levy additional costs on top of the recommended fee by the water utility, making it more expensive to the ordinary consumers.

4.4.7 Over all reasons for lack of satisfaction:
- 66% reported that the cost of water is too high
- 16% insufficient water supply and interruptions.
- 7% lack water mains in their area to connect
- 7% poor quality of water
- 3% other reasons
5.0 Sanitation Services: Key Findings

The sanitation conditions in Kibuye I parish is not good. Most households in low lying areas where the water table is high do not have adequate latrine facilities because proper construction of latrines is very expensive and garbage management is also not good.

5.1 Solid waste management

This is one of the major health hazards affecting the residents of Kibuye I parish, the area experiences poor garbage management practices resulting into clogging of drainage channels, polluting the environment and creation of breeding grounds for mosquitoes, flies and consequently malaria, diarrhoea, typhoid or cholera.

Majority of residents keep their garbage in nylon bags before disposal or burning, often times these are dumped in unauthorised places including drainage channels or by the road sides.

5.2 Reliability of garbage collection

34% of households reported that authorities collected their garbage daily, 11.5% once a week once a week, 2.6% once every fortnight, 7.6% once a month and 36% of households reported that garbage collection by authorities is not applicable to them.

5.3 Payment for garbage disposal:

Big majority (53%) of residents do not pay for their garbage disposal and 47% do pay. This big number of non payment for garbage dis-
posal is an indication of poor garbage management because the Kampala City Council Authority policy is that each household pays for garbage disposals and burning garbage is not allowed by the garbage ordinance.

Do you pay for garbage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13 Awareness about garbage ordinance

5.4 Amount paid for garbage disposal

In Kibuye I parish residents are used to paying per drop rather than being charged on monthly basis. On average they pay between 600 – 1000 Shs per drop on the garbage collection truck.

5.6 Sensitization on garbage management

5.6.1 Awareness of garbage ordinance:

Only 25.5% of households interviewed reported to have been sensitised about proper garbage management while 73.3% said they have never received any training in garbage management and they are not aware of the Garbage Ordinance. As a result many slum dwellers have resorted indiscriminate disposal or burning their garbage something which is contrary to the ordinance.

5.6.2 Overall satisfaction with Solid Waste Management:

70% of households said that they are not satisfied with garbage management services in their locality, but 30% were satisfied The reasons given were as follows: 60% of residents cited lack of free skips to dump garbage, 11% said garbage collecting firms take long to pick garbage in their areas, 10% reported that money charged by private garbage collectors is above their means and 19% reported lack of access roads to their homes.

5.7 Community recommendations:

- Sensitisation of community members on proper garbage management with emphasis on recycling.
- Popularise and translate the garbage ordinance into local language i.e. Luganda
- Punish heavily those who dump in unauthorized areas.
- Garbage collectors should improve their public relations with the community they are serving
- Involve the community youth in garbage collection as an income generation activity for them
5.8 Access to toilet facilities

Majority of households (94%) interviewed use shared pit latrines thus making it difficult to ascertain the exact toilet coverage in the urban poor settlement of Kibuye.

In Kibuye I parish 67.4% of toilets are owned by landlords this implies that they are shared or distributed among tenants. 22.6% of the available toilets are privately owned and 3.6% are public toilets.

5.8.1 Cost of accessing toilets:
Kibuye I Parish being a residential area 83% of the respondents don’t pay any fee to access latrines because all costs are embedded on the rent for their houses. Only 2% said that they pay to access latrines services. The above shows that the land lords shoulder the responsibility of keeping the latrines operational.

5.8.2 Cost of accessing public toilets:
8.6% of respondents reported that they pay Shs.100 per visit to a public toilet facility, 1.4% pay 200/=, 1% pay Shs.50 but a big majority 70.3% said payment to access latrine facilities is not applicable to them.

5.8.3 Regular latrine emptying:
38% households reported that their latrines are emptied regularly and 62% said that they are not emptied regularly.
5.8.4 Reasons for not emptying latrines when full
- 67% of households reported high cost of hiring a cesspool emptier.
- 23% reported that their households are inaccessible.
- 10% due to poor structures and improper use of latrines.

5.8.5 Presence of functional management committee on toilets:
42% of households reported that their toilet facilities had functional user management committees but 58% reported lack of facility management committees.

5.8.6 Complete Satisfaction with Toilet Facilities:
62% of respondents reported that they are not satisfied at all with toilet management in their areas and 38% respondents are satisfied with the toilets facilities.

5.8.7 What people value in toilets:
From focus group discussions, what constitutes a good latrine include; convenience, privacy, cleanliness, has no smell and proximity to households.

5.8.8 Reasons for dissatisfaction with toilet facilities
- 10% reported that the smell from their toilets is unbearable.
- 36% reported the practice of the landlords draining latrines in the drainage channels during rainy seasons.
- 19% indicated that the cost of accessing proper latrine/toilet facilities is very high where the user fee is Shs.100 per entry hence resort to “flying toilets.”
- 18% said when their toilets are full they take long to be emptied.
- 17% reported that their toilet facilities operate under key and lock that is they cannot be accessed at any time of their convenience.

5.8.9 Recommendations from the Community members
- Kampala City Council Authority cesspool emptier should be easily accessible and affordable without any hidden costs on top of the recommended fee.
- Punish heavily those who empty their latrines in drainage channels.
- Local authorities to put emphasis on standardized and appropriate toilet designs to cater for the old and other vulnerable community members.
- Landlords should be forced to put in place adequate toilet facilities for their tenants.
6.0 Drainage:
The most common drainage type in Kibuye I parish is that of the open drainage systems which are generally poorly maintained, often times clogged with garbage and mineral water (plastic) bottle. The frequency of cleaning and maintenance of these drainage channels is not regular leading to flooding during rainy seasons. Regarding waste water disposal, most households surveyed dispose their waste water in their compound thus increasing the dangers associated to poor waste water management.

6.1 Quality of drainage channels
- 26% of households reported that drainage channels in their areas were not lined this makes operation and maintenance very difficult.
- 6% of households were satisfied with the drainage channels in their area because they are lined without any problem.
- 16% stated that drainage channels in their area are too narrow to carry big volumes of water during rainy seasons leading to floods.
- 40% reported that drainage channels have become garbage dumping grounds.
- 11% reported that their channels are not flowing due to silting.

6.2 Responsibility for drainage channels:
The majority of households (71%) believe that it is the responsibility of Makindye division (local government) to maintain the drainage channels because they pay taxes. This clearly explains why majority of drainage channels in poor state, community members don’t want to clean or pay for drainage channel maintenance.

6.3 Divisions’ responsiveness to drainage channels management:
68% of households think that the local authorities in Makindye Division are not doing enough to improve the drainage system in their areas.

6.4 Satisfaction with drainage channels

Figure 17 Satisfaction with drainage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• 90% of households reported that they are not satisfied with the drainage system in their area
• 7% of respondents reported to be satisfied with the status of drainage channels in their area.

6.5 Reasons for lack of satisfaction
These include; flooding of channels 43%, silt- ing 16%, stagnant water due to garbage disposal 17% and 24% of respondents said that the drainage channels are too narrow.

6.6 Community recommendations
• There is need to increase on the frequencies of cleaning and de-silting of all drainage channels.
• Community members must develop a community based mechanism for the management of drainage systems- one option is to have in care takers paid by the community members.
• Strengthening of community policing to get those who dump solid garbage in drainage channels

Suffered from floods in last two years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18 Flooding
7.0 Priority areas for improvement and recommendations

- Need for more coordination and corporation among the Division technical staff, politicians and service providers in the enforcement of agreed mechanisms (e.g. the Garbage Ordinance, operation and maintenance of facilities) for improved Water, sanitation and hygiene service delivery.

- There is need to improve the governance of available water and sanitation resources in the Division. The service providers and local authorities should be more accountable and transparent in all the decisions they make.

- There is need to improve the road network in the Division in order to improve the accessibility of households- with good access roads garbage trucks and cesspool emptier trucks will be able to take their services deeper in the settlements.

- All in all there is need for an effective Urban Slum Upgrading Policy in Uganda which can take account of all the challenges associated with informal settlements in the city.
## 7.1 Recommendations Summarised

Specific Recommendations emerging from the Findings of the Primary Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Issue</th>
<th>Possible Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to safe and clean water</strong></td>
<td>- Put in place many water mains that can sustain high pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase coverage of piped water and reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Repair broken pipes immediately they reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide reminders before water is disconnected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improve on reliability of water by NWSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Establish community based water management systems e.g. water user groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discourage accessing water from natural sources because most of them are contaminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provision for lower connectivity charges and a lower minimum water charges for the slum dwellers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sensitize the community on safe water storage and handling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sanitation: Toilets</strong></td>
<td>- Launch massive public health education programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emphasis on appropriate toilet designs to cater for the old, children, women and disabled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emphasize Ecosan toilets in places where the water table is high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Make cesspool emptier easily accessible to the urban poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Punish heavily those who empty pit latrines in drainage channels during the rain seasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Promotion and prioritization of community managed toilets under the guide line of the Division’s health department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solid Waste Management</strong></td>
<td>- Improve all access roads in the community area such that garbage collecting trucks can reach all households in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Educate the community members on appropriate solid waste disposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Punish heavily those who dump in unauthorized areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Invest in garbage recycling and community sensitization on garbage sorting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Private firms collecting garbage are recommended to improve their public relations with the communities they are serving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The division should provide more refuse trucks in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Develop IEC materials to develop the community about proper solid waste management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste water Management</strong></td>
<td>- Increase on the frequencies of cleaning and De-silting of all drainage channels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drainage Channels</strong></td>
<td>- Development of a mechanism for community based management of drainage systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewer Lines</strong></td>
<td>- IEC campaign to educate communities on proper waste water disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To cover all the drainage channels that are dangerous to pedestrians, bicycle, motor cycle riders and vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community policing to get those who dung solid garbage in drainage channels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Punish heavily those who connect their private sewer lines to drainage channels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Repair sewer lines as soon as they are broken to avoid contamination of water sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>