Dear colleagues, the seminar came to a close at the end of the third day yesterday. You can find accounts of the final three sessions below. A provisional summary of the entire seminar can also be downloaded here (in French). A consolidated account of the lessons learned will be available in the coming weeks. Happy reading!

Small piped water systems: from monitoring locally to nationally

Most small piped water systems, depending on how they are managed, generate large amounts of data. This session explored how this data can be used to feed into national monitoring and evaluation systems and vice-versa.

The participants concluded that two-way data transmission channels need to be built between the local and national levels so that information can flow from the bottom up to the top and back down again. The sustainability of these transition channels will be reliant on stakeholders holding an interest in generating such monitoring data. The key issue is therefore to identify the interests of the various stakeholders; because those who have their own motivation will contribute to ensuring the link is maintained between monitoring at a local level and monitoring at a national level.

Monitoring user satisfaction

This session looked at the monitoring and evaluation of user satisfaction in the specific context of village water infrastructure (hand pumps). The participants all agreed that user satisfaction is a relevant and essential factor to be measured. It was also highlighted that while there may not yet be a certified methodology, proven criteria are available (regarding quality, quantity, reliability and service accessibility). Nonetheless, these should not prevent other key criteria specific to each context being identified.

Some experts also pointed to the bias generated by user satisfaction measuring methods. Each method generates a certain level of distortion of reality, which the analysts need to keep in mind. It was also noted that the monitoring of user satisfaction is used to support dialogue. The results of such monitoring, when they are raised
at public meetings (for instance at the AGM of the Water Users’ Association), help to pin-point the issues and stimulate debate. The limitations of monitoring were also identified: too often user satisfaction is measured on an ad-hoc basis, and is not continued over time. Too often, the issue of division of responsibilities is also unclear.

**Les implications du post 2015 pour les collectivités locales**

This plenary session firstly reiterated the considerable influence that the MDGs have had on monitoring mechanisms and databases set up by governments over the past few years. Nonetheless, the MDGs have their limitations: they do not pay sufficient attention to hygiene, equity, quality or functionality aspects. It is expected that the new generation of indicators, (the SDGs, or Sustainable Development Goals), will fill in these gaps. With this in mind, certain elected officials expressed the need to translate the future SDGs into the local development plans. Some monitoring operators felt that the future indicators represent more work. Some countries (like Ghana), showed their preparedness for the SDGs with ambitious goals for 2025. Furthermore, discussions among participants focused on the use of having inter-sectoral indicators that could be used for water and sanitation. Two final recommendations were made: build on what already exists rather than imposing new systems, and ensure proper linkages between local, national and international levels, avoiding the gathering of data that will never be used!