

# **Emerging Lessons on FSM from Maputo, Mozambique**

#### **Odete Muximpua**

P. Hawkins, J. Stricker, Z. Mugabe, O. Matendjua and A. Madamuge

#### **World Bank**





# 1. Background

- City: 1.2M population
   Project area: 150,000
- Rapid Water supply expansion
  - Shift from dry to wet sanitation systems
- Unclear mandates and lack of service provision capacity
  - 100% household responsibility





# 2. Existing Conditions...

- Replacement of pits
  - Poorly constructed structures
- Limited FSM services
  - Informal emptying
  - Limited access for vacuum tankers
  - Lack of appropriate equipment for unlined pits
- Illegal dumping into residential environment
  - Prevalence of unhygienic, informal, manual emptying





# 3. Project Design

- Partnership led by Maputo City Council
  - Supported by WB and WSUP, funded by JSDF
- Sanitation service improvements in Nhlamankulo District
  - Private sector engagement
  - Technology development
  - Design of service models
  - Capacity development



#### 3. Project Design – cont.

- Transfer stations to improve access and reduce transport costs
- 8 operators (5 primary and 3 secondary)



#### **Initial Model**

## 4. Challenges and Modifications

- Local resistance to construction of transfer stations → mobile tanks
- High dependence on the secondary operators
- Difficulties operating handcarts
- Higher volumes to be emptied compared to reference volumes at the design stage



### 5. Financial Data

Operator	No. of emptyings		Revenue	Cost	Operating profit	Depre- ciation	Net profit (loss)
	Pits	Septic tanks	(USD)	(USD)	(USD)	(USD)	(USD)
Primary Operators							
Acadec	52	61	7,645	4,975	2,670	2,832	(162)
Bejoel	3	63	4,307	1,800	2,507	2,832	(325)
Magoanine	76	79	7,589	2,963	4,626	2,832	1,794
Modac	0	41	1,675	1,293	383	2,832	(2,449)
(Phatima)*	1	7	661	470	191	2,832	(2,641)
Secondary Operators							
Mbonga Mbilo	49	185	10,996	6,488	4,509	11,495	(6 <i>,</i> 896)
Sizema	77	69	8,635	4,107	4,528	11,495	(6 <i>,</i> 967)
Oliveira	0	42	4,976	1,119	3,857	11,495	(7,638)
TOTAL	258	547	46,485	23,213	23,271	48,645	(25,374)

## 5. Financial Data – cont.

- Prices not affordable for poor households
- 7 of 8 operators still operating and covering costs
- Additional investments made by operators
- Access to banking services to expand business
- Haulage to treatment is the largest cost component



### 6. Customer feedback

#### **Source of Information**

- Pamphlets were main source of information 2
- Service appreciated for its cleanliness
- 40% who contacted new service fell back on alternative options due to price



# 7. Drivers of Change

- Existing SWM microenterprises:
  - Familiarity with customer base
  - Similarities in operation of SWM and FSM
  - Existing association of microenterprises
- Political support from City Council
  - Development of sanitation byelaw covering FSM
    Tipping fees waived
- Available data on key challenges for sanitation services



#### 8. Lessons Learned

- Technical
  - Need for improved manual emptying tools
  - Dynamic nature of informal settlements requires flexibility to service wide range of sanitation facilities
  - Due to seasonality of FSM business, operators need complementary sources of income to survive
- Commercial
  - TV adverts had major impact on demand, but leaflets more effective in customer engagement
  - Selling points of the new services were cleanliness and positive environmental impact
  - Price is a major constraint to service uptake and pushes users back to traditional manual emptying



### 9. Outstanding Challenges

- Affordability of improved services → subsidies?
- Mix of equipment types and transport options to increase profitability
- Improved technology for dry sludge and accessing dense unplanned areas
- Improved sludge treatment and re-use





#### Kanimambo!



