Thematic Discussion Series: Synthesis

Synthesis of **The Sanitation Ladder: Next Steps** thematic discussion

SuSanA's Thematic Discussion Series

SuSanA's newly launched Thematic Discussion Series is an initiative to organise discussions on the SuSanA Discussion Forum which address intersectoral topics and involve collaborative efforts from thematic leads, the relevant SuSanA working groups, SuSanA's members, and a coordination aspect to provide moderation, summaries and structure to the discussions. More information can be found at www.susana.org/resources/thematic-discussion-series.

sustainable sanitation alliance

The Sanitation Ladder: Next Steps

This first thematic discussion addressed the role of the functional sanitation ladder in the WASH-related post-2015 landscape, where discussions and negotiations are currently taking place to determine the targets and indicators of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for 2015-2030.

The discussion was led by three thematic experts, Patrick Bracken, Elisabeth Kvarnström, and Ricard Gine on the SuSanA Discussion Forum from 9-27 February 2015 with weekly topics of:

Week 1: Evolution and Further Development of the Sanitation Ladder
Week 2: The post-2015 agenda & emerging monitoring challenges in the sanitation sector
Week 3: The way forward…adaptation of the sanitation ladder to the post-2015 period

As the discussion unfolded, several of the **key issues** were discussed, including: implications of the SDG indicators on a functional sanitation ladder; including equity, human rights and schools and health centres in the framework; defining "safe" sanitation; complementary ideas to a sanitation ladder; and adopting the functional sanitation ladder.

The following is a synthesis of the posts which took place in the discussions and does not necessarily represent the views of all contributors or SuSanA. A list of contributors to the discussion can be found on the last page.

Contents:

Why a functional sanitation ladder (FSL)?

The discussion was introduced as starting from the basis of the publication of the paper "The Sanitation Ladder: A need for a revamp?" (2011) which describes a function-based seven-step ladder sanitation ladder (see here for the ladder) as a "revamp" to the technology-focused sanitation ladder which is currently the monitoring framework used at a global level for the WHO/ UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply and Sanitation (JMP) monitoring of global development goals.

There was discussion which focused on the reason for the shift to a functional ladder approach, including: the aim that the outcome and impact of a functioning sanitation system should be the focus of sanitation monitoring and thus be technically neutral. For example, the focus would be on:

- lower rungs: health protection (first step as excreta containment)
- higher rungs: progressively added issues of environmental protection and the integrated resource management of different flow streams in sanitation systems

The technology-focused and function-based sanitation ladder images are on the next page.

Proposed function-based sanitation ladder (Kvarnström et al., 2011):

Table 2 | Suggested function-based sanitation ladder*

	Function	Indicators	Management needs
Environmental functions	7 Integrated resource management	Indicators will differ and depend on flowstreams from the full environmental sanitation system (urine, faeces, greywater, faecal sludge, wastewater as below but also including water provision, stormwater management and solid waste management) and context	
	6 Eutrophication risk reduction	Indicators will differ and depend on flow stream from the sanitation system (urine, faeces, greywater, faecal sludge, wastewater)	
	5 Nutrient reuse	(i) X% of N, P, K excreted is recycled for crop production, (ii) Y% of used water is recycled for productive use	
Health functions	4 Pathogen reduction in treatment	Indicators will differ and depend on flow stream from the sanitation system (urine, faeces, greywater, faecal sludge, wastewater) and also whether the flowstream will be used productively afterwards or not	
	3 Greywater management	(i) No stagnant water in the compound, (ii) no stagnant water in the street, (iii) no mosquitoes or other vectors	
	2 Safe access and availability	(i) 24-hr access to facility year-round, (ii) facility offering privacy, personal safety and shelter, (iii) facility is adapted to needs of the users of the facility	
	1 Excreta containment	(i) Clean facility in obvious use, (ii) no flies or other vectors, (iii) no faecal matter lingering in or around latrine, (iv) hand-washing facility in obvious use with soap, (v) lid, (vi) odour-free facility	

*Note that moving up the ladder means that the functions below have also been fulfilled!

Technology-focused sanitation ladder (JMP, 2008)

Pros and Cons of the Functional Sanitation Ladder (FSL)

Several comments were made regarding general benefits and criticisms of the sanitation ladder, as well as more specifically about the Functional Sanitation Ladder, both of which are outlined here:

- ▲ (ladder) simple to understand
- ▲ (ladder) Linear concept: appeals to aspirational desire to move up the "social ladder"
- ▲ Priority setting: only those systems that satisfy the requirements of the previous rungs go through, with the primary priorities as containing excreta and assuring privacy, access, and acceptability
- ▲ Supports a move towards more sustainable sanitation frameworks that fulfil service expectations
- ▲ can cover dimensions to ensure the realisation of the multi-dimensional benefits of sanitation
- ▲ recognizes the context, and that a one-size fits all technological approach can be limiting to new technologies, and successful technologies in a context-specific way
- ▲ eases the framework for upscaling of new sanitation technologies
- ▲ Because ladder concept is accepted and well-known, can impact existing monitoring and inspire change to a function-focus (from a technology focus)
- ▲ concentrates on the function of the entire system, not just the user interface
- ▲ it has been applied in practice to support monitoring of sanitation interventions carried out by different development partners

- ▼ (ladder) Linear concept: reality often not linear - the ladder does not reflect multiple dimensions; and different functions are not always viewed in a culturally euro-centric concept of "climbing up"
- ▼ (ladder) Aspirational appeal: spontaneous advancement rare in a community, often due to: affordability, lack of awareness of next steps, satisfaction with current step
- ▼ Can fade out local priorities and stakeholder preferences
- ▼ Perspective that for some, if they aim to start at the bottom of the ladder, they may possibly miss out on opportunities to start higher up the ladder
- ▼ More complicated to understand for policy-makers than the technology-based ladder
- ▼ More information required for assessment and analysis than for the technology-based ladder (TBL)
- ▼ Top rungs (which relate to other SDGs) are more academic than pragmatic, while lower rungs don't discrminate among those people with poor access to sanitation (at least, 35% of world's population)
- ▼ Possible negative reactions from "flush toilet" no longer always being the top spot

Moving "up" the ladder

Note: While the FSL (image on left) moves up the ladder from bottom (excreta containment) to top (integrated resource management), the JMP ladder (above) moves from the top, with simpler sanitation solutions, and has more advanced solutions at the bottom of the ladder.

Box 1

FSL Adaptation:
SKAT's framework from Moldova

This example highlights a country-specific approach used by Skat (a Swiss funded water and sanitation organisation) in Moldova. See post #12011 for diagrams and the full post.

Context of Moldova
The situation in rural areas is has pit latrines in poor shape as the standard sanitation type, few sewers and wastewater treatment non-existent. Perspectives of government and funders range from sewers or nothing, supporting the MDGs and JMP ladder, and environmental protection via wastewater treatment.

Adapted sanitation ladder framework + service levels
The adapted ladder addresses different functions of sanitation independently, and treats them as different dimensions of the same thing rather than steps of a ladder, to define objectives, priorities and direct resources.

The framework described service levels in sanitation as: Protection of health; Protection of the environment; Dignity, comfort and status; and Human rights. The existing sanitation systems and technologies were ranked on the different dimensions and plotted on a two-dimensional graph (see diagram) of the axes of dimensions of service levels.

A key aspect that it addresses is that progress in one function does not necessarily mean progress in another, and thus has a shift from the linearity of the sanitation ladder.

Criticism included: that the functions/ dimensions of service levels plotted were not linked to each other; and that it does not incorporate a dimension for future benefits/ costs.

Defining new roles for the FSL

The use of the ladder has changed, with roles in monitoring (nation-wide and global), advocacy, influencing policy, and as a resource for implementation. For example, a municipality may use the new ladder to: assess the status quo, compare to other neighbourhoods/ cities in an objective fashion, identify gaps, and based on this, lobby for funds and propose new sanitation interventions.

Examples of use of the Sanitation Ladder

The functional sanitation ladder has been adopted and adapted for implementation and use, see Box 1 and situations including:

Welthungerhilfe 6-Rung Functional Ladder
Used a 6 rung function-based ladder (see Ch. 6) to monitor progress in the sanitation and hygiene status of partner communities to specifically consider their project environments.

IRC's WASHCost Project (2008-2013)
IRC's working paper "Assessing sanitation service levels" which outlines a costing perspective for different sanitation and hygiene service levels where different ladder rungs can be translated to different service levels.

Spanish Draft of the Sanitation Ladder

A Spanish draft of the functional sanitation ladder can be found here.

Context of the FSL in Global Processes

A considerable amount of discussion concerned the current environment of change from the shift from the MDGs (2000-2015) to the negotiation process for the SDGs (to be implemented for 2015-2030). In particular, the relevance of a functional sanitation ladder in the current climate, and how it would fit in with indicators and targets of the post-2015 agenda. The negotiations in 2015 in relation to the SDGs will be based on the OWG recommendations (see discussion above), but inputs from other parallel processes will be also considered.

Formulation of indicators and targets Post-2015:

Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals has proposed two different targets specifically related to sanitation (sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdgsproposal). One "core" indicator is currently planned for each target. The drinking water and sanitation-related targets are:

Target 6.1 by 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all

Target 6.2 by 2030, achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all, and end open defecation, paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations

Target 6.3 by 2030, improve water quality by reducing pollution, eliminating dumping and minimizing release of hazardous chemicals and materials, halving the proportion of untreated wastewater and increasing recycling and safe reuse by [x] per cent globally

Each core indicator will be supported by "supporting indicators". The OWG formulations of suggested sanitation-related SDGs aim at a high level, including transboundary water management, restoration of water eco systems. For more information, see http://goo.gl/mxH09v.

Roles of the JMP and the WASH Sector in the post-2015 process

The **JMP**, based on the above targets, has coordinated a consultative process to define more specific WASH post-2015 targets and indicators (www.wssinfo.org/post-2015-monitoring/). At this point, the JMP will continue to monitor and report on all levels of the ladder.

JMP WASH professionals come from an expansion of the MDG perspective, where hygiene, equity, excreta management are in focus. Service delivery (rather than technology) is the aim and focus. The WASH Sector is currently recommending 33 core indicators for targets 6.1 and 6.2.

What is still being discussed at a global level:

- **Indicators**
- **Safely managed concept:** more ambitious than "basic sanitation" (under JMP: "improved sanitation") as basic sanitation needs to be achieved to have safely managed. Baseline will be challenging, and a call instead for "basic access" as more realistic, with a 50% improvement on safely managed by 2030.
- **Human rights:** including the commitment to human rights and equity, with the latter possibly monitored outside the SDG indicators
- **Measuring affordability:** kept separate from the ladder concept?

A list of key JMP definitions can be found in post #12075, including for basic sanitation, basic handwashing facilities, and safely managed sanitation.

Some JMP Provided Definitions for Target 6.2:

access (for all) - Implies facilities close to home that can be easily reached and used when needed

to adequate - Implies a system which hygienically separates excreta from human contact as well as safe disposal of excreta in situ, or transport to a treatment plant

and equitable - Implies progressive reduction and elimination of inequalities between population sub-groups

sanitation - Sanitation is the provision of facilities and services for safe management and disposal of human urine and faeces

and hygiene - Hygiene is the conditions and practices that help maintain health and prevent spread of disease including hand washing, menstrual hygiene management and food hygiene

for all - Suitable for use by men, women, girls and boys of all ages including people living with disabilities

end open defecation - Excreta of adults or children are: deposited (directly or after being covered by a layer of earth) in the bush, a field, a beach, or other open area; discharged directly into a drainage channel, river, sea, or other water body; or are wrapped in temporary material and discarded

Considerations for integrating functionality and SDG indicators in the FSL

Question:
Are there different assessments at different boundary levels?

With a movement to look at the entire sanitation system and applying wider boundaries with the FSL in areas with varying levels of sanitation service, system boundaries may be set at different levels, for example:

individual sanitation project level: with varying sanitation provision, even a small % of people practicing ODF could affect the health of everyone else – would the poorest form of sanitation in a community determine safety?

city/ town/ settlement level: particularly if Shit Flow Diagrams are used as a tool to assist monitoring. The edges are blurred of what the JMP might consider "safely managed sanitation", with a move towards looking at the system (including users, collection, transport, treatment etc.) and functionality, and what happens when different systems overlap.

Some approaches to address this may be:

Prioritise those practices that pose the greatest risk

Community mechanism for self-monitoring within the ladder, possible use as an indicator for ODF (taking into consideration, for example, this graph here)

Defining the Terminology

Building from the JMP's definitions for targets, discussion continued on the incorporation of the proposed SDG targets and indicators in a functional framework. See for an exercise which discusses how the definition of target elements could apply within target language see post #12223; and also, how they could apply to rungs of the functional sanitation ladder:

Rung 1 (Excreta containment): proposed indicator "*Safely managed sanitation*...where excreta is safely disposed in situ or transported to a designated place for safe disposal or treatment."
Rung 2 (Safe access and availability): target 6.2 "*access* (for all) to *adequate* and *equitable*"
Rung 3 (Greywater management): target 6.3
Rung 4 (Pathogen reduction in treatment): proposed indicator "*Safely managed sanitation*"

Considerations of implementation of the FSL for monitoring

As current JMP monitoring is based on the technology-focused sanitation ladder, discussion arose around which factors need to be considered to develop indicators for future monitoring (JMP or not). The following factors were considered as considerations with the implementation of a functional ladder:

Source of data: Population-based surveys and national censuses may not be enough and other sources to collect data may be necessary. Shift to more qualitative data may be necessary.

Cost of data collection: Cost estimate of data collection for the JMP for the 169 SDG targets at $254 billion for 2015-2030, <1 cost-benefit ratio (see URL). And other issues include: capacity constraints, buy-in from stakeholders and ethics of spending. Would more information and data be needed to be collected?

Other uses of data: For example, for the type and number of toilets built and information on cost, lifespan, trends and effectiveness of new technologies.

Dimensions covered in the post-2015 targets: Sanitation dimensions have largely focused on health, and sanitation also has the potential to achieve other SDG targets as well.

Relation to the SDGs: The most recent SDG proposal seems to be measured against approximately rung 6 of the ladder (see post #11971 for image of ladder), whereas the MDG targets were more like rung 1 because they focused on separation between the human and its feces, but did not include hygiene (hand washing was not included), so the MDG targets did not even meet the first FSLrung.

Collecting data through large surveys: Large surveys can only handle structured questions. Therefore, a limited number of categories in the technology-focused sanitation ladder made it easier to perform disaggregated analysis.

Incorporating aspects into the FSL

Human Rights

Some questions which can be raised when considering human rights inclusion:
Should some communities be prioritized (ex. based on socio-economic/ demographic factors)?
How to develop a special focus to identify and prioritize the most vulnerable population?

Implications of declaring HRWS before defining safe sanitation
Question raised: Is there value of declaring the HRWS without first defining what is an acceptable level of safety to which all persons on the planet should have access?
Doing so could have the following implications for:

- those without full civilian rights (ex. refugees, illegal immigrants)as part of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights the provision of sanitation is a legally claimable right.
- Priority setting is based on the "greatest common good" (not necessarily in favour of minorities/ marginalized populations) vs. "no one left behind" (human right) concept in decision making:

Progressive Realisation of Human Rights
Rather measure "rate of change" (need a baseline value/ benchmark rate) and not "level of achievement". A country can be evaluated based on the efforts it makes and improvements it achieves (see this article on developing an index for progressive realization of human rights)

From post #12117, according to the First Consultation Report on monitoring WATSAN

Human Rights do
- define the criteria against which enjoyment of the right can be assessed viz., availability, safety, acceptability, accessibility, affordability, participation, non-discrimination, accountability.
- require all groups to have access, over time, within the maximum extent of available resources.

Human rights do not mean:
- service must be free
- that private sector participation is prohibited
- everyone is entitled to a tap and flush toilet tomorrow

Equality and Equity

Can the sanitation ladder reduce inequalities? How can it be integrated?
Argument: that the sanitation ladder approaches the 'advantaged' populations while the disadvantaged (vulnerable, marginalized) populations are omitted, where cost factor is the highest priority, and marginalised communities have little say in the decision-making process.

- Flexibility is needed in the functional ladder, so if sanitation is a public good, marginalised populations are financially supported to reach this public good (and not further marginalised by receiving badly implemented systems "just" for the poor)

How can equity be integrated into the ladder concept for monitoring?
For example, "new arrivals" in slums in planning cycles who get shunned on service provision
Progressive realization of rights includes the dimensions of economics, enabling environment and equity. *Equity* (defined to comprise these 3 dimensions) could be added to rungs 1 & 2 of the functional ladder viz., excreta containment and safe access and availability.
From a monitoring perspective, current JMP reports already attempts to report on wealth-based differences and rural / urban disparities; and the UN SR will be supporting the development of monitoring of equity

Considerations for measuring and monitoring equity
Need for several measures: ex. gender, income, features of geographical location, caste/community, special situations like conflict/ disaster situations). A Lorenz curve or Gini coefficient is the standard statistical measure of equity
Disaggregated analysis: Sanitation access relates to rungs 1 & 2, the information for which is collected from large population surveys and national censuses. Therefore, disaggregated analysis (and provision of information) is required along with ensuring that the survey forms address equity (ex. addressing risk factors that result in inequity).

Sustainability
Sustainability questions for sanitation ladder include: What is the minimum lifespan for a sanitation technology to be considered? For example, what is the status of the sanitation facilities from the MDGs?

Debate:
Should the "enabling environment" be included in a sanitation monitoring and

Reason for inclusion:
Scoring the progress of groups and communities on the ladder without looking at the enabling environment may have limited effect, ex. If there is no supply chain of sanitation solution providers, how can rural sanitation ever achieve scale? Would it not be possible to assign each rung/step of the ladder with an indication or mapping tool of what would normally be needed in terms of private and public sector services and legislation/fee structures to achieve each level of functionality?

Reason for not explicitly including it: it is rather a *critical framework condition* made up of many individual and important elements, than something to be additionally mentioned. The "environment" where services are delivered is crucial but not necessarily the main function of a ladder, where the "environment" (ex. policies, supply chain, institutional framework – how can this be monitored?) and the "infrastructure" (which the sanitation ladder can monitor) should be monitored separately.
At international level, for instance, the GLAAS report provides a global update on the policy frameworks, institutional arrangements, etc., while the JMP currently presents the results of the global monitoring of progress towards MDG 7 target C.

Safe Sanitation

What is considered as safe/ adequate sanitation? The JMP plan moving forward seems to keep their technical definitions of "access to improved sanitation" and expand upon this by looking at if it's "safely managed sanitation" (defined as the population using an improved sanitation facility which is not shared with other households and where excreta is safely disposed in situ or transported to a designated place for safe disposal or treatment) with a specific mention of services.

This represents a shift from a minimum target of improved sanitation in the MDGs (about rung 1 of the FSL or below rung 1 – as hand washing was not included), to safely managed improved sanitation, **perhaps rungs 1 to 4**, including excreta containment; safe access and availability; greywater management; pathogen reduction through treatment dependent on context.

Sanitation Access of Schools and Health Centres

Should targets prioritize settings beyond the household? Rungs 3 & 4 of the FSL are important for health centres (ex. pathogen destruction, pharmaceutical drug presence, safe treatment of greywater), and adequate sanitation access could be covered in rungs 1 & 2.

Is a separate sanitation ladder necessary for schools and health centres? As per JMP definitions, basic sanitation includes shared facilities between not more than 5 households or 30 persons, whichever is lesser. A separate sanitation ladder is necessary if the above dimensions (eg. waiting time, geographical distance, needs of users etc.,) are significantly different from shared facilities for households. However, integration into one ladder (although possibly with separate reporting), could be useful for simplicity of explaining concepts to stakeholders, harmonization of terms and comparative analysis.

Health-related targets and pathogen reduction

What indicators could be used for pathogen reduction?
WHO Guidelines for reuse, and the use of treatment proxies (time temperature etc.)

Measure health-related targets: Instead of directly measuring pathogens, instead measure some health-related target, for ex. incidence of watery diarrhea per thousand people or representative spot checks for common pathogens in stool samples. But, will not point to the cause of the illness, affected by the way it is recorded and confounding factors, and measures the outcome, not the output (which is what the SDG indicators measure)

Points of consideration include: is the measurement for pathogen reduction in actual practice (vs. just the technology, ex. in an area with high monsoons), how would the data be collected, public health risk of agricultural reuse and food safety, including hygiene

Complementary frameworks and tools to the functional ladder

The discussion explored other frameworks and complementary frameworks to the FSL.

Index Approach

Current PhD field work
from Dorothee Spuhler (Eawag)

Addresses the question: How can engineers shape the sanitation design procedures for sanitation systems according to required service functions to achieve sustainability criteria?

The research will look into:

- how to design appropriate sanitation system alternatives based on and considering different options including on-site, conventional and new innovations for RRR?

- What kind of performance indicators are we able to provide to inform policy makers on their potential performance in a sustainability perspective?

Current status:
developed a methodological approach and currently applying the framework to a city sanitation planning project in Nepal

An index approach which allows various dimensions of sanitation to be combined (weighted and aggregated), whereas with the ladder, all the dimensions are aggregated using a multiplicative function meaning one cannot climb a ladder rung unless all dimensions are fulfilled (which is advantageous with one or two functions).

An example idea for an index approach is a **Score card system** (see post #11995)
This multi-dimensional score card would be a semi-quantitative monitoring system based on an index approach with a generic service level scoring at the end, or 4 to 5 core indicators to encourage stakeholders to optimise systems according to circumstances, in a flexible, simple format. Based on, for example, "Sanitary assessment forms" (WHO) and "Community Score Cards" (World Bank), the TAF, Aguasan sustainability assessment framework.

Another example was to develop **multi-part core monitoring indicator** (see post #12263)
To develop one measurable, robust indicator for monitoring & reporting on each SDG target, as sanitation has several key dimensions and key elements in the targets and functional ladder could be condensed into a 3-part code: for example – sanitation coverage, equity, costs and health + environment benefits, reading as "x% of sanitation coverage with y equity in access achieved at z cost-effectiveness ratio". Would quickly and compactly show performance on four key dimensions of sanitation provision.

Service Level Approach

Each level would define the minimum service need for that level, and in order to proceed to the next level then these minimum requirements need to be fulfilled. Different households or communities decide on the desired, appropriate service level for them (and thus not a "linear development", although lower levels of service may have more benefit to the household, while higher levels, more to the community in general). Sanitation systems could be ranked in a country according to the different dimensions, resulting in service levels for the different functions.

Good practice database and case studies

Good practice databases and case studies as a tool to accompany the sanitation ladder to fill the gap from a functional sanitation ladder on pragmatic advice for decision-makers towards a role in implementation. The good practice approach is already used in health (for example, European Portal for Action on Health Inequalities), and case studies in sanitation have been published by SuSanA using a grading format which has potential to be adapted into a system using a numerical score from an index of factors which are relevant to the ladder rungs.

Further suggestions for steps forward

Suggestions from the discussion for the functional ladder

- Clarify who is served, who is not served
- Focus on a 4 to 5 rung ladder: as the first four steps are usually in focus and achieved
- Focus on the level of service delivered and relate them to a function-based approach: Currently the functions and rungs of the ladder do not allow all the differentiation between different service levels accessed by different households.
- Can the FSL be used in developed and low-income countries (is it more useful for monitoring basic sanitation?
- Can the FSL be simplified to include aspects which can be considered as major concerns in settings that have no or limited sanitation, for example, including a rights approach conceptual framework (thus including issues of availability, physical accessibility, safety, acceptability, affordability)
- Possibility of including two (or more) dimensions to the sanitation ladder to make it less linear? This would perhaps be more stair-based rather than ladder based.
- How to practically incorporate the SDG targets and indicators in a way that will be pragmatic to achieve.

A Continued Call on Adaptations of the Functional Ladder

From the discussion, it would be helpful to further develop examples which have oriented the functional ladder to the needs of practitioners, with indicators that measure towards "safely managed sanitation" to be able to use it towards target 6.2 and 6.3, which organizations can use locally in their sanitation work.

Next Step: of SuSanA Members and Discussion Participants

There were several mentions of the need to get involved in the OWG process, and to have a voice in developing indicators, particularly from a functional perspective. One suggestion was to prepare a recommendations report, a draft of which can be found here, and a role which this synthesis also takes.

Next Step: of the Thematic Leads

The leads emphasized that the thematic discussion has provided an impetus towards making the originally proposed functional ladder more practice-oriented and more relevant in the post-2015 context.

Their next steps will be to review the original functional ladder and produce a new version of the functional ladder which brings it up to date to the post-2015 landscape that may be of use to implementers, providing them with a clear reference framework for their interventions and for monitoring, which conforms to the demands of the SDGs, and the development of the require tools to agree upon, conceive, design, and implement sanitation systems.

Quick Links to the Thematic Discussion:

Sanitation ladder discussion

Background Information for the discussion

YouTube Intro to the discussion

Weekly Summaries

Week 1 Discussion: Evolution and Further Development of the Sanitation Ladder

Week 2 Discussion: The post-2015 agenda and emerging monitoring challenges in the sanitation sector

Week 3 Discussion: The way forward...adaptation of the sanitation ladder to the post-2015 period

Thematic Discussion Series:

About the Thematic Discussion Series (TDS)

TDS Info on the SuSanA Website

All information in this document has been taken as a synthesis of the discussions which took place on the SuSanA Thematic Discussion on The Sanitation Ladder: Next Steps. The discussions used are cited on page one under the heading "The Sanitation Ladder: Next Steps"

To contact the thematic leads, coordination, or participants please either join in the discussion or contact SuSanA through email at: info@susana.org

Looking for more info on SuSanA?

See the website :
www.susana.org

Discussion Forum:
www.forum.susana.org

Working Group Platform:
http://www.susana.org/en/working-groups/overview

Thematic Discussion Series:
http://www.susana.org/en/resources/thematic-discussion-series

Contributors

The following contributors made one or more posts on the forum. There were over 60 posts made by the participants during the three week period. The contributors are listed in order of first posting.

NAME OF CONTRIBUTOR	COUNTRY OF REGISTRATION
Patrick Bracken	Germany
Julius Krischan Makowka	Germany
Joe Turner	UK
Elisabeth Kvarnström	United States
Ricard Gine	Spain
Florian Klingel	Switzerland
Dorothee Spuhler	Switzerland
Sowmya Rajasekaran	India
Roslyn Graham	Germany/ Canada
F H Mughal	Pakistan
Elisabeth Von Muench	Germany
Marijn Zandee	Nepal
John Brogan	Switzerland
Fabiola Garduno	Mexico

Synthesis Contributors

This synthesis has been prepared by the following contributors:

Compiled and Edited by:
Roslyn Graham

Reviewed by:
Patrick Bracken
Ricard Gine
Elisabeth Kvarnström

The Thematic Discussion Series Hosts

The Thematic Discussion Series on sanitation ladder was organised and hosted by the Sustainable Sanitation Alliance (SuSanA) on the SuSanA Discussion Forum Platform

sustainable sanitation alliance

SuSanA Forum