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Sanitation in Other Public Institution
1.0 Background

Gram Panchayat (GP) offices are a focal point in rural settings. Most people visit GP offices frequently for their day to day work. It is very important that sanitation and drinking water facilities are adequately available in public places like these. Hence one of the aspects covered in this study is the assessment of sanitation in public offices such as Gram Panchayat offices, Revenue offices, Agricultural offices etc.

Feedback was obtained from HHs (1319 #) that had visited public offices in the last one year and officials (22#) regarding their experiences with the sanitation facilities available in these offices. YSD team also monitored the availability and status of sanitation infrastructure in these public offices (22#).

2.0 Access and Usage

Among the 1969 HHs surveyed in the study, 67% had visited a public office in the last one year. Among them 94% had visited a Gram Panchayat (GP) office. During their visit, 21% HHs had used the toilets at the Public Institutions; 68% did not use the toilets because there was no necessity. Based on their feedback after using toilets in these offices, it is found that 58% offices have toilets, 48% offices have separate toilets for men and women, 34% offices have urinal facilities. Many of these toilets (69%) are friendly for people with special needs (PwSN).

*Figure 1: Availability of sanitation infrastructure in public offices as reported by HHs*

Officials’ feedback indicates that all the public offices have a separate building, 68% of them have drinking water facility, 82% offices have toilets – 61% among them are functional. The figure below gives details of various sanitation infrastructure available in offices as reported by officials.
2.1 Service Quality

Only 32% of those who used the toilets at the public offices reported that the toilets were clean and were maintained well. Proper signage display was also reported by an equal number of HHs (32%). Similar feedback was obtained from the team that observed the toilets in public offices. The team reported that toilets in 56% offices were maintained clean. Availability of water in toilets and ventilation in toilets is reported by 40% HHs that had used the toilets.
Treated water available within the institution is the main source of drinking water in 53% offices as reported by officials. The same was observed by the YSD team which reported that 57% offices used treated water available within the institution as the main source for drinking purposes.

Waste water from toilets in 36% offices flow into surrounding open spaces; 32% flows into open drains and remaining 32% flows into garden as reported by officials. During observation study by the team it was observed that waste water from 66% public offices went out into the surrounding open spaces.
Maintenance and cleaning of toilets in offices is found to be average with officials reporting that toilets are cleaned daily in 44% offices while another 44% said toilets are never cleaned. When cleaned, 90% offices clean their toilets using soaping agent and disinfectant. On the contrary, it was observed that 44% offices cleaned toilets using soaping agent and disinfectants; 25% cleaned only with water.

In 61% offices, toilets and urinals are cleaned by Peons while in remaining offices they are cleaned by concerned office staff as reported by officials. According to the officials, 91% toilets provide privacy for use. Observations show that 75% toilets in offices provide privacy and security for use.

A vast majority of the offices have their premises and surroundings clean (95%). Garbage bins are cleared on a daily basis in 68% offices as reported by officials.

### 2.2 IEC on sanitation in Public offices

Officials report that a majority of the public offices in Ganjam district conduct activities to promote awareness about hygiene and sanitation such as village cleaning and wash drive by GP and WSHG members, rally and door to door campaign, conduct awareness programmes in village about use of toilet etc. Observation of public offices show that the visible efforts are very low with only 5% reporting that offices display use of water posters and even display of signage for public toilet is seen in only 5% offices.

*Figure 7: IEC efforts by public offices on sanitation and hygiene as reported by Officials*
2.3 Sanitation problem incidence and resolution

Problem incidence reported by HHs is low. Only 14% HHs have reported facing sanitation related problems during their visit to public offices. Among them, 74% reported that lack of public toilets is the main sanitation problem they face. Many of those who faced problems did not lodge complaint (65%). The remaining 34% who lodged complaints did so mostly orally (32%) to Sarpanch. Even among the few who lodged complaints about their problems, only 34% reported that their problems were resolved.

Existence of grievance redress mechanism was reported by 21% HHs, however, 68% officials reported the presence of grievance redress mechanism in offices. Only 5 cases were registered in the last one year of which 4 cases were resolved as reported by officials. Lack of toilets is reported as a main problem by officials as well.

Incidence of sanitation problems among officials while discharging their duties in public offices was high with 64% reporting facing problem. A vast majority of them (93%) lodged complaints regarding the problems to Block Development Officer. However, it is very disappointing to note that only 7% among them reported that their problems were resolved.

All public offices maintain records as reported by officials. A majority of them (91%) maintain registers as well as electronic version of the records in computers. A majority (95%) of the officials say it is easy to approach higher authorities in times of necessity and also report that the process of receiving allocated funds to the institution is easy.

Satisfaction with problem resolution is high among HH respondents with 95% of those whose problems were resolved, reporting that they are satisfied with the resolution.

2.4 Overall satisfaction and suggestions for improvement

Overall satisfaction with sanitation facilities in public offices is good with 77% HHs reporting that they are satisfied. Among those HHs that are dissatisfied, main reasons for dissatisfaction shared are as follows:

- Lack of toilets: 50%
- Not allowed to use toilets: 11%
- Lack of separate toilets for women: 6%
Half of the officials are dissatisfied with sanitation and hygiene facilities in the public offices they work at.

Main reasons for dissatisfaction among officials are

- Lack of toilets: 50%
- Lack of drinking water: 47%
- Lack of hand washing: 10%
- Lack of toilets for PwSN: 20%

Users and officials have come forward with suggestions that can help improve the existing sanitation facilities in public offices. Some of the key suggestions are listed below in table 1 and table 2.
Table 1: Key suggestions for improvement of sanitation facilities in Public offices by HH users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions by HHs</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every public institution should build a toilet</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All sanitation problems should be solved at all institutions</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets should be cleaned everyday</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Key suggestions for improvement of sanitation facilities in Public offices by Officials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions by Officials</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate toilets should be constructed for women</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every public institution should construct toilet</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People should use the toilets</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply should be made available for drinking and toilet usage</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet construction should be completed within the right time</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 Conclusion

Most public institutions have toilets of which roughly 70 % are functional. Availability of Urinals is however low. Accessibility of toilets to PwSN is rated uniformly low and observed to be so too. Usage of toilet is low. Generally officials have reported higher availability of sanitation infrastructure as compared to HHs.

Though drinking water is available in a reasonable number of offices water in the toilet is available in very few.

General cleanliness of office premises is good. Garbage bins are not available in sufficient numbers. Where available, Garbage clearance is good. Cleanliness and maintenance of toilets is below average.

Wastewater outlet from toilets into the surrounding spaces is differently reported by officials and by the observation team. However, it is reported by both. This is a serious environmental as well as health issue.
Efforts on spreading awareness on sanitation and hygiene from the offices, is good based on official feedback. However, observation study gives contrasting views. Signage for public toilets are also missing in a majority of the public offices.

Problem incidence reported by HHs is low whereas officials have reported higher incidence rate. Both have however reported a very low problem resolution.

Cooperation from higher officials is good and funds availability for sanitation infrastructure is found to be good.

Overall satisfaction with sanitation in public offices is above average. Officials are more dissatisfied than HH users.