

# EAU VIVE'S EXPERIENCE IMPLEMENTING MUS IN BURKINA FASO

**By Juste Hermann NANSI**  
*Country Director / Burkina Faso & Togo*

MUS GROUP Meeting  
Rome 2011

# Outline



- Presentation of Eau Vive
- Country and region context
- Needs and demand for MUS in 2004
- Objectives and scope of Eau Vive project 2004-2010
- Steps in intervention cycle
- Situation in 2011
- Strengths and weaknesses of the experience
- Steps forward from 2011 to 2014

# About Eau Vive



- French NGO created in 1978
- Support to rural communities for WASH, food security, transboundary river basin management
- Field operations + policy dialogue and advocacy at national and international levels
- 7.5 million USD invested in 2010
- Headquarters in Paris, 4 Country offices in West Africa

# Where is Eau Vive?



# Burkina Faso : Context



## Burkina Faso

- Developing country,
- Water scarcity; 56% coverage for rural drinking water,
- Political commitment to IWRM (supposedly including MUS), but no real strategy for MUS at national or local level
- Important national MDG-based WASH program & unlinked regional programs for irrigation on one hand and livestock watering on other hand.



# Sahel region : Context



## Sahel Region

- Arid region of 36 166 km<sup>2</sup> representing 13.2% of the country
- Low rainfall of 300 to 600 mm/year and a long dry season of 8 months a year
- 1 million inhbits living mostly from livestock breeding (about 2 million head of cattle, mainly goats, but also donkeys and camels)
- Theoretical 42.15% coverage of domestic needs mostly with hand pumps (designed for domestic use of 300 inhbits per pump within a 500m radius)
- Livestock watering through wells and small ponds for 6 to 7 months and through drinking water point for 5 to 6 months
- More than half the people and livestock move from January to June because of water shortages

# Assessing the needs and demand for MUS: case of Wiboria village



## Wiboria village in 2004

- Two important water needs: domestic use (2,000 inhbts) and livestock watering (3,000 cattle and 10,000 goats)
- Both needs insufficiently met (2 borehole/hand pump and ponds/waterholes in rainy season)
- Existing drinking water sources were not designed for livestock watering
- Lack of funds to implement specific water systems for livestock or other needs
- O&M costs for drinking water systems not fully recovered

# Objectives and scope 2004 - 2010



Improving coverage of both domestic water needs and...

...livestock watering and other livelihood needs with...

...improved drinking water systems (fundable within WASH project).



# The intervention cycle (1/2)



- ↓ Collection and assessment of village's drinking water demands
- ↓ Participative drinking water supply planning (prioritization at Commune level with domestic needs coverage as main criteria)
- ↓ Design of water system facilitating both human and livestock supply (by installing trough system with hand pump borehole)

# The intervention cycle (2/2)



- ↓ Design of small community gardens near boreholes
- ↓ Setting of specific tariff for each use domestic, livestock and garden to improve O&M cost recovery
- ↓ Implementation
- ↓ Monitoring and Evaluation

# After the MUS intervention: Wiboria in 2011



- 5 boreholes with hand pumps all functioning
- Adapted tariff setting for diverse uses, socio-economic status and complying with food security issues (for both humans and livestock)
- Full O&M cost recovery for water systems at village level and margin for village participation in new capital investments in WASH
- About half of people and their livestock still move between February and June because of water shortages (available systems are not sufficient to address all needs when waterholes dry up)
- People willing to settle permanently in the village if they can meet human and livestock needs of water and other productive uses

# Strengths of the experience



- ☺ Improvement of drinking water and livestock watering coverage
- ☺ Improvement of drinking water systems O&M cost recovery and village capacity for capital investment for WASH
- ☺ Optimization of available WASH investments funds to address livestock watering issues

# Weaknesses of the experience



- ☹️ No assessment of effective livelihood needs: *How many head of livestock? At what rate is the animal population increasing? How many litres needed per animal per day? Where is the appropriate place to build the system to address efficiently livestock watering needs, etc?)*
- ☹️ No matching between water system capacity and livelihood needs : *a system capacity of 20L/capita/day for 300 inhbits is used to supply 300 inhbits and 1000 head of livestock.*

# Next steps: from 2011 to 2014



## Sahel Region

- ✓ MUS action-research project implemented jointly with a WASH project
- ✓ Testing of “water for livelihood based planning” at village and commune level
- ✓ Identification of new design parameters for water systems
- ✓ Designing of drinking water system optimized at least for both human and livestock needs
- ✓ Implementation of new systems by WASH project
- ✓ Monitoring and evaluation of performance levels and efficiency of new systems
- ✓ Setting new guidelines for drinking water investment planning to be shared at national level for policy improvement

*Lesson learnt: Strictly domestic use water approach in rural areas seems as viable/reliable as this railway...*

For more details:  
[jnansi@eau-vive.org](mailto:jnansi@eau-vive.org)  
[www.eau-vive.org](http://www.eau-vive.org)