

1 **Healthcare Facility Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Service Status and Barriers**  
2 **in Ethiopia: It's Implication for COVID-19 pandemic and Healthcare Acquired**  
3 **Infection Prevention.**

4

5 Atimen Derso<sup>1\*</sup>, Taffere Addis<sup>1</sup>, Bezatu Mengistie<sup>1</sup>, Awoke keleb<sup>2</sup>, Ayechew  
6 Ademas<sup>2</sup>

7 <sup>1</sup>Institute of Ethiopian Water Resource, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa,  
8 Ethiopia.

9 <sup>2</sup>Department of Environmental Health, College of Medicine and Health Sciences,  
10 Wollo University, Dessie, Ethiopia

11

12

13 Corresponding author: \*atimen.de@gmail.com

14

## 15      **Abstract**

16      **Background:** Despite the public health significance of healthcare Water, Sanitation,  
17      and Hygiene (WASH) service in reduction of nosocomial infection and improving  
18      quality of care is paramount little is known on the status of WASH service in a health  
19      care facility at the time of pandemic and the barriers that hinder the service in the  
20      health care setting in Ethiopia.

21      **Objective:** The aim of this study was to assess status of basic water, sanitation, hand  
22      hygiene, healthcare waste management, and environmental cleanliness service and its  
23      barriers at public health care facilities in the city of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia 2022.

24      **Methods:** Convergent parallel mixed design was conducted among 86 public health  
25      care facilities located in Addis Ababa city. Stratified sampling technique was used to  
26      select health care facilities. A semi-structured observational checklist tool was used to  
27      measure the availability of services. For the qualitative study, semi-structured  
28      interview was conducted among 16 key informants and thematic data analysis was  
29      done to identify the barriers.

30      **Finding:** This study found that no one healthcare facility had basic access to overall  
31      WASH services. The independent WASH domain analysis showed that, about 86%  
32      healthcare facilities had basic water access, 100% had limited sanitation access, 88.4  
33      % had limited hand hygiene service, 69.8% had limited healthcare waste management  
34      service, and 97.7% had limited environmental cleaning service. Built environments of  
35      WASH infrastructure; Resource availability and allocation; leadership and  
36      stakeholder participation; inadequate training and poor behaviour; and legal issues  
37      were identified barriers to provision of basic healthcare WASH services.

38      **Conclusion and recommendation:** The availability of healthcare WASH services in  
39      Addis Ababa city remains far from the pace to achieve the sustainable goal target by

40 2025. The limited access to WASH services makes worsening the prevention and  
41 control of COVID-19 pandemics, healthcare acquired infection in the facility. The  
42 country need to act now on more financial investment, capacity building, facilitating  
43 committed leadership, and participation of stakeholders to ensuring basic WASH  
44 services at healthcare setting.

45 **Key words:** WASH services, Healthcare facilities, Barriers, COVID-19, Ethiopia.

## 46        **Introduction**

47        Availability of sustainable WASH in a health care facility is critical for quality care to  
48        meet individual preferences, needs, and values; without minimum standards of  
49        WASH service in all health care facilities cannot meet the demand for good quality of  
50        care and human right to health (1). Provision of basic WASH service is a prerequisite  
51        for infection prevention and control(IPC) which can protect front-line health care  
52        workers, patients, visitors from infectious disease transmission in a health care  
53        setting; and it is human rights, dignity, social justice and gender issue at any health  
54        care setting (1,2).

55        Inadequate WASH remains one of the determinants of the global burden of disease as  
56        pointed out by Pruss-Ustun et.al (3). Lack of basic healthcare WASH services is a  
57        major public health problem, and it continues a challenge to international  
58        communities. Emerging and re-emerging diseases like Antimicrobials Resistance  
59        (AMR), Ebola, and COVID-19 pandemic place WASH as a centre of disease  
60        prevention. Health care WASH is more important than ever in the role of prevention  
61        of COVID-19 and AMR among patients, staff, or community (4,5). However,  
62        worldwide 11% of healthcare facilities had no water service, 10% of health care  
63        facilities had no sanitation service, and only 51% of health care facilities had basic  
64        hand hygiene service at the point of care and nearby toilet by 2022, which makes  
65        hundreds of millions of people are face risk of infection; since more than 681 million  
66        people lacked basic waste management service in health care facilities in Sub-Sahara  
67        African countries, and 3.85 billion people worldwide lacked basic hand hygiene  
68        service at their healthcare facilities (6).

69        The Lancet review reveals that healthcare-associated infection burden is much higher  
70        in developing than developed countries, which is more than 15% of patients

71 developed an infection when they are staying in hospitals; and the risk of patients  
72 admitted to health care facility acquire one or more infection is two to twenty times  
73 higher developing than developed countries (7,8). Systematic review in Africa reveal  
74 that poor WASH services provision in the HCF causes women to choose home  
75 delivery and increase patient dissatisfaction in low and middle-income countries (9).  
76 We argue that health care professionals are at the front line of protecting clients from  
77 infection and covid-19 pandemic response, and they are exposed to infection when  
78 they are working in a high-risk environment. As reported by Desta et.al (10), the  
79 availability of supplies and infrastructure of WASH service is critical to safeguard  
80 health care professionals and to enhance the practice of IPC. The lesson gain from  
81 Ebola outbreak and Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) implies poor WASH  
82 service in the health system ready-made to expose clients and frontline workers to  
83 infection and expand the COVID-19 pandemic. Worldwide the proportion of health  
84 care workers infected with SARS was from 20% to 60% (11); and Cooper et.al  
85 reported, there was challenging to expand the outbreak of Ebola in Liberian  
86 healthcare facilities with poor WASH services for IPC (12).  
87 To improve WASH service in a health care facility, which has public health  
88 significance in the reduction of nosocomial infection, improving quality of care,  
89 increasing healthcare-seeking behaviour, and averting cost expend for infection  
90 Ethiopia launched WASH initiatives, clean and safe health facility (CASH), and  
91 sector-wide One-WASH national program (OWNP) (13). However, there is a dearth  
92 of evidence on the status of basic health care WASH service and the barriers that  
93 setback the provision of WASH services in a health care setting in Ethiopia. Therefore  
94 the aim of this study was to assess the status of basic WASH services availability and

95 explore the barriers to providing adequate WASH services in public health care  
96 setting through mixed research design in the city of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

## 97 **Materials and Methods**

### 98 **Study Area**

99 The study was conduct in Addis Ababa city. There are 14 public hospitals including  
100 specialty centres and COVID-19 treatment centres, and 100 health centres located in  
101 the city of Addis Ababa. With the efforts of private health care facility these public  
102 health care facilities are serving in a range of health care services for Addis Ababa  
103 city population and part of Ethiopia, which is estimated to be around 5,228,000 by  
104 2022 (<https://population.un.org/wpp/>). During pandemic, Addis Ababa city is the city  
105 where the highest number of COVID-19 cases located which accounting 54.2%  
106 (254,447) of people tested positive were located in Addis Ababa city from the total of  
107 469,581 positive cases. (<https://ethiopianhealthdata.org/dashboard/covid19-ethiopia>).  
108 (Figure 1)

### 109 **Study Design/Approach and period**

110 Convergent parallel mixed design was conducted. We intend to use convergent  
111 parallel mixed design to collect both quantitative and qualitative forms of data  
112 independently at the same time farm on the same concepts of WASH services and  
113 analyse and integrate the information to final interpretation of results to have a  
114 complete understanding of the research questions(14). The study was conducted from  
115 March, 2022 to June, 2022.

### 116 **Study population**

117 The study population of this study was all public health care facilities, health centre,  
118 specialty centres, and referral and teaching hospitals located in the city of Addis  
119 Ababa.

## 120 **Inclusion and Exclusion criteria**

121 **Inclusion criteria:** public healthcare facilities in Addis Ababa which provide service  
122 for the communities during the study were included.

123 **Exclusion criteria:** public healthcare facility in the city which is exclusively serving  
124 for a COVID-19 treatment centre was excluded.

## 125 **Study Variables**

126 Dependent variable: WASH services status

127 Independent variables: WASH service barriers

## 128 **Operational Definition**

129 **WASH services status:** The status of WASH services in the health care facility will  
130 be measured by JMP health care facility WASH standard, and the five indicators of  
131 WASH service has been classified into separate three-level service ladder (basic,  
132 limited, and no service) as guided by GMP standard (16).

133 **Basic Water Service:** health care facility where the main source of water is an  
134 improved source and located on the premises, and from which water is available at the  
135 time of the survey (16).

136 **Basic Sanitation Service:** health care facility with improved and usable sanitation  
137 facilities, and with at least one toilet dedicated for staff, and one sex separated toilet  
138 with menstrual hygiene facilities and one toilet accessible for users with limited  
139 mobility (16).

140 **Basic Hand Hygiene Service:** health care facility with fictional hand hygiene  
141 facilities are available at one or more points of care and within 5 meters of toilets (16).

142 **Basic Health Care Waste Management Services:** healthcare facilities where waste  
143 is safely segregated in consultation areas, and sharps wastes are treated and disposed  
144 of safely, and infectious wastes are treated and disposed of safely (16).

145 **Basic environmental cleaning services:** health care facility that have a protocol for  
146 cleaning, and staff with cleaning responsibilities have all received training on cleaning  
147 procedures (16).

148 **Barriers:** barriers are challenges or bottlenecks that deter health care facilities to  
149 provide adequate WASH service or to the improvement of WASH services in health  
150 care facility (17).

## 151 **Sample Size Determination and Sampling Procedure for quantitative** 152 **study**

153 Sample size was determined using a single proportion formula with the assumption of  
154 the estimated availability of basic treatment and disposal of healthcare waste service  
155 in Ethiopia was 64 % from JMP baseline healthcare WASH report (18), 95%  
156 confidence interval (CI) and  $\alpha=5\%$ , 5% marginal error.

$$157 \quad n = \frac{[(z_{\alpha/2})^2 * (p(1 - p))]}{w^2}$$

158  $n$ = minimum requirement of sample size

159  $z_{\alpha/2}$ = the critical value of SD at 5% of  $\alpha$  ( $z_{\alpha/2}= z_{0.025}=1.96$ )

160  $p$ = availability of healthcare waste management service

161  $w$  =marginal error=5%=0.05

$$162 \quad n = \frac{[(1.96)^2 * 0.64 * (1 - 0.64)]}{0.05^2} \quad n = \mathbf{354}$$

163 However, the total source population in this study is 114 healthcare facility which less  
164 than 10,000. Based on this population we used reduction formula to calculate final  
165 sample size as recommended by scholars.

$$166 \quad n' = \frac{n}{1 + \frac{(n - 1)}{N}}$$



167  $n'$ = final sample size,  $n$ = first calculated sample size,  $N$ = total study/source  
168 population

$$169 \quad n' = \frac{354}{1 + \frac{(354 - 1)}{114}}$$

170  $n'$ = 86, the study need 86 healthcare facilities.

171 To get representative sample stratified random sampling technic was used. Simple  
172 random sampling technique was applied to select hospital and health centre.

### 173 **Study participants and recruitment technic for Qualitative study**

174 For the qualitative study, there are no agreed ways to determine the sample size (15).  
175 The saturation or redundancy of information about all need concepts after conducting  
176 a sequential interview was determine the number of sample size (19). Accordingly,  
177 the study participant, 16 key informants, were selected through purposive sampling  
178 method from hospitals (11 participants IPC focal person) and health center (4 medical  
179 directors), and Addis Ababa health bureau (one WASH program expert) based on  
180 personal experience or knowledge on healthcare WASH services and exposure to  
181 WASH services barriers at a health care facility and whose views or opinions can  
182 provide focused, useful, and creditable rich information..

### 183 **Data collection tool and procedure for quantitative study**

184 The quantitative data was collected by a semi-structured observational checklist  
185 adapted from WHO and UNICEF joint monitoring program core question, and  
186 indicators in monitoring WASH service level in health care facilities (20).  
187 Observation of WASH services was carried out through observing water, sanitation,  
188 hand hygiene, and waste management facility and functioning of service at the time of  
189 observation, and asking and reviewing supportive documents and standards IPC  
190 department. The observation was held by trained two data collectors. After getting

191 legitimacy the data collectors were taken the spatial location of facilities  
192 (geographical positioning coordinate), and visit the WASH infrastructure of the  
193 facility's randomly selected outpatient service area and finally they were visit the  
194 hospital or health centre environment related to health care waste treatment and  
195 disposal system; sanitation service; hand washing service; and observing and asking  
196 environmental cleaning services and protocols.

### 197 **Data collection tool and procedure for the qualitative study**

198 For qualitative data collection, face-to-face in-depth interviews with purposively  
199 selected key informants were conducted by the principal investigator through semi-  
200 structured interview guide which is adapted from relevant literatures. After getting  
201 participant consent in written and oral form, the principal investigator was conduct  
202 face-to-face dialogue with key informants. The interview was recorded by an  
203 audiotape recorder with additional key informant emphasis were held on memos by  
204 the interviewer. The interview was continued until no new information or concepts  
205 emerged for all questions (total 16 interviews has been conducted).

### 206 **Data quality assurance**

207 The quality of the data and research process were ensured through adequate training  
208 (one-day training) for data collectors (BSc) and 2 supervisors (postgraduate) on the  
209 purpose of the study, part of questionnaire to assess WASH services, way of quality  
210 assurance, research ethics, and observing and data recording approach. The data  
211 collection was started within a week after the training. Data collectors were also  
212 supervised every day at the time of the survey.

213 To ensure the trustfulness and reliability of qualitative findings, the interview  
214 technique was revised in between interview periods if there is any new insight from  
215 the prior interview, key informants were encourage expressing their ideas and opinion

216 freely at begging of interview and explain their experience on healthcare WASH  
217 service. We were check carefully the meaning (description) of each code with the data  
218 given that code. A detailed description of major themes has been carried out.  
219 Qualitative researchers were invited to review the finding and raise questions on them  
220 to improve the credibility of the result.

### 221 **Data management and analysis for quantitative study**

222 The completeness of data was checked manually and after editing and clearing, data  
223 entry was done by using Epi data version 3.1. Then, the data was exported to SPSS  
224 version 25 for analysis. Descriptive analysis was carried out to quantitative data. All  
225 observed core questions under each WASH service indicator have been presented  
226 through frequency distribution tables, bar graphs, and narration. The percentage of  
227 water, sanitation, hygiene, waste management, and environmental cleanliness service  
228 availability across the health care facility was compute from the summation of core  
229 questions that are used to measure basic, limited, and no service level.

### 230 **Data management and analysis for the qualitative study**

231 Thematic analysis method was conducted for the qualitative data. The analysis of  
232 qualitative data was undergoing after each interview has been ended. First, after  
233 conducting the interview, audio recorded data and filed note (memo) data were under  
234 go transcribed and translated to English and the text data was stored and located in  
235 qualitative data management Atlas ti software. Second, organize the data; Third-  
236 generating initial codes; Fourth-organized codes; after revising the identified codes,  
237 potential themes or contents were created by clustering or categorizing related codes  
238 based on their concepts and relationship. Fifth-organized main themes; themes were  
239 revised, interrelating, and categorized which includes the barriers of WASH provision

240 in the health care setting, and finally main themes were defined and explained with  
241 quotes of key informants' opinions on the barriers as a major finding as part of report.

## 242 **Ethical Consideration**

243 Ethical clearance approval was sought from the ethical review board of St. Paul's  
244 Hospital Millennium Medical College and Addis Ababa Public Health Research and  
245 Emergency Management Directorate. Verbal and written consent was obtained for  
246 each study participant before the interview. This study was address the code of  
247 research ethics on disclosing all the necessary information regarding autonomous  
248 rights, confidentiality, risk and benefit, free withdrawal at the time of interview.

## 249 **Results**

### 250 **Water service availability**

251 A total of 86 health care facilities were studied during the survey. Of which, 75(87.2)  
252 were health centers, and 11(12.8%) of facility were hospitals including specialty  
253 centers, referral, and specialized teaching hospitals. The mean daily client flow rate at  
254 hospital and health centre was 590.6 ( $\pm$  541.5) and 220.6 ( $\pm$  88.8), respectively. The  
255 overall proportion of basic water service availability in healthcare facilities in Addis  
256 Ababa was 74 (86%), while limited water service was 12(14%). At the time of the  
257 survey, one out of six health centers (16%) in Addis Ababa city had limited water  
258 service (Figure 2).

259 All studied healthcare facilities had access piped water from an improved source  
260 located within the health care facility premises. However, water was not available  
261 from main source at time of the survey at 12(14%) healthcare facility and nearly  
262 three-quarters 64(74.4%) of healthcare facilities had faced water discontinuity before  
263 the survey. Moreover, 47(54.7 %) of healthcare facility had not piped water access at  
264 the OPD (Table 1).

## 265 **Sanitation service availability**

266 All healthcare facilities, 86(100%) had limited sanitation services and no one the  
267 healthcare facilities had access to basic sanitation services. Of the total, 49(57%)  
268 healthcare facilities had usable toilets. Only 4(4.7%) of healthcare facilities and  
269 17(19.8%) of healthcare facilities had access to menstrual hygiene toilets and toilets  
270 accessible for users with limited mobility respectively (Table 2).

## 271 **Hand hygiene service availability**

272 Out of 86 observed healthcare institutions, only 7(8.1%) institutions, one hospital, and  
273 six health centers, had access to basic hand hygiene services, while three healthcare  
274 facilities (3.5%), one hospital and two health centers, had not to hand hygiene service  
275 both at point of care and within 5 meters of the toilet. Majority of healthcare  
276 institution had limited hand hygiene service, meaning that they had not to hand  
277 hygiene service both at the point of care and nearby the toilet (Figure 3).

278 Of all, 59(68.6%) of healthcare facilities had functional hand hygiene facilities (either  
279 with water and soap or alcohol hand rub) at point of care. However, 11(12.8%) of  
280 healthcare facilities had not to hand hygiene service at the point of care.(Table 3).

## 281 **Healthcare waste management service availability**

282 Out of 86, healthcare facilities studied 25(29%) had not to waste management service  
283 at all. Unfortunately, only one (1.2%) facility had basic healthcare waste management  
284 service. More than two thirds 60(69.8%) of Public healthcare facilities in the city of  
285 Addis Ababa had limited waste management service (Figure 4).

286 Of all healthcare facilities, 25(29%) of facilities had not to waste segregation bins in  
287 the outpatient department; only one hospital safely segregated medical waste in three  
288 labelled bins. Seventy-nine (91.8%) healthcare facilities and 80(93%) healthcare  
289 facilities used brick-type incinerators for the disposal of infectious waste and sharp

290 waste respectively. A protected pit was used by all healthcare facilities to dispose  
291 placenta and pathological waste. All healthcare facilities dispose of pharmaceutical  
292 waste at the national waste collection point in collaboration with Food and Drug  
293 Administration Authority (FDA), Ministry of Health, and Addis Ababa Regional  
294 Health Bureau (Table 4).

### 295 **Environmental cleaning service availability**

296 Only 2(2.3%) healthcare facilities had basic environmental cleaning services, while  
297 the rest 84(97.7%) healthcare facilities had limited service (Figure 5).

298 About one quarter 22(25.6%) of health care facilities had cleaning protocols for all  
299 cleaning services with cleaning schedules, and only 2(2.7%) health centers trained all  
300 staff related to cleaning services and standards. Furthermore, only 7(8.2%) of  
301 healthcare facilities had cleaning supplies including cleaning equipment and detergent  
302 in the patient care area (Table 5).

### 303 **Healthcare WASH service barriers**

### 304 **Socio-demographic characteristics of key informants**

305 For the qualitative interview, 16 key informants have participated. Of these, 11 were  
306 recruited from hospitals, 4 were from health center, and one was from Addis Ababa  
307 Regional health bureau. Among the participants, 12(75%) were male. The  
308 participants were between the age of 26 and 58 with a mean age of  $35.25 \pm 7.77$  years  
309 had 3 to 39 years of working experience with a mean of  $10.94 \pm 9.23$  years. Thirteen  
310 and three participants had bachelor's degrees and master's degrees educational status,  
311 respectively. Of these, 11(68.7%) were working as infection prevention and control  
312 officers, 4(25%) participants were working as medical directors, and 1(6.3%)  
313 participant working as WASH program officer, respectively. The average time for the  
314 interview was 26.16 minutes.

### 315 **Healthcare WASH service barriers**

316 The qualitative parts of the study consist of five main themes and 12 subthemes of  
317 barrier, to providing basic healthcare WASH services, raised by the participants.

318 **Built Environment and Necessity:** the most frequently quoted challenges by  
319 participants; it describes limited availability, poor design, none functioning, poor  
320 maintenance service of healthcare WASH infrastructure and shortage of necessities  
321 like water affects healthcare WASH service provision. This theme emerged from four  
322 subthemes, non-availability (inadequate) of basic WASH infrastructure; lack of  
323 maintenance service; poor design and layout of facility and WASH infrastructures;  
324 and shortage of necessities.

325 **Resource availability and allocation:** in this theme, the availability of resource and  
326 allocation of it affects the status of WASH services. Participants mention that the  
327 inadequate procurements of supplies, extended bid system, high maintenance cost,  
328 and inadequate (lack) budget allocation for WASH impeded healthcare WASH  
329 service. The subthemes under this theme were inadequate (lack) budget allocation and  
330 shortage of supplies.

331 **Stakeholder participation and Leadership commitment:** this theme describes the  
332 lack of supervision and commitments of facility managers, and responsible  
333 governmental institutions, and the lack of partner organization participation are  
334 among the barriers to providing basic healthcare WASH service. Emerged subthemes  
335 are the lack of administrative support and leadership; and lack of partner  
336 organizations participation.

337 **Individual level barrier:** this theme describes individual level awareness, attitude,  
338 and behaviour, able to improve or retard the level of healthcare WASH service. The

339 emerged subthemes under this main theme are lack of training and awareness; and  
340 poor attitude and behaviour.

341 **Legal issue barrier:** this theme describes the role of framework and guidelines on  
342 healthcare WASH service. Participants said the poor status of healthcare WASH  
343 service is attributed to unavailability of framework supported by healthcare WASH  
344 program documents and guidelines for a year. Emerged themes are the lack of  
345 program-supported framework, and the lack of healthcare WASH guidelines.

### 346 **1. Built environment and Necessity related barrier**

347 This main theme describes the most frequented barriers related to hardware  
348 infrastructure and the necessity to provide basic healthcare WASH service as  
349 mentioned by participants. Most of the time, the available WASH facilities were not  
350 fully functioning because of a lack of timely maintenance and renovation services.

351 Another barrier related to the build environment is the design of the building and  
352 WASH hardware; each service point of the facility had not WAHS system because of  
353 the poor design of the facility. In addition, participants state that shortage of water is a  
354 critical challenge for healthcare WASH services.

#### 355 **A. Non-availability of basic WASH infrastructures**

356 The participants described healthcare facilities are not doing WASH services as per  
357 the standard. The minimum requirement of basic WASH infrastructure has not been  
358 available and it was not in line with client flow and as per the standard. Senior  
359 program officer participant stated that;

360 *“Availability of built facility (hardware) is a basic challenge; you know...all*  
361 *the facilities were not constructed considering adequacy and the inclusive*  
362 *WASH issues that create a significant challenge in the facility itself to address*  
363 *the issue right now”.* (KI 11)



364 Participants noted that the construction of WASH facility at healthcare setting was not  
365 considered users contenance and inclusive at the first beginning to address the issue of  
366 WASH for all; which was inadequate, and lack of user-sensitive toilets impact the  
367 usability of WASH service and compromise the needs of clients and facility staffs at  
368 all. The female deputy medical director of the health center stated that;

369 *“...we do have a narrow outpatient room (small in surface area by m2)*  
370 *without hand washing facility. We do have also small number of toilets; the*  
371 *users and number of toilets are not much, we do not have toilets for menstrual*  
372 *hygiene service, also we do not have toilets for limited mobility customers*  
373 *including staff. Personally I fear what will happen to these existing WASH*  
374 *services if cholera occurred at this time”. (KI 14)*

375 Despite participants recognizing the significance of WASH service availability at  
376 each point of care and critical area, there was a variation of availability among service  
377 points. A medical director from the health center stated that

378 *“....some rooms have not to WASH service equipment (hardware facility). As*  
379 *you know every service provider at the point of care should wash their hand*  
380 *after a visit or counselling each patient but most of our service point rooms*  
381 *had not to hand washing facility”. (KI 12).*

382 The number of WASH facilities and users was not balanced, and participants were  
383 stressed on the ratio of expected users to available hardware should be critically  
384 designed and planned at the time of healthcare facility construction. An infection  
385 prevention officer (IPC) from one hospital described;

386 *“...One of the challenges is WASH infrastructure availability; for example, in*  
387 *our hospital, there are no built washing sinks (hand washing) at each point of*  
388 *care or service point. And also the hospitals have inadequate toilets”.(KI 04)*

389 **B. Lack of maintenance service of WASH infrastructures**

390 The other barrier described by participants was the lack of a functional WASH facility  
391 and poor maintenance services of it. Not all WASH facilities were fully functioning  
392 and ready to use because of a lack of active maintenance and renovation services. A  
393 senior IPC officer from one hospital stated;

394 *“...from my experience, it is common to see broken or non-function toilets,*  
395 *sinks, and other WASH services hardware in this hospital, which are not*  
396 *maintained timely the same time. There is a maintained inability to make the*  
397 *service fully (100%) functional in a timely and sustainable manner”.* (KI 02)

398 Most of the healthcare facility had not sanitary maintenance workers and electricians  
399 at the time of the survey and the state of sustained functionality of WASH  
400 infrastructure are questionable; due to that lack of actively tracking and maintenance  
401 service was challenging for the healthcare facilities. IPC officer from one hospital  
402 described;

403 *“...Lack of sustainability issues for the existing WASH facilities is a challenge*  
404 *in our hospital; what I have observed in our facility is there is no culture of*  
405 *prevention which means there is no active preventive maintenance and repair*  
406 *service for WASH systems rather corrective one”.* (KI 08).

407 **C. Poor design of WASH infrastructure**

408 Another barrier related to the build environment is the design and layout of the  
409 building and WASH hardware; participants explained that how the design of the  
410 building and installation of WASH hardware substantially enhance or retarded  
411 healthcare WASH services. The program officer from Regional Health Bureau  
412 explained that;

413            *"...The major bottlenecks are related to the design of buildings, if you*  
414            *experience the available health centers in the city the toilets and hand washing*  
415            *facilities are not functional which is mainly resulted from the poor design and*  
416            *installation of WASH facilities".(KI 11)*

417    As stated by participants, each service point of the facility had not all WAHS system  
418    because of the poor design of the facility; even if the hardware is available, it might  
419    not be fully functional because some of the facilities (hospitals) were built many years  
420    ago and they need to be renovated, and some of the hardware has not been properly  
421    installed. The health center medical director stated;

422            *"...If we observe the service delivery areas, they don't have water service;*  
423            *because water pipe is not installed towards many of the service areas in the*  
424            *first beginning, and also the rooms (service point) had not installed hand*  
425            *washing facility. Sometimes, I thought like.... the building was not built for*  
426            *healthcare facility at the first beginning". (KI 16)*

427    **D. Shortage of necessity:**

428    In all healthcare facilities, shortage of water was found to be challenging for  
429    healthcare WASH service provision; even if the hardware is available, shortage of  
430    water was mentioned as a challenge to make fully functional all other WASH services  
431    across the building. Another deputy medical director from the health center explained;

432            *"...we are sharing water with the community, we do not access water*  
433            *independently and water is interrupted for three (3) or four(4) days...even we*  
434            *do have a limited number of tankers as a backup of water to serve us a couple*  
435            *of days and it will run away at the end". (KI 13)*

## 436 **2. Resource availability and allocation related barriers**

437 In the healthcare setting, the availability and allocation of adequate resources have  
438 played a significant role in the hardware and software components of WASH service.

439 The participant mentioned that the availability and practice of healthcare WASH  
440 service was affected by inadequate budget allocation for WASH, inadequate  
441 procurements of supplies, extended bid system, and high maintenance cost; An IPC  
442 officer from the hospital highlighted that;

443 *“The challenge is no separate budget for the IPC and WASH service and there*  
444 *is frequently a shortage of WASH-related supplies. We did not ask them why*  
445 *supplies run out frequently and why purchased in a timely because there is no*  
446 *separate budget code assigned to WASH activities, even not for IPC”.* (KI 07).

447 Participants said that not only a shortage of resources but also unable to use dedicated  
448 budget effectively was found to be a barrier; poor supply procurement habit of  
449 administration and extended or delayed bid system was challenging the healthcare  
450 WASH service. One of IPC officers from the hospital supported it;

451 *“The WASH service is not available similarly in each room due to a shortage*  
452 *of supplies. For instance, lack of segregation of biohazard wastes; the*  
453 *purchasing process of the government (facility administration) is very lagging.*  
454 *Lack of sharp waste collecting bins (safety box) is also one of our problems;*  
455 *we use safety boxes prepared from normal cartons which are not as per the*  
456 *standard. This is available on the market system, but there is purchasing*  
457 *delay”.* (KI 02).

## 458 **3. Stakeholder participation and Leadership**

459 This theme describes the lack of supervision and commitments of facility managers  
460 and responsible governmental institutions, and the lack of partner organization

461 participation are among the barriers that hampering basic healthcare WASH access.  
462 Emerged subthemes are inadequate administrative support and poor leadership, and  
463 lack of partner organization participation.

464 **A. lack of administrative support and leadership**

465 A great challenge is the lack of actively engaging in the implementation of WASH  
466 activities. The participants' explanation was agreed that the improvement of  
467 healthcare WASH services needs the engagement and support of governmental  
468 administration and committed health sector and facility leadership. This is the  
469 problem of most of the facilities at the time of the survey challenging back the  
470 healthcare WASH service, with a little bit of variation, the management staff either  
471 from the facility or higher offices did not have commitments to share and fix the  
472 challenges. One of the hospital IPC officers stated that;

473 *“One of the major challenges is lack of senior management engagement, they*  
474 *do not consider the WASH activities as the major one rather considering it as*  
475 *additional and/or auxiliary activity and task aside to the clinical service. For*  
476 *instance, they did not allocate budget for the supplies and maintenance*  
477 *service, they did not conduct routine support for WASH activities” (KI 07)*

478 The problem was magnified at the health center level, which denied them from  
479 seeking financial and technical support from higher health sector offices like sub-  
480 cities and regional health bureaus. The health center depute medical director described  
481 that;

482 *“...We do not have supportive supervision and follow-up from sub-city or any*  
483 *higher office regarding Health center WASH services. Since in my career in*  
484 *this facility, no one is visit here until now, to support and supervise WASH*  
485 *service specifically unlike other clinical service” (KI 14).*

486 Unlike the clinical service, WASH service was not emphasized by the Regional Health  
487 Bureau and Ministry of health starting from the design and construction of the health  
488 facility to the implementation of the WASH program, participants described how this  
489 made challenging for the existing healthcare WASH service. The program officer  
490 supported this statement;

491 *“The major problem is during the construction of buildings when the health*  
492 *facilities are constructed, it is based on the interest of engineer’s taken the*  
493 *contract. Health care professionals and WASH experts are not participating in*  
494 *the design of buildings”.*(KI 11)

495 Health sector governance has not given attention to allocating WASH practitioners in  
496 the healthcare facility, particularly at health centers. Participants described that  
497 challenging of limited or shortage of technical personnel assigned for effective  
498 implementation of healthcare WASH service, unavailability of environmental health  
499 and hygiene experts in the health facilities (87% of healthcare facilities) is affecting  
500 the system which resulted from lack of emphasis given for healthcare WASH  
501 services. The WASH program officer highlighted that;

502 *“Most of the health facilities use health officers or other professionals at IP*  
503 *(infection prevention) focal persons but no environmental health professional*  
504 *is deployed for the position. So, the challenge is related to the shortage of*  
505 *environmental health professionals”.* (KI 11)

#### 506 **B. lack of partner organization participation**

507 Some of participant rose that, the other challenge to limited healthcare WASH service  
508 is due to the absence of partner organization participation in healthcare WASH  
509 project. The participant’s opinion described that engagement of partner organizations  
510 would improve and sustain basic healthcare WASH service yet that did not happen.

511 The unavailability of agreement between partner organizations and healthcare facility  
512 administering body is the unmet opportunity for healthcare WASH services. The IPC  
513 officer highlighted this;

514 *“...I think lack of engagement of partner organizations like NGOs.....or*  
515 *governmental stakeholders working on it (WASH), is just one of the enabling*  
516 *environments for limited services of healthcare WASH. Renovation of*  
517 *hospitals like waste management technology including incinerator, waste*  
518 *drainage system could be upgraded and sustained by external stockholder yet*  
519 *not that happened on the ground”. (KI 04)*

520 Although partner organizations are participating in many clinical service programs in  
521 most of the surveyed hospitals, the participants indicated that the WASH service was  
522 overlooked in the health settings. Participants believed that the constraints of resource  
523 and technology limitations of the facility could be overcome by engagements of  
524 partner organizations, as highlighted by the deputy medical director;

525 *“We need support from partner organizations because they could be the*  
526 *source of funds, there may do have alternative technology and improve all*  
527 *over the status of WASH both in hardware and capacity building aspects”.(KI*  
528 *14)*

#### 529 **4. Individual level barriers**

530 This theme describes individual level awareness; attitude and behaviour can improve  
531 or retard the level of healthcare WASH service. The emerged subthemes under this  
532 main theme are lack of training and awareness; and attitude and behaviour.

##### 533 **A. Lack of Training and Awareness**

534 The training was given to healthcare professionals including cleaners across  
535 healthcare facilities. However, participants pointed out how low levels of awareness

536 and inadequate training on healthcare WASH among staff and allied workers were  
537 challenging to healthcare WASH service, leading to the poor practice of it. The IPC  
538 officer said that;

539 *“Even though the hospital is continuous professional development (CPD)*  
540 *center, healthcare workers did not take adequate training; They do have a low*  
541 *level of awareness on the importance of healthcare WASH which leads to poor*  
542 *adherence to WASH service practice during healthcare attachment*  
543 *particularly poor hand hygiene compliance and waste management*  
544 *practice” (KI 03)*

#### 545 **B. Poor Attitude and Behaviour**

546 Participants said that both professionals and management did not feel that WASH  
547 activities are the responsibility of all other staff beyond designated IPC officers and  
548 cleaners; They considered WASH is just an IPC, and they did not want to take a role  
549 in the improvements of healthcare WASH service. IPC officer from one hospital  
550 noted;

551 *“One of the first challenges is attitude problem on IPC and WASH because*  
552 *IPC is not individual responsibility its responsibility of all staff, patients and*  
553 *management bodies; however, some staffs even management bodies perceived*  
554 *that WASH is just an IPC and it is only the duty of the focal person or IPC*  
555 *officers”.* (KI 04)

556 There was also professional negligence and ignorance towards the importance of  
557 healthcare WASH service at the point of care; participants pointed out that some  
558 professionals were not adhering to the practice of cleaning protocols. An IPC officer  
559 from one hospital described that;



560 *“There are a physician and other health professionals who perceived that ICP*  
561 *is just bout hand washing; so that they do not mind about WASH activities like*  
562 *waste segregation at point of care, cleaning of point of care and the like”.*(KI  
563 02)

564 Similarly, participants noted that negligence of proper waste segregation among  
565 clients was found one of the challenges to healthcare WASH services, as spoken by  
566 the IPC officer;

567 *“Waste segregation practice is very poor among caregiver of the patient and*  
568 *health professionals have poor practice in waste segregation. For example,*  
569 *they damp gloves inappropriately but mostly waste segregation problem*  
570 *raised from the client, caregiver and visitors and we try to face the problem*  
571 *by giving health education”.* (KI 05)

## 572 **5. Legal issue towards healthcare WASH**

573 Participants believed that the existing poor healthcare WASH service was attributed  
574 to unavailability of a holistic WASH framework supported by healthcare WASH  
575 guidelines. Unavailability of healthcare associated infection surveillance systems, and  
576 unavailability of guidelines in healthcare settings was a challenge to WASH service  
577 provision. An IPC officer from the hospital stated that;

578 *“There is no working healthcare WASH framework unlike other clinical*  
579 *services given in the hospital. There is no surveillance system and tracking*  
580 *staff in the hospital that conduct tracking of healthcare associated infections”.*  
581 (KI 03)

582 Among the surveyed healthcare facility not more than 4 facilities started to apply and  
583 practice new healthcare WASH guideline; hence unavailability of specific healthcare

584 WASH guideline for a year was also a challenge as participants raised. An IPC officer  
585 explained it;

586 *“There is no specific WASH document or officer. WASH activities are*  
587 *overlooked in healthcare setting; there is IPC guideline and IPC focal officer*  
588 *who runs WASH integrated with the IPC department. Healthcare facilities had*  
589 *no independent guideline and professional staff responsible for primarily to*  
590 *WASH service”.* (KI 10)

## 591 **Discussion**

592 The findings of this mixed study provide the current status of healthcare WASH  
593 service and the contemporary opinion of participants (healthcare professionals)  
594 experience on healthcare WASH service barriers in public healthcare facilities of  
595 Addis Ababa City. In this study, we found that no one healthcare facility had basic  
596 access to all WASH services. The independent WASH domain analysis showed that  
597 about 86% of healthcare facilities had basic water access, 100% had limited sanitation  
598 access, 88.4 % had limited hand hygiene service, 69.8% had limited healthcare waste  
599 management service, and 97.7% had limited environmental cleaning service.

600 Compared with the findings of other studies, overall access to basic healthcare  
601 WASH service in our study was lower than from the study conducted on urban  
602 healthcare facilities in Uganda (12.12%) (21), and a study conducted on rural  
603 healthcare facilities in sub-Saharan Africa countries e.g: Zambia (21%), Kenya  
604 (30%), Uganda (30%) and Ruanda (50%) (22). The limited access to healthcare  
605 WASH service might be due to unavailability of healthcare facility WASH standards  
606 for a year, and the lack of committed leadership from the side of the government. The  
607 other possible explanation could be due to unavailability of adequate resources

608 distribution across healthcare facilities for the WASH services, building, and  
609 maintenance of infrastructure.

610 To our findings, healthcare facilities are facing challenges in providing basic access to  
611 WASH service. In this study, the finding was different from the national level of  
612 WASH service reported by the WHO and UNICEF joint monitoring healthcare  
613 WASH baseline report. The basic access to water service (86%) was higher than from  
614 national level access (30%) (18), and the worldwide level of basic water service  
615 (78%) (6). However, the available basic sanitation service(0%) and basic hand  
616 hygiene service (8.1%) in our study were lower than from national level of access  
617 59% and 52% respectively by 2016 (18), and from the study conducted in the north  
618 western part of Ethiopia, 21.4% of facility had basic access to hand washing facility  
619 (23). The higher level of basic water service access might be attributed to the study  
620 area conducted in urban setting, which is the capital city of Ethiopia with better  
621 investment to access improved water sources as compared to studies conducted in  
622 urban and rural parts of the country. The lower level of basic hand hygiene service  
623 could be due to the limited availability of financial resources to facilitate supplies and  
624 maintenance service of hand hygiene facilities and the lack of timely repair system  
625 across healthcare facilities.

626 In this study, all healthcare facilities had limited sanitation service which is lower than  
627 in sub-Sahara African countries, 13% of healthcare facilities had basic sanitation  
628 service by 2022 (6); only 5% and 20% of healthcare facilities had access to a toilet for  
629 menstrual hygiene and limited mobility clients respectively; which means that more  
630 than 80% of public healthcare facilities in Addis Ababa were not user sensitive. These  
631 are more likely to affect the dignity and privacy of users. Unavailability of insufficient  
632 gender-sensitive sanitation facilities, the menstrual hygiene toilets, was also shown in

633 studies conducted in Uganda and Zimbabwe (21,24), the proportion of sanitation  
634 facilities for menstrual use and disabled user remains poor. This could be due to that  
635 the essence of WASH for all might not be given emphasis and the design of the  
636 facility not considering user sensitive sanitation facility.

637 This study identified healthcare WASH service barriers, participants provided detailed  
638 descriptions of their healthcare facility WASH barriers, and the identified themes  
639 explained the limited access to healthcare WASH service findings. We found that  
640 built environments of WASH related barriers; lack of resource availability and  
641 allocation; partner organization and leadership barrier; individual level barriers and  
642 legal related barriers were the identified barriers to healthcare WASH service  
643 provision in the study area.

644 In the context of poor healthcare WASH services, adverse events including healthcare  
645 acquired infection and risk of AMR significantly affect the healthcare system (23). In  
646 our study, built environments of WASH infrastructure was found to be the most  
647 commonly cited barrier to WASH services provision in all healthcare facility. The  
648 unavailability of the built facility, lack of maintenance service, and poor design of the  
649 facility were among the significant barriers that were affecting the healthcare WASH  
650 services. The findings were found to be consistent with studies conducted in Kenya  
651 and Ethiopia, and the JMP baseline report (25–27). The design and availability of  
652 built WASH facilities were the most prevalent challenges; facilities were not built  
653 considering adequacy for users, and facilities were not designed at every point of care  
654 and did not consider special needs in the healthcare settings; maintenance service was  
655 not also given attention. These all affect the availability and practice of WASH  
656 services in the healthcare settings to the prevention of healthcare acquired infection  
657 and COVID-19 disease (28).

658 In the absence of an adequate and user friendly built sanitation service, an estimated  
659 risk of transmission of hospital acquired infection by contaminated environment  
660 contributed to 30-50% (29). Healthcare facilities were not in the position to improve  
661 the dignity and privacy of patients, staff, women and people with limited mobility  
662 regarding WASH services. The descriptive parts of our findings indicated that 95% of  
663 facilities had not to gender sensitive WASH service which makes to feel discomfort  
664 among menstruating girls and women due to issues of privacy and dignity (30); 80%  
665 of facilities had no a toilet for limited mobility users, this physical barrier kept away  
666 the disable users from using the toilet in the facility (31); 17% of healthcare facilities  
667 had not staff toilet, and 87.2% of the facility had not urinal service for men nearby the  
668 toilet. Due to that existing built sanitation facilities in the study area could have the  
669 significant contribution to poor quality of care and increase the risk of getting an  
670 infection (29,32,33).

671 Lack of functional hygiene facility at healthcare setting has the potential to increase  
672 the risk of healthcare acquired infection at the point of care and within the facility  
673 compound (29,33). In this study, due to physical, financial, and leadership related  
674 barriers raised by participants, 31.2% and 88.4% of healthcare facility had not  
675 functional hand hygiene facilities at the point of care and nearby the toilet  
676 respectively, either it has not to hand hygiene services at all, lacks water and/or soap  
677 at time of survey or it lacks maintenance services; and 93% of hand washing facility  
678 was not accessible to users with special need.

679 Similarly mixed method evaluation in part of Ethiopia (23), lack of functional hand  
680 hygiene facility and lack of washing materials at the point of care and nearby the  
681 toilet was impeding factors indicating that quality of care and patient safety was  
682 compromised across all healthcare facility, which makes that the risk of catching with

683 COVID-19, monkey box, Ebola and any else among patients and caregivers are high  
684 (32,34).

685 Shortage of water was found to be one of the main barriers in most the healthcare  
686 facilities surveyed; Interruption of water availability affects the function of WASH  
687 service. This finding was also highlighted from studies conducted in Uganda and  
688 India (21,30). In our finding, facilities were suffering from a shortage of water; three-  
689 quarters of healthcare facility were faced water discontinuity previous to the survey  
690 due to that healthcare facilities were accessing water through shifting (*fereka*)  
691 program with the community; of which nearly half(45.3%) of the facility was  
692 experienced daily water interruption. In the healthcare setting, having only a built  
693 facility is not good enough to prevent infection; all WASH domains must work  
694 synergistically; in the absence of water service toilet and hand washing facility would  
695 nor functional, clients also would not use the WASH facility and exposed to infection  
696 and which has led to developing negative experience and frustration that will deny  
697 them seeking care and loss of trust on the future (9,27).

698 The other most frequently cited barrier in our finding was inadequate resource  
699 availability impeding the availability of basic healthcare WASH service in the  
700 facilities. This was in line with studies conducted in Ethiopia and Kenya about  
701 resource barriers to health care WASH (13,25). The challenges in the prevention of  
702 infection have doubled in countries with the limited resources at the time of covid-19  
703 pandemic (35). To avail all the required healthcare WASH facilities, to provide  
704 adequate and timely training for healthcare staff, and timely maintenance of services,  
705 basic financial resources and supplies are required and government should allocate  
706 adequate budget and materials. Similar to the qualitative study conducted in Malawi

707 (23), a shortage of WASH supplies affect the availability of WASH services and  
708 practice in the study area.

709 Shortage of supplies (materials and equipment) for healthcare WASH service was  
710 found to be a significant barrier that hampering healthcare professionals, janitors, and  
711 clients to practice hygienic behaviours and environmental cleaning services. Shortage  
712 of WASH supplies causes to miss handling and management of healthcare waste,  
713 poor cleaning services, and poor hand hygiene practices across healthcare facilities,  
714 these could be due to the unavailability of budget and poor management of supplies  
715 which makes that care provider, patients, and cleaners vulnerable to infection and  
716 poor quality of care in the facilities. This challenge similarly reported from studies  
717 conducted in Ethiopia (10,27), highlighted the significance of adequate WASH  
718 service supplies to safeguard healthcare providers and to enhance the quality of care.

719 Therefore, a shortage of supplies do not build trust in the working environment and  
720 affects prevention practices (34,36); this implies that patient care practice is  
721 compromised that able to facilitate the chance of getting healthcare acquired infection  
722 or any emerging disease among patients, caregivers, waste handlers, and visitors  
723 across the healthcare facilities (37,38). These all could be attributed to a lack of  
724 and/or inadequate budget allocation for WASH services and a delayed bid system to  
725 purchase WASH materials and equipment.

726 Our finding showed that nearly one-third of the facilities in the study area had no  
727 healthcare waste segregation bins at the point of care, and two third of facilities had  
728 limited waste segregation services. Later shortage of waste segregation bins  
729 including safety boxes at the point of care leads to the poor practice of waste  
730 management and exposure to occupational hazards in the facility (38,39).

731 The other major barriers reported in this study were the lack of committed leadership  
732 and stakeholder participation. To the improvement of healthcare WASH service  
733 engagement and support of governmental administration, and committed health sector  
734 and facility leadership are worthy issues. Studies reported the implementation of basic  
735 WASH services in the healthcare setting is affected by the absence of committed  
736 leadership, lack of timely and on-going monitoring system for implementation and  
737 maintenance, cleaning and waste management system; and the absence of a range of  
738 stakeholders capable of influencing or responsible for the provision of sustainable  
739 basic healthcare WASH services (13,25).

740 In this study, the most challenging in most healthcare facilities was, senior  
741 management staff, either from the facility or higher offices, were not taking a role in  
742 WASH service improvement in a good way. They did not allocate enough budget and  
743 technical staff for WASH service; they were not actively to engage in the design and  
744 construction of the facility; they were not providing timely technical assistant to IPC  
745 team to improve healthcare WASH service. Similarly, studies reported the degree of  
746 commitment and engagement of government and senior facility managers to take an  
747 action to improve healthcare WASH services was significantly attributed to the  
748 variation in WASH services availability in the healthcare facilities (8,21,25).

749 Evidence showed that the lack of integration of WASH service with other key  
750 national programs, and the lack of participation of private or none profit organizations  
751 in healthcare WASH projects were affecting the status and sustainability of healthcare  
752 WASH services. To solve the financial and technical barriers, integration of programs  
753 and agreements with partner organizations could be an alternative solution for  
754 healthcare facilities with the limited resources (13,29). In this study, the lack of  
755 engagement of partner organizations in healthcare WASH, and excluding the city



756 from the One-WASH program was mentioned as barriers to WASH service provision.  
757 This might be due to that the lack of an effort to institute functional multi-sectorial  
758 coordination and technical working force to healthcare WASH service by the ministry  
759 of health and regional health bureau.

760 This study found that individual level barrier was affecting healthcare WASH service;  
761 participants noted that lack of awareness, lack of training, poor attitude and  
762 negligence among care providers and janitors, and lack of awareness and inattention  
763 of healthcare attendants in the study area were the barriers for healthcare WASH  
764 service practice. The study found to be consistent with other findings in Ethiopia,  
765 inadequate training on WASH and IPC, low awareness of janitors and healthcare  
766 workers, and visitors were challenged to improving and manage healthcare WASH  
767 service in the facility (27,37,40).

768 We found that healthcare WASH service was suffering from the absence of healthcare  
769 WASH framework and guidelines. Participants in this study noted out the absence of  
770 comprehensive healthcare WASH service framework was attributed to limited  
771 healthcare WASH service in the facilities; healthcare WASH framework provides a  
772 clear road map for healthcare facility including targets to be achieved, healthcare  
773 infection surveillance system, monitoring tool and integration of it with the other  
774 clinical services. The other barrier raised by participants was the lack of healthcare  
775 WASH guidelines for a year. The absence of updated and inclusive guidelines  
776 focusing on healthcare WASH was significantly affecting facilities. Healthcare  
777 WASH facilities were not adequate, inclusive, and user friendly as a result of the  
778 absence of updated guidelines. The finding was in line with studies (8,13,29), gaps  
779 in the national level healthcare WASH framework and guidelines were the barriers to  
780 improving healthcare WASH service.

## 781 **Strengths and limitations of the study**

782 As a limitation, since the key informants were selected purposely generalization of  
783 healthcare WASH service barriers to the larger population cannot be made. As the  
784 strength, the study used a mixed method design by observing the WASH facilities and  
785 involving the key informant interview to have a complete understanding of the  
786 availability of healthcare WASH services and the barriers to WASH services  
787 provision. Using the new healthcare WASH service assessment tool, including details  
788 of WASH domains, accurately revealed the status of WASH services in healthcare  
789 facilities.

## 790 **The implication of the Study**

791 This study is the first in kind to assess the availability of healthcare WASH services  
792 based on the JMP service ladder, and to describe the experience of IPC focal officers,  
793 medical directors, and program officer about the barriers to healthcare WASH  
794 services provision in Ethiopia. Despite improvements of WASH related hygienic  
795 behaviour at the time of the COVID-19 pandemic, the study revealed inadequate  
796 WASH services and multiple challenges across healthcare facilities have negative  
797 implications on the prevention and control measure of the COVID-19 disease,  
798 healthcare acquired infection and increase risk of AMR, and emerging future  
799 pandemics.

800 In the absence of significant improvement in basic service of healthcare WASH  
801 services, COVID-19 disease, and healthcare acquired infection and AMR risk are still  
802 challenging for healthcare facilities that causing healthcare providers, clients, and  
803 cleaners are daily facing the risk of infection. The country needs to act now to ensure  
804 basic WASH services in at the healthcare setting. Hence, the study serves as an input  
805 for policymakers and programmers to design healthcare WASH frameworks and

806 appropriate monitoring tools to tackle infection in healthcare settings. The finding  
807 also pledges leverage of adequate resources from partners, the ministry of health and  
808 healthcare facilities; and leadership commitment for the attainment of basic access to  
809 healthcare WASH services.

## 810 **Conclusions and Recommendation**

811 The availability of healthcare WASH services in Addis Ababa city remains far short  
812 of the pace to achieve the SDG target (80% of facilities have basic services) by 2025.  
813 This study founds, based on the JMP service ladder none of the healthcare facilities in  
814 Addis Ababa city had basic access to all WASH services.

815 Limited access to WASH services and multiple existing challenges at healthcare  
816 facilities in Ethiopia makes worsening the prevention and control of COVID-19  
817 pandemics, healthcare acquired infection, and AMR risk. It should be given priority  
818 and the need for more financial investment, capacity building, the commitment of  
819 leadership, and participation of partners in healthcare WASH service to ensure basic  
820 healthcare WASH and minimized the risk of health emergencies and AMR in  
821 healthcare settings.

## 822 **Acknowledgements**

823 We would like to acknowledge St. Paul Hospital Millennium Medical College Ethical  
824 Review Board and Addis Ababa City Administration Regional Health Bureau to  
825 assured ethical clearance letter. We also acknowledge all hospital and health centre  
826 management staff, for their commitment and information provided to conduct this  
827 study. Our thanks also extended to data collectors, supervisors, participants and  
828 friends contributed for the study.

829

## 830      **References**

- 831      1.      Matthews Magdalene and Tsion Gebreyesus. WASH in Health Care Facilities,  
832              UNICEF Scoping Study in Eastern and Southern Africa. 2019;1–68.
- 833      2.      WHO 2020. Global progress report on water, sanitation and hygiene in health  
834              care facilities: fundamentals first. Geneva:: 2020.
- 835      3.      Prüss-Ustün A, Wolf J, Bartram J, Clasen T, Cumming O, Freeman MC, et al.  
836              Burden of disease from inadequate water, sanitation and hygiene for selected  
837              adverse health outcomes: An updated analysis with a focus on low- and  
838              middle-income countries. *Int J Hyg Environ Health*. 2019;222(5):765–77.
- 839      4.      WHO 2019. Results of Round II of the WHO International Scheme to Evaluate  
840              Household Water Treatment Technologies. Geneva: World Health  
841              Organization. Who. 2019.
- 842      5.      WHO, FAO, OIE 2020. Technical Brief on Water, Sanitation, Hygiene and  
843              Wastewater Management to Prevent Infections and Reduce the Spread of  
844              Antimicrobial Resistance. 2020. 32 p.
- 845      6.      WHO and UNICEF 2022. Progress on WASH in health care facilities 2000–  
846              2021: special focus on WASH and infection prevention and control  
847              (IPC). Geneva: World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations  
848              Children’s Fund (UNICEF). 2022.
- 849      7.      Allegranzi B, Nejad SB, Combescure C, Graafmans W, Attar H, Donaldson L,  
850              et al. Burden of endemic health-care-associated infection in developing  
851              countries: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet*. 2011;377(9761):228–  
852              41.
- 853      8.      Didier Pittet LD. Clean Care is Safer Care: A worldwide priority. *Lancet*.  
854              2005;366(9493):1246–7.

- 855 9. Bouzid M, Cumming O, Hunter PR. What is the impact of water sanitation and  
856 hygiene in healthcare facilities on care seeking behaviour and patient  
857 satisfaction? A systematic review of the evidence from low-income and  
858 middleincome countries. *BMJ Glob Heal*. 2018;3(3):1–14.
- 859 10. Desta M, Ayenew T, Sitotaw N, Tegegne N, Dires M, Getie M. Knowledge,  
860 practice and associated factors of infection prevention among healthcare  
861 workers in Debre Markos referral hospital, Northwest Ethiopia. *BMC Health*  
862 *Serv Res*. 2018;18(1):1–10.
- 863 11. Mcdonald LC, Simor AE, Su I, Maloney S, Ofner M, Chen K, et al. SARS in  
864 Healthcare Facilities, Toronto and Taiwan. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2004;10(5):777–  
865 81.
- 866 12. Cooper C, Fisher D, Gupta N, MaCauley R, Pessoa-Silva CL. Infection  
867 prevention and control of the Ebola outbreak in Liberia, 2014-2015: Key  
868 challenges and successes. *BMC Med*. 2016;14(1).
- 869 13. WHO 2017. Achieving quality universal health coverage through better water,  
870 sanitation and hygiene services in health care facilities: a focus on Ethiopia.  
871 Geneva: World Health Organization. 2017.
- 872 14. Halcomb E HL. Mixed methods research. *Nursing Standard. Qual Res Heal*  
873 *Care*. 2015;6:41–7.
- 874 15. Creswell JW. *Research design : qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods*  
875 *approaches* / John W. Creswell. — 4th ed. 4th ed. Knight V, editor. SAGE  
876 Publications India Pvt. Ltd; 2014. 1–342 p.
- 877 16. WHO and UNICEF 2019. Core questions and indicators for monitoring WASH  
878 in health care facilities in the Sustainable Development Goals. Geneva: World  
879 Health Organization and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF). WHO

- 880 press, data are available at <http://apps.who.int/iris>. 2019;28.
- 881 17. WHO 2017. Achieving quality universal health coverage through better water,  
882 sanitation and hygiene services in health care facilities: a focus on Ethiopia.  
883 Geneva:World Health Organization. 2017.
- 884 18. WHO and UNICEF 2019. WASH in health care facilities: Global Baseline  
885 Report 2019, WHO and UNICEF, Geneva. 2019.
- 886 19. Cleary M, Hayter M, Horsfall J. Data collection and sampling in qualitative  
887 research: does size matter? *J Adv Nurs*. 2014;473–5.
- 888 20. WHO and UNICEF 2018. Core questions and indicators for Core questions and  
889 indicators for monitoring WASH in health care facilities in the Sustainable  
890 Development Goals. Geneva: World Health Organization and the United  
891 Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF). 2018.
- 892 21. Kayiwa D, Mugambe RK, Mselle JS, Isunju JB, Ssempebwa JC, Wafula ST, et  
893 al. Assessment of water, sanitation and hygiene service availability in  
894 healthcare facilities in the greater Kampala metropolitan area, Uganda. *BMC*  
895 *Public Health*. 2020;20(1):1–11.
- 896 22. Guo A, Bowling JM, Bartram J, Kayser G. Water, sanitation, and hygiene in  
897 rural health-care facilities: a cross-sectional study in Ethiopia, Kenya,  
898 Mozambique, Rwanda, Uganda, and Zambia. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*.  
899 2017;97(4):1033–42.
- 900 23. Berihun, Gete, Metadel Adane ZW, Abebe M, Alemnew Y, Natnael T,  
901 Andualem A, Ademe S, et al. Access to and challenges in water , sanitation ,  
902 and hygiene in healthcare facilities during the early phase of the COVID-19  
903 pandemic in Ethiopia : A mixed-methods evaluation. *PLoS One*. 2022;53:1–15.
- 904 24. Hirai M, Nyamandi V, Siachema C, Shirihuru N, Dhoba L, Baggen A, et al.

- 905 Using the water and sanitation for health facility improvement tool (WASH  
906 FIT) in Zimbabwe: A cross-sectional study of water, sanitation and hygiene  
907 services in 50 COVID-19 isolation facilities. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*.  
908 2021;18(11):1–11.
- 909 25. Maina M, Tosas-Auguet O, McKnight J, Zosi M, Kimemia G, Mwaniki P, et  
910 al. Evaluating the foundations that help avert antimicrobial resistance:  
911 Performance of essential water sanitation and hygiene functions in hospitals  
912 and requirements for action in Kenya. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(10):1–19.
- 913 26. WHO and UNICEF 2020. *State of the World’s Sanitation: An urgent call to*  
914 *transform sanitation for better health, environments, economies and societies*.  
915 New York: United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and the World Health  
916 Organization Organization. 2020.
- 917 27. Mersha A, Shibiru S, Girma M, Ayele G, Bante A, Kassa M, et al. Health  
918 professionals practice and associated factors towards precautionary measures  
919 for COVID-19 pandemic in public health facilities of Gamo zone, southern  
920 Ethiopia: A crosssectional study. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(3 March):1–10.
- 921 28. Kanyangarara M, Allen S, Jiwani SS, Fuente D. Access to water, sanitation and  
922 hygiene services in health facilities in sub-Saharan Africa 2013-2018: Results  
923 of health facility surveys and implications for COVID-19 transmission. *BMC*  
924 *Health Serv Res*. 2021;21(1):601.
- 925 29. Peters A, Otter J, Moldovan A, Parneix P, Voss A, Pittet D. Keeping hospitals  
926 clean and safe without breaking the bank; Summary of the Healthcare Cleaning  
927 Forum 2018 11 Medical and Health Sciences 1117 Public Health and Health  
928 Services. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2018;7(1):1–12.
- 929 30. Kohler P, Renggli S, Lüthi C. WASH and gender in health care facilities: The


- 930 uncharted territory. *Health Care Women Int.* 2019;40(1):3–12.
- 931 31. White S, Kuper H, Itimu-Phiri A, Holm R, Biran A. A qualitative study of  
932 barriers to accessing water, sanitation and hygiene for disabled people in  
933 Malawi. *PLoS One.* 2016;11(5):1–18.
- 934 32. Peters A, Borzykowski T, Tartari E, Kilpatrick C, Mai SHC, Allegranzi B, et  
935 al. ‘Clean care for all – it’s in your hands’: the 5th May 2019 World Health  
936 Organization SAVE LIVES: Clean Your Hands campaign. *J Hosp Infect.*  
937 2019;101(4):367–9.
- 938 33. Vermeil T, Peters A, Kilpatrick C, Pires D, Allegranzi B, Pittet D. Hand  
939 hygiene in hospitals: anatomy of a revolution. *J Hosp Infect.* 2019;101(4):383–  
940 92.
- 941 34. Engdaw GT, Gebrehiwot M, Andualem Z. Hand hygiene compliance and  
942 associated factors among health care providers in Central Gondar zone public  
943 primary hospitals, Northwest Ethiopia. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control.*  
944 2019;8(1):1–7.
- 945 35. Angrup A, Kanaujia R, Ray P, Biswal M. Healthcare facilities in low- And  
946 middle-income countries affected by COVID-19: Time to upgrade basic  
947 infection control and prevention practices. *Indian J Med Microbiol.*  
948 2020;38(2):139–43.
- 949 36. G. Kampfa, Y. Bru¨gemann b, H.E.J. Kaba c, J. Steinmann d, S. Pfaender b, S.  
950 Scheithauer c ES b. Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19  
951 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel  
952 coronavirus COVID-. *J Hosp Infect J.* 2020;106(January):2–5.
- 953 37. Yazie TD, Sharew GB, Abebe W. Knowledge, attitude, and practice of  
954 healthcare professionals regarding infection prevention at Gondar University



- 955 referral hospital, northwest Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. BMC Res Notes.  
956 2019;12(1):563.
- 957 38. WHO 2017. Safe management of wastes from health-care activities: summary.  
958 Geneva: World Health Organization. 2017.
- 959 39. Yazie TD, Tebeje MG, Chufa KA. Healthcare waste management current  
960 status and potential challenges in Ethiopia: A systematic review. BMC Res  
961 Notes. 2019;12(1):1–7.
- 962 40. Abebe S, Raju RP, Berhanu G. Health Care Solid Waste Generation and Its  
963 Management in Hawassa Referral Hospital of Hawassa University, Southern,  
964 Ethiopia. Int J Innov Res Dev. 2017;6(5):126–32.
- 965  
966  
967  
968


969 **Figure legends**

970 **Figure 1: Spatial location of sampled healthcare facility**



971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987


988 **Figure 2: Water service availability among public healthcare facility in Addis**  
989 **Ababa city, Ethiopia 2022.**



990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000  
1001  
1002  
1003  
1004  
1005  
1006  
1007  
1008

1009 **Figure 3: Hand hygiene service availability at public healthcare facilities in**  
1010 **Addis Ababa city, Ethiopia 2022.**

1011



1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028


1029

1030

1031


1032

1033 **Figure 4: Healthcare waste management service availability at public healthcare**  
1034 **facility in Addis Ababa city, Ethiopia 2022.**



1035  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1050  
1051  
1052  
1053  
1054  
1055

1056 **Figure 5: Environmental cleaning service availability in Addis Ababa public**  
1057 **health care facility, Ethiopia 2022.**



1058  
1059  
1060  
1061

1062 **Tables**

1063 **Table 1: Proportion of water service availability indicator at public healthcare**  
1064 **facilities in Addis Ababa city, Ethiopia 2022.**

Water service indicators at HCF	Proportion by HCF		
	Hospital N(%)	Health center N(%)	Total N(%)
Water availability during survey (N=86)			
▪ yes	11(100%)	63(84%)	74(86%)
▪ no	0(0%)	12(16%)	12(14%)
Water discontinuity (N=86)			
▪ yes	7(63.6%)	57(76%)	64(74.4%)
▪ No	4(36.6%)	18(24%)	22(25.6%)
Frequency of discontinuity (N=64)			
▪ Frequently per day	2(28.6%)	27(47.4%)	29(45.3%)
▪ rarely per day	5(71.4%)	30(52.6%)	35(54.7%)
Alternative water source (N=86)			
▪ yes	6(54.5%)	4(5.3%)	10(11.6%)
▪ no	5(45.5%)	71(94.7%)	76(88.4%)
Piped water at OPD (N=86)			
▪ yes	8(72.7%)	39(52%)	47(54.7%)
▪ No	3(27.3%)	36(48%)	39(45.3%)

1065 **HCF: Healthcare Facility**

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070

1071

1072

1073

1074

1075 **Table 2: Sanitation service indicator at public healthcare facility in Addis Ababa**  
 1076 **city, Ethiopia 2022.**

Sanitation services indicator	Proportion by HCF type		
	Hospital N (%)	Health center N (%)	Total N (%)
<b>Types of Toilet</b>			
▪ flush/pour flush to sewer system	6(54.5%)	2(2.7%)	8(9.3%)
▪ flush/pour flush to septic tank or pit	5(45.5%)	71(94.7%)	76(88.4%)
▪ Pit latrine with slab	0(0%)	2(2.7%)	2(2.3%)
<b>Usable toilet</b>			
▪ yes	7(63.3%)	42(56%)	49(57%)
▪ no	4(36.4%)	33(44%)	37(43%)
<b>Staff toilet</b>			
▪ yes	9(81.8%)	62(82.7%)	71(82.6%)
▪ no	2(18.2%)	13(17.3%)	15(17.4%)
<b>Menstrual hygiene toilet</b>			
▪ yes	0(0%)	4(5.3%)	4(4.6%)
▪ no	11(100%)	71(94.7%)	82(95.4%)
<b>Toilet for limited mobility</b>			
▪ yes	0(0%)	17(22.7%)	17(19.8%)
▪ no	11(100%)	58(77.3%)	69(80.2%)
<b>Excreta/waste-water disposal</b>			
▪ Sewerage system	6(54.5%)	4(5.3%)	10(11.6%)
▪ Septic tank	5(45.5%)	71(94.7%)	76(88.4%)
<b>Urinal service for male</b>			
▪ yes	2(12.8%)	9(12%)	11(12.8%)
▪ no	9(81.8%)	66(88%)	75(87.2%)

1077

1078

1079

1080



1081 **Table 3: Proportion of Hand Hygiene service status at public healthcare facility**  
1082 **in Addis Ababa city, Ethiopia 2022.**

Hand hygiene services indicator	The proportion by HCF type		
	Hospital N(%)	Health center N(%)	Total N(%)
Hand hygiene facility at point of care (N=86)			
▪ Yes functional hand hygiene with water and soap	2(18.2%)	10(13.3%)	12(14 %)
▪ Yes Alcohol based hand rub(ABHR)	6(54.5%)	41(54.7%)	47(54.6%)
▪ Yes but it lacks water and/soap	2(18.2%)	14(18.7%)	16(18.6%)
▪ No hand hygiene service	1(9.1%)	10(13.3%)	11(12.8%)
Hand hygiene facility within 5 meter of the toilet (N=86)			
▪ Yes functional hand hygiene	1(9.1%)	9(12%)	10(11.6%)
▪ Yes but it lacks water and/soap	8(72.7%)	54(72%)	62(72.1%)
▪ No hand hygiene service	2(18.2%)	12(16%)	14(16.3%)
Hand hygiene Promotion material on washing facility (N=72)			
▪ yes	1(11.1%)	4(6.3%)	5(6.9%)
▪ no	8(88.9%)	59(93.7%)	67(93.1%)
Hand hygiene facility accessible to all users (N=72)			
▪ yes	1(11.1%)	4(6.3%)	5(6.9%)
▪ no	8(88.9%)	59(93.7%)	67(93.1%)

1083

1084

1085

1086

1087

1088

1089 **Table 4: Proportion of healthcare waste management service status at public**  
1090 **healthcare facilities in Addis Ababa city, Ethiopia, 2022.**

Waste management service indicators	Proportion by HCF type		
	Hospital N(%)	Health center N(%)	Total N(%)
<b>Medical waste segregation</b>			
▪ Waste segregation meet the standard	1(9.1%)	0(0%)	1(1.2 %)
▪ Segregation and bins aren't meet the standard	8(72.7%)	52(69.3%)	60(69.8%)
▪ segregation bins are not present	2(18.2%)	23(30.7%)	25(29%)
<b>Disposal of infectious waste</b>			
▪ incinerator(two-chamber,850-1000)	2(18.2%)	0(0%)	2(2.3%)
▪ incinerator(brick type)	7(63.6%)	72(96%)	79(91.8%)
▪ burning in the protected pit	0(0%)	3(4%)	3(3.5%)
▪ Collected for disposal off-site	2(18.2%)	0(0%)	2(2.3%)
<b>Disposal of sharp waste</b>			
▪ incinerator(two-chamber,850-1000)	2(18.2%)	0(0%)	2(2.3%)
▪ incinerator(brick type)	7(63.6%)	73(97.3%)	80(93%)
▪ burning in protected pit	0(0%)	2(2.7%)	2(2.3%)
▪ Collected for disposal off-site	2(18.2%)	0(0%)	2(2.3%)

1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096  
1097  
1098

1099 **Table 5: Proportion of environmental cleaning service status of public health**  
1100 **care facility in Addis Ababa city, Ethiopia, 2022.**

Environmental cleaning service indicators	Proportion by HCF type		
	Hospital	Health center	Total
	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)
Cleaning protocol availability			
▪ Yes for all cleaning service	9(81.8%)	13(17.3%)	22(25.6 %)
▪ Yes, but not for all cleaning service	2(18.2%)	62(82.7%)	64(74.4%)
Training for responsible staff			
▪ Yes for all given	0(0%)	2(2.7%)	2(2.3%)
▪ Some staff had trained	11(100%)	70(93.3%)	81(94.2%)
▪ No one is trained	0(0%)	3(4%)	3(3.5%)
Cleaned floor, table & unpleasant smell			
▪ yes	11(100%)	64(85.3%)	75(87.2%)
▪ no	0(0%)	11(14.7%)	11(12.8%)
Cleaning supplies in the area of the outpatient room			
▪ Yes present	6(54.5%)	1(1.2%)	7(8.2%)
▪ Not present	5(45.5%)	74(86%)	79(91.8%)

1101

1102

1103

1104

1105

1106