Monitoring drinking water quality in nationally representative household surveys: cross-sectional analysis of 20 Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys 2014-2019

Authors

Rob Bain¹
Rick Johnston²
Shane Khan^{1,3}
Attila Hancioglu¹
Tom Slaymaker¹

¹ Division of Data, Planning, Analysis, and Monitoring, UNICEF, New York, NY, USA

² Department of Public Health and Environment, WHO, Geneva, Switzerland

³ Marxe School of Public and International Affairs, Baruch College, New York, NY, USA

Contact

Rob Bain, UNICEF, 3 UN Plaza, New York, 10017, USA
rbain@unicef.org

Running title

Water quality testing in household surveys

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the implementing agencies who integrated water testing in national household surveys. We thank the entire MICS team for the excellent collaboration in the development of the new water quality module as well as the JMP water quality trainers providing technical support to countries implementing the water quality module. The following international consultants supported water quality testing in MICS: Abdus Saboor, Andrew Shantz, Caetano Dorea, Elisabeth Lictévout, Lars Osterwalder, Loay Hidmi, Mamadou Djerma and Peter van Maanen. Yadigar Coskun provided data processing support on the custom wealth indices. Jennyfer Wolf, Matt Freeman, Andrew Mertens and Amy MacDougall provided guidance on multilevel regression modeling. Jennifer de France and Angella Reinhold kindly reviewed a draft of the study.

Funding

Funding for the integration of water testing in household surveys was provided by the Netherlands Directorate-General of International Cooperation (DGIS), the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

Competing Interests

RB TS RJ work for the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme. AH and SK work for the UNICEF Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey Programme. Authors' opinions do not reflect position of WHO or UNICEF.

Abstract

Background. The Sustainable Development Goals set an ambitious new benchmark for safely managed drinking water services (SMDW), but many countries lack data on the availability and quality of drinking water.

Objectives. To quantify the availability and microbiological quality of drinking water, monitor SMDW and examine risk factors for *E. coli* contamination in 20 low-and middle-income countries.

Methods. A new water quality module for household surveys was implemented in Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys. Teams used portable equipment to measure *E. coli* at the point of collection (PoC, n=48,323) and at the point of use (PoU, n=51,345) and asked respondents about the availability and location of drinking water services. *E. coli* levels were classified into risk categories and SMDW was calculated at the household- and domain-levels. Modified Poisson regression was used to explore risk factors for contamination.

Results. *E. coli* was commonly detected at PoC (range 16-90%) and was more likely at PoU (range 20-97%). Coverage of SMDW was 56% points lower than improved drinking water with water quality the limiting factor for SMDW in 14 countries. Detection of *E. coli* at PoC was associated with use of improved water sources (RR=0.64 [0.52-0.78]) located on premises (RR=0.78 [0.67-0.91]) but not with availability (RR=0.94 [0.82-1.06]). Households in the richest quintile (RR=0.67 [0.50-0.90]) and in communities with high (>75%) improved sanitation coverage (RR=0.95 [0.91-0.98]) were less likely to use contaminated water at PoU whereas animal ownership (RR=1.08 [1.03-1.14]) and rural residence (RR=1.11 [1.03-1.19]) increased risk of contamination.

Discussion. Water quality data can be reliably collected in household surveys and can be used to assess inequalities in service levels, to track the SDG indicator of SMDW, and to examine risk factors for contamination. There is an urgent need to implement scalable and sustainable interventions to reduce exposure to faecal contamination through drinking water.

93 Introduction

94
95 The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) set ambitious targets for
96 universal access to safe drinking water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) by
97 2030. Expert consultations and negotiations between UN Member States led
98 to the adoption of a new global indicator 6.1.1, the “use of safely managed
99 drinking water services” which builds on, but greatly extends, the previous
100 Millennium Development Goal (MDG) indicator of “use of an improved
101 source”. Safely managed drinking water services are defined as improved
102 sources of drinking water (piped water, protected groundwater sources,
103 rainwater collection, packaged or delivered water), that are accessible on
104 premises and provide water which is available when needed and free from
105 faecal and priority chemical contamination (WHO/UNICEF 2017b).

106
107 WHO and UNICEF through the Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) for Water
108 Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene are mandated to monitor the SDG global
109 indicators for WASH and released baseline estimates in July 2017
110 (WHO/UNICEF 2017b) and updated estimates in 2019 (WHO/UNICEF
111 2019b). The JMP reports confirm earlier academic studies estimating that
112 approximately 2 billion people drink water from sources that contain faecal
113 indicator bacteria (Bain et al. 2014a; Onda et al. 2012). While the importance
114 of water quality is increasingly recognized by policymakers, the 2019 report
115 found that only four of the eight SDG regions and 98 of the 193 UN Member
116 States had enough data to report on water quality for target 6.1
117 (WHO/UNICEF 2019b). There is an urgent need to expand the monitoring of
118 drinking water quality to inform national efforts to achieve safely managed
119 drinking water services by 2030.

120
121 Globally the highest priority parameter of drinking water quality to monitor
122 from a health perspective is *E. coli*, WHO’s recommended indicator for faecal
123 contamination of drinking water (WHO 2017). Arsenic and fluoride are priority
124 chemical contaminants due to their respective disease burdens. For the
125 purposes of SDG monitoring “free from contamination” implies that drinking
126 water does not contain *E. coli* (in a 100 mL sample) or elevated levels of
127 arsenic (>10 µg/L) or fluoride (>1.5 mg/L).

128
129 In preparation for the SDGs, and in response to the recommendations of
130 expert task forces on monitoring drinking water quality reflecting on the
131 limitations of MDG monitoring and the availability of data on water quality from
132 administrative systems (Bartram et al. 2014), the JMP has supported the
133 piloting and scale-up of water quality testing in nationally representative multi-
134 topic household surveys. Integration of water quality testing in household
135 surveys has several key advantages including the ability to obtain
136 representative data at comparatively low cost and to link it with other
137 information on household characteristics collected in the survey (health,
138 nutrition, education, wealth, ethnicity, etc.). Data from household surveys
139 were critical to MDG WASH monitoring and are expected to continue to be a
140 major data source for SDG monitoring alongside data from administrative
141 sources, especially regulators (WHO/UNICEF 2017a).

142

In close collaboration with UNICEF-supported Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS), a new water quality module was developed as MICS transitioned from the fifth global round of surveys (MICS5, 2013-2017) to the sixth round (MICS6, 2017-current). The water quality module is now available as a standard module offered to countries implementing MICS6. This work builds on earlier studies supported by the JMP, in particular the Rapid Assessment of Drinking water Quality (Aldana 2010; Aliev et al. 2010; Howard et al. 2009; Ince et al. 2010; Tadesse et al. 2010). Final reports published by the implementing agencies are available from the MICS website (mics.unicef.org) and researchers have begun to explore the risk factors for contamination (Kandel et al. 2017; Wardrop et al. 2018) and associations with child health and development (Haque et al. 2017). With the exception of Nigeria, without the water quality data made available from household surveys, none of the 20 countries included in this study would have the nationally representative data necessary for monitoring SMDW.

The objectives of this study were to describe the main features of the new water quality module, and to use the data from the first 20 MICS that included the new module to explore patterns in water quality by country, type of water source and wealth, and compare levels of the MDG and SDG indicators for drinking water. We used multivariable regression to explore household- and community-level risk factors for faecal contamination, including accessibility and availability of drinking water.

Methods

The water quality module was integrated into multi-topic household surveys supported by the global MICS programme and implemented by national authorities, often the National Statistical Offices. Table 1 lists the countries that integrated water quality testing in Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys between 2014 and 2019 for which microdata are publicly available. The STROBE statement for observational studies informs our reporting and Figure 1 shows how data from the 20 MICS were used in this study.

[Insert Table 1]

Figure 1. Study flow diagram

Water quality module

The water quality module was developed as a collaboration between the JMP and the global MICS programme and was first piloted in Bogra and Sirajgani districts, Bangladesh in April/May 2012 prior to being adopted in the national MICS Bangladesh survey in 2012-2013. The procedures have evolved since the pilot study and further details are provided in the respective survey final reports. The procedures for the standardized module are described in the MICS Manual for Water Quality and MICS Water Quality Testing Questionnaire, both available on the MICS website (mics.unicef.org/tools).

In households selected for water quality testing, the interviewer requests permission to collect samples of drinking water, asking the respondent for a “glass of drinking water” (point of use - PoU) and to be shown the location of the source of the drinking water (point of collection - PoC) to take a sample from that location. Two samples are analyzed to examine differences in quality between the point of collection (PoC) and the point of use (PoU). The water quality testing questionnaire includes sections for the interviewer to record test results. It also includes specific questions on the source of the glass of drinking water and household water treatment and an observation of water storage practices.

The field team member responsible for water quality testing differs between surveys depending on the distribution of other tasks. In MICS, the “measurer” who is responsible for anthropometry usually also conducts the water quality test, but in some countries the male interviewer or supervisor were selected instead.

Water quality test procedures

Water samples were analyzed for *E. coli* using a portable membrane filtration apparatus (Figure S1). *E. coli* was measured by field teams, who filtered 100 mL of sample through a 0.45 micron filter (Millipore Microfil®) which was then placed onto CompactDry™ EC growth media plates (Nissui, Japan) which had been rehydrated with 1 mL of sample water. In the first six surveys (MICS5), an additional 1 mL sample was also tested directly onto a second media plate. Water samples were either collected directly into the pre-assembled manifold or using sterile Whirl-Pak sample collection bags (Enasco). Samples were analysed on-site within 30 minutes and incubated overnight (24-48 hours) in either an electric incubator (Lynd) or incubation belt or pouch specifically designed to keep samples at close to body temperature. The number of *E. coli* (blue) and total coliform (red/purple) colonies were enumerated by eye the following day and recorded in the water quality testing questionnaire. Survey teams recorded cases where there were more than 100 colonies on a given plate and in cases where the plate turned pink as ‘too numerous to count’. For more recent surveys (MICS6), “*E. coli* only” CompactDry™ plates were used, with the advantage that the second media plate was not needed to count up to 100 *E. coli*.

Sample design for the water quality module

MICS are based on a multistage stratified cluster survey design in which households have a known probability of selection enabling national estimates to be generated (Khan and Hancioglu 2019). To ensure an adequate sample size for sub-national regions, the sample is usually stratified (for example urban/rural and geographic regions). MICS usually include informal urban settlements or slums in sampling frames, but are rarely designed to stratify results for these settings. Within each stratum, enumeration areas are randomly selected from which 20-25 households are selected for inclusion in the survey. Enumeration areas vary between countries but are often between 100 and 250 households. The water quality module was conducted in a sub-sample of households (between 1 and 5) within each cluster. Not every household was selected to minimize the cost and workload and because it was anticipated that the marginal gains of increasing the sample size would be small due to intra-cluster correlation (households in the same cluster having similar water quality) and correspondingly high design effects. It was anticipated that this would be particularly the case for households using the same community water source (Giné-Garriga et al. 2013). Design effects were calculated and are reported in supplementary materials (Table S1).

Training and QA/QC

An international water quality trainer working alongside national experts led training of field teams. A standard training programme was used and adapted depending on the size of the survey and number of field teams. For example in Nigeria a centralized training of trainers was followed by zonal trainings by microbiologists selected by the Federal Ministry of Water Resources (FMWR). A hands-on training course lasting between 2 and 7 days usually included field practice, a strong focus on aseptic procedure and understanding the different scenarios that testers might face through role-play. National experts from regulatory agencies, research laboratories or ministries of health provided technical inputs to the training and oversight during the fieldwork

with a small number of visits scheduled to visit field teams to allow for observation of the testing procedure.

A key measure of quality control used in water quality analysis is a “blank test”, a sample utilized to ensure that the analyst has not inadvertently contaminated the sample and is able to consistently produce the expected negative results. In each survey blank tests (usually one per cluster) were conducted by the field teams to provide confidence in the results. Water for the blank test was obtained from a reliable brand of mineral water or distilled/deionized water. Blank tests using bottled mineral water or deionized water from a laboratory were used as a negative control in the surveys (Table S2). The proportion of positive blanks was $\leq 2.5\%$ in 18 out of 20 countries indicating high levels of compliance with testing procedures, but there were an elevated number in Gambia (6.2%) and Cote d’Ivoire (8.2%). Two blank tests in Cote d’Ivoire and four in Gambia exceeded 10 *E. coli* per 100 mL.

Household questionnaire

In addition to developing the new water quality module, the household questionnaire (available from mics.unicef.org/tools) was adapted to include a new question on the availability of drinking water. In the MICS5 round different questions were asked:

Nepal. Since last (day of week) did you have water coming from the pipe or tap for at least one hour a day? (*piped water only*)

Nigeria. Was the water from this source not available for at least one full day? (*excludes piped on premises*)

Paraguay. In the last 15 days has there been any time you have not been able to access water in sufficient quantities? (*translation from Spanish*)

The more recent MICS6 surveys have used the following standard question on the availability of drinking water aligned with the JMP core questions (WHO/UNICEF 2018b):

In the last month, has there been any time when your household did not have sufficient quantities of drinking water?

In all surveys, households were asked where their main drinking water source was located and the roundtrip travel time to collect drinking water. In all countries the main source of drinking water and the source of the water quality sample (where this differed) were recorded (Table S4). In most cases the water sample was taken from the household’s main source of drinking water or the same classification of water source used in this study but there were notable differences in some countries, particularly Kiribati (27%) and Mongolia (16%).

Descriptive analysis

Microdata were downloaded from the MICS website (mics.unicef.org/surveys). Data analysis was conducted using Stata 16 (Statacorp). For each survey descriptive statistics and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) were calculated using appropriate sample weights and taking into account the stratification and clustering using the `svy` command. For most surveys, separate sample weights were calculated for the source and household water quality samples due to different sub-samples used or response rates. Information on drinking water quality was combined with data from the household questionnaire (type of water source, household assets) to examine patterns in water quality for different population sub-groups and calculate the proportion of the population using safely managed services.

The levels of *E. coli* were classified according to the number of colony forming units (CFU) per 100 mL as follows: <1 “Low risk”, 1-10 “Moderate risk”, 11-100 “High risk” and >100 “Very high risk” (WHO and UNICEF 2012; WHO 2017). There was some evidence for heaping of the last digit in a few countries (Figures S2-S4) but we deemed this insufficient to require adjustment of the risk classification (Wardrop et al. 2018). In a small number of cases from MICS5 datasets, results of the 100 mL and 1 mL tests were inconsistent, could not be classified according to these categories and data were excluded from the analysis (Table S5).

Calculation of safely managed drinking water services

Safely managed drinking water services are defined as an improved source of drinking water, accessible on premises, available when needed and free from faecal and priority chemical contamination (United Nations 2017). For the countries with information on accessibility, availability and quality (n=17) we estimated the proportion of the national population using improved drinking water sources (MDG indicator) and safely managed drinking water services (SDG indicator) taking into consideration all three criteria. For the remaining countries (n=3) all improved water sources meeting the quality and accessibility criteria were assumed to be available when needed. We calculated estimates for safely managed services based on information from individual households (“household-level”) and also using the approach taken by the JMP whereby a minimum of the three new criteria for safely managed is used at the domain-level (“domain-level”). For global monitoring the JMP uses the “domain-level” approach to accommodate estimates drawn from different data sources, as relatively few countries have all of the information required to calculate the new safely managed indicator from a single data source and at the household level (WHO/UNICEF 2018a).

Risk factors for contamination

To explore risk factors for faecal contamination of drinking water at the PoC and PoU we used bivariate and multivariable modified Poisson regression models with results reported as risk ratios (RRs) (Zou 2004). Modified Poisson regression is particularly suited to indicators with a high prevalence and has been used in recent studies of handwashing and the association between water and sanitation and trachoma (Garn et al. 2018; Wolf et al. 2019). The dependent variable in these models was the proportion of the population with drinking water contaminated (≥ 1 CFU/100 mL) or very highly

359 contaminated (>100 CFU/100 mL) with *E. coli* at the PoC or PoU. Pooled
 360 estimates were generated using a multilevel model with random intercepts for
 361 each country (Gelman and Hill 2007). Random intercepts for clusters were not
 362 included as these had a negligible impact on the pooled effect sizes and their
 363 confidence intervals in models that converged. Separate country-level models
 364 with cluster random intercepts were fit to examine their contributions to the
 365 pooled estimates and calculate unadjusted and adjusted RRs for each
 366 country. To visualize the pooled and country-level regression results we
 367 plotted coefficients and their 95% CIs.

368
 369 To examine the relationship between the criteria for safely managed services,
 370 the presence of *E. coli* at the PoC and PoU was first predicted by whether the
 371 water source was improved, accessible on premises and available when
 372 needed (using only MICS6 surveys with standardized questions on
 373 availability). In a second set of models, we differentiated types of improved
 374 water source (piped, packaged, boreholes/tubewells, delivered water,
 375 protected wells and springs) and examined a wider range of pre-defined
 376 household-level (residence, wealth quintile, improved sanitation, shared
 377 sanitation, open defecation, handwashing, education of household head, sex
 378 of household head and animal ownership) and cluster-level (>75% improved
 379 sanitation, no open defecation) variables in these models (see Table S5).
 380 Additional risk factors for contamination at PoU included: natural flooring,
 381 handwashing facilities with water and soap, water storage, and appropriate
 382 household water treatment. Variables were excluded from country-level
 383 models where there were fewer than 25 cases, for example for open
 384 defecation in Georgia or use of boreholes as a main source of drinking water
 385 in Suriname and Kiribati.

386
 387 We conducted sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of the regression
 388 models to alternative specifications including the use of custom wealth index
 389 quintiles excluding WASH variables (Martel 2017) and the source of the
 390 sample of drinking water rather than the household's main source.
 391

Results

Survey characteristics

The total number of households interviewed ranged from 3,280 (Kiribati) to 64,400 (Bangladesh) with a total sample size of >300,000 households (Table 1). Most selected households with completed household interviews provided a sample of drinking water at PoU (mean 98%, range 86-100%) and at PoC (mean 94%, range 79-100%). The response rate is lower for samples at PoC, often as a result of water sources being too far, not being accessible or not having water available at the time of interview (Table S6). The number of water quality samples collected ranged from 622 to 6,724 at PoU (n=51,434 in total) and 454 to 6,687 at PoC per country (n=48,360 in total).

[Insert Table 1]

Tables S7 and S8 summarize the main characteristics of water services and pre-defined risk factors for faecal contamination in the 20 surveys that have integrated water quality testing. The proportion of the population using improved drinking water sources (the MDG indicator for drinking water) ranges from 43% in Madagascar to over 95% in Bangladesh, Georgia, Iraq, Paraguay, Suriname and Tunisia. Drinking water was accessible on premises for >75% of the population in these six countries and in Lao PDR but below 50% in 9 countries. Availability of drinking water when needed ranged from 68% in Kiribati to >95% in Bangladesh and Lao PDR. Households were most likely to report appropriate treatment practices (boiling, filtration or adding chlorine) in Kiribati (88%), Mongolia (83%) and Lao PDR (37%). Where respondents were observed filling a glass of drinking water, this was often from a storage container in countries that recorded this information (>50% in 12 out of 17 countries) but the respondent usually obtained water directly from the water source in Georgia, Iraq, Tunisia and Suriname.

Improved sanitation facilities were used by over half of the population (>75% in 7 countries) except in Madagascar and Togo, where open defecation was practiced by 40% and 45% respectively. The proportion of the population with handwashing facilities with water and soap ranged from 12% to 92% and was <50% in 9 countries. The proportion of household heads having secondary education or higher ranged from 16% in Nepal to 90% in Georgia. Around half of countries are predominantly rural whereas in 5 out of 20 countries over two-thirds of the population lives in urban areas. Animal ownership ranged from 11% in Suriname and 14% in Iraq to 89% in Kiribati and natural flooring ranged from <1% in Georgia and Tunisia to 61% in Bangladesh and 67% in Nepal.

Water quality results at national level

Figure 2 shows the risk levels for *E. coli* in the source of drinking water (point of collection). The proportion of the population using a drinking water source (either improved or unimproved) with detectable *E. coli* (≥ 1 *E. coli* per 100 mL) ranged from 16% [14-19] in Mongolia and 20 [18-23] in Tunisia to 85% [80-89] in Kiribati and 90% [88-93] in Sierra Leone. A substantial proportion of the population used very high risk drinking water sources (>100 *E. coli* per

100 mL) in Madagascar (51% [48-54]), Sierra Leone (49% [45-53]), Nigeria (46% [43-49]), Togo (38% [33-42]), Lao PDR (36% [34-38]), Kiribati (35% [29-40]) and Côte d'Ivoire (34% [30-38]).

Figure 2: Proportion of population by *E. coli* risk level at the point of collection

Figure 3 shows the risk levels for *E. coli* in the glass of drinking water within the home. The proportion of the population consuming drinking water with detectable *E. coli* at PoU ranged from 20% [17-23] in Mongolia to 97% [96-98] in Sierra Leone and over half the population were exposed to very high risk drinking water at PoU in Madagascar, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Togo. In all countries drinking water was more likely to be contaminated at the PoU than PoC.

Figure 3: Proportion of population by *E. coli* risk level at the point of use

Change in water quality between point of collection and use

For the households with paired samples at PoC and PoU, it is possible to assess whether water quality deteriorated, stayed the same or improved between collection and use (Figure S6). A similar pattern is seen across the countries: deterioration (10-66%) in water quality was more likely than improvement (3-18%) although most often the risk level did not change (30-87%). Among households using a contaminated drinking water source and reporting appropriate water treatment practices, water quality improved in less than half cases (13-44%), except in Mongolia where water quality often improved (70%). As a result, fewer than one in five of these households used water free from *E. coli* at PoU in 17 out of 20 countries and more than one in five used very high risk drinking water at PoU in 14 out of 20 countries (Figure S7).

Water quality, accessibility and availability by water source type

478 **Figure 4: *E. coli* at the point of collection, by type of drinking water**
 479 **source** *Note: For source types with at least 25 cases. Water source*
 480 *categories ordered by unweighted mean proportion with no detectable *E. coli*.*

481
 482 Figure 4 shows that the levels of *E. coli* vary considerably between water
 483 source types and between countries, but that contamination in all source
 484 types ranged from low to very high. The general pattern suggests that piped
 485 water was often the most likely to be free from contamination, followed by water
 486 from boreholes/tubewells then packaged and delivered water. The quality of
 487 piped water varies considerably between countries with around 20% of the
 488 population using piped water that exceeds 100 *E. coli* per 100 mL in
 489 Bangladesh, Kiribati, Nepal and Nigeria, and around 40% in Sierra Leone and
 490 Lao PDR. In Bangladesh, boreholes provided considerably higher quality
 491 water than piped water supplies (63% vs 44% free from *E. coli*). Other
 492 improved sources were also often found to be contaminated. Rainwater and
 493 protected wells and springs consistently had significant levels of
 494 contamination but appear to be less frequently contaminated than unimproved
 495 sources such as unprotected wells and springs and surface water. Delivered
 496 water in Mongolia and Tunisia was usually free from *E. coli* but this was not
 497 the case in Iraq and Nigeria. Figure S8 shows the *E. coli* risk levels at PoU.

498
 499 Figure 5 shows that there is also considerable variation in accessibility of
 500 different water source types across countries, but unimproved sources and
 501 surface water are less likely to be accessible on premises or within 30
 502 minutes.

503
 504 Figure 6 shows that there is less variability in reported availability of drinking
 505 water, but piped water is often less reliable than other improved and
 506 unimproved sources.

507
 508 Table S3 lists the main reasons why water was unavailable in the last month.
 509 Most households without water in the last month attributed this to water not
 510 being available from the source (78.8%) or the source not being accessible
 511 (8.5%) and fewer due to water being too expensive (1.5%). A substantial
 512 proportion of households without water available reported that there were
 513 other reasons, especially in Mongolia (33.0%), Lao PDR (21.8%) and Kiribati
 514 (20.5%).

515

516

Figure 5: Location and time to collect water from of main source of drinking water, by type of water source *Note: For source types with at least 25 cases. Water source categories ordered by unweighted mean proportion with on premises.*

517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526

Figure 6: Availability of drinking water, by type of water source
Note: For source types with at least 25 cases. Water source categories ordered by unweighted mean proportion with available when needed.

536 **Inequalities in water quality by wealth quintile**

Figure 7: *E. coli* contamination of drinking water at point of collection and point of use, by wealth quintile Wealth quintiles from 1 (Poorest) through 5 (Richest). Orange lines: At least 1 CFU *E. coli*/100 mL sample; Red lines: Over 100 CFU *E. coli*/100 mL.

Figure 7 shows the patterns of *E. coli* contamination by wealth quintile. Except in Bangladesh, Kiribati and Sierra Leone, the poorest quintiles are more likely to use sources of drinking water contaminated with *E. coli*. The differences in proportion of the population using sources contaminated with *E. coli* between the richest and poorest quintiles exceeded 50% points in 7 countries. The disparities in water quality at PoU are similar in most of the countries and there is a notable deterioration even in the richest quintile in several countries. With a few exceptions (e.g. Kiribati and Nigeria), absolute disparities between the poorest and richest were generally larger for any contamination than for very high risk drinking water. In contrast, relative inequalities tended to be greater for very high risk drinking water at both PoC and PoU.

556 ***Safely managed drinking water services***

557 Table 2 shows national estimates for the proportion of population using
 558 improved water sources, as well as the proportion with improved water
 559 sources which are accessible, available and free from faecal contamination. In
 560 14 out of 20 countries the quality criterion was the least likely to be met, in the
 561 other countries accessibility on premises was the limiting factor. The standard
 562 JMP method is to calculate accessibility, availability, and quality of improved
 563 drinking water supplies separately in the rural and urban domains, and use
 564 the minimum of the three as the safely managed drinking water indicator
 565 (WHO/UNICEF 2018a). A national estimate is then produced by weighted
 566 average of the rural and urban estimates. This approach allows the JMP to
 567 combine data coming from different sources. When information on all of the
 568 criteria for safely managed drinking water services are available from a single
 569 household survey, they can be combined at the household level to determine
 570 where all criteria are met which produces substantially lower estimates.

571

572 [Insert Table 2]

573

574 Figure 8 compares the coverage of improved and safely managed services
 575 calculated at the domain and household levels. The adjustment for
 576 accessibility, availability and quality results in a substantial reduction in all
 577 countries, including Bangladesh, Georgia, Paraguay, Suriname and Tunisia
 578 where use of improved drinking water sources exceeded 95%. The mean gap
 579 between use of improved drinking water and safely managed drinking water
 580 services was 58 percentage points calculated at the household level
 581 compared with 46 percentage points at the domain level.

Figure 8. Comparison of improved and safely managed services calculated at domain- and household-level. Data on water availability in Nepal are for piped water only. No data on availability of drinking water were collected for Congo and Côte d'Ivoire.

Risk factors for *E. coli* contamination

The results of bivariate regression are provided in supplementary materials and we find that all pre-selected variables are significantly associated with faecal contamination at PoC and PoU in at least one country (Tables S9 and S10).

In a first set of multivariate regression models, we examined the association between each of the criteria for safely managed services and faecal contamination at PoC and PoU (Figure 10, Table 3). Figure 10 shows strong and significant impacts of improved water (RR = 0.64 [0.52-0.78]) and accessibility on premises (RR = 0.78 [0.67-0.91]) at PoC. A similar reduction in the risk of contamination at the PoU was seen for water located on premises (RR = 0.75 [0.65-0.86]) but improved sources were less strongly associated at the PoU (RR = 0.85 [0.80-0.92]). RRs for availability of water when needed were all below 1 but were not significant in the pooled estimates at the 5% level. This may reflect the heterogeneity in country-level effect sizes for availability which ranges from Iraq (RR = 0.73 [0.67-0.79]) to Zimbabwe (RR = 1.20 [1.07-1.35]) at PoC. Most RRs were below 1 for individual country models for improved water and accessibility of water on premises (Table 3). Kiribati was the only country with an RRs for PoC contamination that were not significantly below 1 for improved water. RRs for very high levels of contamination are also shown in Figure 11 and demonstrate the protection afforded by improved water sources at PoC (RR = 0.34 [0.24-0.49]) and PoU (RR = 0.58 [0.49-0.67]).

Figure 10. Association between use of improved water sources, and availability and accessibility of improved drinking water sources, and faecal contamination. Includes MICS6 with standard questions on availability of drinking water (n=15). An RR of <1 implies a lower risk of detecting *E. coli*.

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

Figure 11. Association between use of improved water sources, and availability and accessibility of improved drinking water sources, and very high risk drinking water. Includes MICS6 with standard questions on availability of drinking water (n=15). An RR of <1 implies a lower risk of > 100 *E. coli* per 100 ml.

[Insert Table 3]

In a second set of multivariate regression models we included all pre-selected risk factors for contamination. The RRs for contamination and very high risk drinking water vary considerably between countries with each risk factor significantly associated with faecal contamination in at least one country (Figures S12-S26). Figure 12 and 13 shows the pooled results across the 15 MICS6 and demonstrates the strong impact of water supply type and wealth in these models and confirms the risk of contamination is considerably lower for some types of improved source than others. Compared to unimproved water sources, pooled estimates suggest that piped water 0.58 (0.44,0.76) (RR = 0.60 [0.51-0.71]), boreholes/tubewells 0.61 (0.51,0.73) (RR = 0.59 [0.47-0.74]) reduced the risk of contamination at PoC whereas protected dug wells and springs 1.00 (0.93,1.08) (RR = 1.0 [0.94-1.10]) and rainwater 1.10 (0.86,1.42) (RR = 1.1 [0.88-1.30]) did not. At PoU only piped water was found to be associated with a lower risk of contamination 0.87 (0.81,0.93) (RR = 0.86 [0.80-0.92]). Water accessible on premises was associated with decreased risk of contamination at PoU 0.92 (0.88,0.96) (RR= 0.92 [0.88-0.96]). All improved drinking water source types offered protection against very high risk drinking water at PoC and PoU, with the exception of rainwater and delivered water which were not significant at PoU.

Compared to the poorest quintile, the risk of very high risk contamination at PoU was lower in all other quintiles, with a clear trend with increasing wealth.

Animal ownership (RR = 1.08 [1.03-1.14]) and rural residence (RR = 1.11 [1.03-1.19]) were found to increase the risk of contamination at the PoC. Community (>75%) improved sanitation coverage 0.95 (0.91,0.98) (RR = 0.95 [0.92-0.99]) but not household sanitation coverage 1.03 (0.96,1.10) (RR = 1.02 [0.99-1.06]) was associated with lower risk of contamination at PoU. Household water treatment was not significantly associated with lower risk of contamination at PoU (RR = 0.90 [0.79-1.03]).

Figure 12. Adjusted relative risks for faecal contamination of drinking water at point of collection and point of use. Includes MICS6 with standard questions on availability of drinking water (n=15). An RR of <1 implies a lower risk of detecting *E. coli*.

Figure 13. Adjusted relative risks for very high risk drinking water at point of collection and point of use. Includes MICS6 with standard questions on availability of drinking water (n=15). An RR of <1 implies a lower risk of > 100 *E. coli* per 100 ml.

In sensitivity analyses we found excluding WASH variables from the wealth index marginally increased the RRs for water supply types and decreased the strength of the association with wealth (Figure S27) however use of the source of the water quality sample rather than a household's main source had a negligible impact on RRs for water source types (Figure S28).

679

680 Discussion

681

682 The new SDG indicator for drinking water “safely managed services” reflects
683 consensus on the need to go beyond monitoring the types of water sources
684 used by households and to monitor the level of service received. Integration of
685 water testing in multi-topic household surveys has demonstrated the feasibility
686 of this approach for collecting representative data on drinking water service
687 levels and the ability to link them with information on the socio-economic
688 characteristics of the population. Integrating water testing into existing surveys
689 provides a cost-effective approach compared with running a dedicated water
690 quality survey.

691

692 ***Water quality and risk factors for contamination***

693 The findings in the countries included in the analysis show that large
694 proportions of the population are exposed to faecal contamination through
695 their drinking water and many people are exposed to very high levels of
696 contamination.

697

698 In line with a systematic review of the quality of water from different sources
699 (Bain et al. 2014b), we find that piped water, packaged water and boreholes
700 are generally providing higher quality water than unimproved sources and
701 they offer substantial protection against very high risk drinking water.
702 Rainwater harvesting, delivered water, and protected wells and springs often
703 do not provide drinking water that is less likely to be contaminated than
704 unimproved sources. Piped water was the only source type significantly
705 associated with water free from contamination at PoU in the adjusted models.

706

707 By combining data on water quality with information on the socio-economic
708 status of households, it was possible to explore patterns by wealth quintile in
709 greater detail than prior studies (Yang et al. 2013). We find pronounced
710 differences between rich and poor in almost all countries. Differences were
711 smaller in Bangladesh where the richest were found to be more likely to use
712 water from a contaminated source. This reflects the high degree of
713 contamination of piped water supplies in Bangladesh disproportionately used
714 by the wealthy, compared to the less contaminated boreholes used by most of
715 the population.

716

717 The surveys also confirm that there is often substantial deterioration in quality
718 between PoC and the point where households consume drinking water
719 (Shields et al. 2015; Wright et al. 2004). In 25% to 40% of households the
720 water quality deteriorated by at least one risk class, compared with
721 improvements in only 8% to 20%. In many countries appropriate household
722 water treatment practices were relatively uncommon and most households
723 store drinking water at home. Our analysis suggests that household water
724 treatment usually does not provide substantial protection for households using
725 contaminated sources (with the notable exception of boiling in Mongolia).
726 These findings are likely to be impacted by a lack of correct and consistent
727 use of water treatment practices and reporting bias, which has been
728 documented in other countries (Rosa et al. 2016; Rosa and Clasen 2017),

and call into question the use of household water treatment in burden of disease estimates by WHO and IHME (Pruss-Ustun et al. 2019; Stanaway et al. 2018). In contrast, we find that animal ownership (Wardrop et al. 2018), rural residence and community sanitation coverage are significantly associated with contamination at PoC and PoU in the adjusted regression models.

The risk factors for contamination vary considerably between countries and this heterogeneity is reflected in the range of effect sizes in the individual country models. Further work is required to understand the relationship between household and community level risk factors and the extent to which these can be mitigated through interventions to improve infrastructure and change behaviours.

Monitoring safely managed services

In addition to integrating the water quality module, questions that address the availability and accessibility of drinking water are required to monitor safely managed services. Questions on the location and/or time to collect drinking water have been included since the second round of MICS in 1999-2003 and form part of the JMP's updated guidance on monitoring WASH in household surveys (WHO/UNICEF 2018b). New questions to assess the availability of drinking water services were asked in 17 out of 20 countries to establish the population lacking sufficient drinking water when needed. In these countries the proportion of the population drinking water that was not accessible on premises, or which was contaminated with *E. coli*, was generally much higher than the proportion reporting lacking sufficient water in the last month.

Multivariable regression analysis exploring the association between drinking water sources meeting the criteria for safely managed services provides further evidence that improved drinking water services are more likely to be free of contamination and underscores the importance of accessibility on premises for water quality, especially at the PoU. However, the models suggest that improved sources meeting the criterion for availability are not necessarily more likely to be free from contamination. Furthermore, the relationships between the individual criteria differ between and within countries. This suggests that it is important to separately monitor these new criteria and that there may be tradeoffs in seeking to improve quality, availability or accessibility.

The integration of water quality testing in household surveys should complement, not compete with, ongoing efforts to strengthen surveillance of water quality by regulatory authorities. In many low and middle-income countries, water quality data from regulatory authorities are limited, especially for rural areas. Nationally representative data from household surveys can provide a cost-effective means of filling these data gaps in the short term and draw attention to service quality in the absence of regulation. Furthermore, the responsibility of the service provider usually ends at the household connection or public tap, as a result regulators rarely collect samples from within the home.

779 **Recommendations for water testing in future household surveys**

780 The water quality module has been integrated in an increasing number of
 781 MICS and other national and sub-national surveys with support from the JMP
 782 team including national household surveys in Ghana, Democratic People's
 783 Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, Ecuador and Lebanon (WHO/UNICEF 2019a).
 784 There have also been sub-national pilots in the Demographic and Health
 785 Survey in Peru (Wang et al. 2017), SUSENAS in Indonesia (Cronin et al.
 786 2017) and Living Conditions Survey in Afghanistan (Central Statistical
 787 Organization of Afghanistan 2017). This illustrates the growing demand for
 788 understanding the quality of services and the willingness of national
 789 authorities to shine a light on this important but politically sensitive issue.

790
 791 Several key lessons from these experiences taking water testing to scale
 792 could inform the design and implementation of future surveys. In particular,
 793 testing drinking water in a sub-sample of households for a limited number of
 794 priority parameters is critical to the cost effectiveness and practicability of this
 795 approach. The design effect will vary depending on the number of samples
 796 tested but also the context, parameter and survey stratification. Analysis of
 797 these early surveys suggests that conducting water quality testing in
 798 approximately four households per cluster provides a good balance between
 799 increasing statistical power and minimizing the design effect. Strong technical
 800 support is often available from national authorities and water quality experts
 801 who are familiar with membrane filtration in a laboratory setting. Involvement
 802 of regulatory authorities is strongly recommended given their mandate for
 803 oversight of water service provision. Quality control measures are important
 804 during fieldwork and in order to build confidence in the results – blank tests
 805 are especially valuable to confirm that detection of *E. coli* is not the result of
 806 poor hygiene by field teams. Close attention is needed for the training which,
 807 depending on the number of teams and facilitators, should last 3-5 days and
 808 include sufficient practice (preferably at least 15 tests) for each step in the
 809 process.

810
 811 Due to logistical considerations and concerns related to misinterpretation of
 812 test results by households, water quality data were not shared with individual
 813 households but were made available in aggregate form in the MICS final
 814 reports and in anonymized form in the datasets used in this analysis. In a few
 815 countries leaflets explaining contamination risks and methods for safe water
 816 treatment and storage were provided to households selected for the water
 817 quality module. Further work is needed to determine how best to share
 818 information on water quality with households and their communities in order to
 819 inform decisions on data sharing by implementing agencies (Khan et al.
 820 2017).

821 822 **Water testing equipment and procedures**

823 There are several water quality tests that could potentially be integrated in
 824 household surveys (Bain et al. 2012). In the approach used in MICS an
 825 adapted membrane filtration process has been used, yielding reliable
 826 quantitative results (Brown et al. 2020). The costs are approximately \$2.5 per
 827 test using the new “*E. coli* only” Compact Dry plates and \$1500 per team for

828 hardware (mainly the filtration equipment) but these are expected to reduce
829 over time.

830

831 The use of enzymatic substrates offers specific detection of *E. coli* and
832 permits the use of non-standard incubation temperatures in contrast to the
833 often-used thermotolerant coliform tests which require incubation at circa
834 44°C to ensure specificity (Matthews and Tung 2014). Although incubation
835 belts have proven to be a pragmatic approach, further research and
836 development on incubation technologies is merited since belts need to be
837 worn overnight and are considered inappropriate in some parts of the world
838 (e.g. northern Nigeria, Afghanistan). Ambient temperature and phase change
839 incubators are both potential solutions (Brown et al. 2011) and CompactDry™
840 plates have been shown to perform favourably when compared to reference
841 methods when incubated at ambient temperature in Bangalore, India (Brown
842 et al. 2020).

843

844 Future surveys could consider the use of presence/absence testing as used in
845 Ecuador ENEMDU (Moreno et al. 2020)(where contamination is expected to
846 be relatively rare) or combined with a 1 mL plate (to detect high levels).
847 Alternatively, the reuse of manifolds in multiple surveys or the development of
848 a lower cost filtration apparatus could significantly lower costs for surveys with
849 larger numbers of teams such as Nigeria. A low-cost manifold (<US\$100) has
850 successfully been piloted in the Afghanistan Living Conditions survey (Central
851 Statistical Organization of Afghanistan 2017) and provincial MICS in Pakistan
852 (Pakistan Punjab Bureau of Statistics 2018). In the longer term it is hoped that
853 novel, rapid tests will replace the culture-based approaches that dominate the
854 water quality testing market (Rompre et al. 2002; UNICEF 2017). Such tests
855 have the potential to greatly reduce the cost and complexity of water testing in
856 household surveys.

857

858 **Limitations**

859 Integrating water quality testing in nationally representative household
860 surveys provides a single measurement of water quality, often during a
861 season when weather is favourable for fieldwork, and is not a substitute for
862 routine monitoring by the responsible authorities in each country. As a
863 snapshot of quality it will likely underestimate exposure to faecal indicator
864 bacteria 'at all times'. Furthermore, *E. coli* as an indicator of faecal
865 contamination has known limitations (Gleeson and Grey 1996) including
866 greater sensitivity to chlorine than pathogens such as *Cryptosporidium* (WHO
867 2017).

868

869 To match published reports, our main analysis of inequalities by wealth did
870 not exclude water, sanitation and hygiene facilities in the definition of the
871 asset index (Martel 2017) but we conducted a sensitivity analysis to explore
872 this. The sample size, especially in Nepal and Kiribati, limits the precision of
873 estimates for subpopulations and inference from the regression models.
874 Different concepts of availability were evaluated in the MICS5 round, limiting
875 comparability with data collected during the MICS6 round and highlighting the
876 importance of standardized approaches to data collection. The exploratory
877 regression analysis examined the presence or absence of *E. coli* and

878 exposure to very high risk drinking water (>100 *E. coli* per 100 mL) at PoC
879 and PoU and future studies could examine changes in risk levels between
880 these two sampling locations in more detail. There are many potential risk
881 factors for water quality that were not considered in the regression analysis
882 either because they are not collected in MICS (e.g. metrological data, sanitary
883 risk assessments) or because the number of missing values is large (e.g.
884 child faeces disposal practices). Furthermore, the cross-sectional nature of
885 the data may understate the importance of risk factors that may be important
886 during the wet season. Regression estimates were not weighted to reflect
887 population sizes and the contribution of each survey to the pooled estimates
888 reflects the varying number of samples taken in each country.
889
890
891
892

893 **References**

- 894
- 895 Aldana JM. Rapid assessment of drinking-water quality in the republic of
896 nicaragua: Country report of the pilot project implementation in 2004-2005.
897 2010. Geneva, WHO/UNICEF.
- 898 Aliev S, Shodmonov P, Babakhanova N, Schmoll O. Rapid assessment of
899 drinking-water quality in the republic of tajikistan: Country report of the pilot
900 project implementation in 2004–2005. 2010. Geneva, WHO/UNICEF.
- 901 Bain R, Bartram J, Elliott M, Matthews R, McMahan L, Tung R, et al. 2012. A
902 summary catalogue of microbial drinking water tests for low and medium
903 resource settings. *International journal of environmental research and public*
904 *health* 9:1609-1625.
- 905 Bain R, Cronk R, Hossain R, Bonjour S, Onda K, Wright J, et al. 2014a.
906 Global assessment of exposure to faecal contamination through drinking
907 water based on a systematic review. *Tropical medicine & international health* :
908 *TM & IH* 19:917-927.
- 909 Bain R, Cronk R, Wright J, Yang H, Slaymaker T, Bartram J. 2014b. Fecal
910 contamination of drinking-water in low- and middle-income countries: A
911 systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS medicine* 11:e1001644.
- 912 Bartram J, Brocklehurst C, Fisher MB, Luyendijk R, Hossain R, Wardlaw T, et
913 al. 2014. Global monitoring of water supply and sanitation: History, methods
914 and future challenges. *International journal of environmental research and*
915 *public health* 11:8137-8165.
- 916 Brown J, Stauber C, Murphy JL, Khan A, Mu T, Elliott M, et al. 2011. Ambient-
917 temperature incubation for the field detection of escherichia coli in drinking
918 water. *Journal of applied microbiology* 110:915-923.
- 919 Brown J, Bir A, Bain RES. 2020. Novel methods for global water safety
920 monitoring: Comparative analysis of low-cost, field-ready e. Coli assays. *npj*
921 *Clean Water* 3:9.
- 922 Central Statistical Organization of Afghanistan. 2017. Afghanistan living
923 conditions survey 2016-2017.
- 924 Cronin AA, Odagiri M, Arsyad B, Nuryetty MT, Amannullah G, Santoso H, et
925 al. 2017. Piloting water quality testing coupled with a national socioeconomic
926 survey in yogyakarta province, indonesia, towards tracking of sustainable
927 development goal 6. *International journal of hygiene and environmental health*
928 220:1141-1151.
- 929 Garn JV, Boisson S, Willis R, Bakhtiari A, Al-Khatib T, Amer K, et al. 2018.
930 Sanitation and water supply coverage thresholds associated with active
931 trachoma: Modeling cross-sectional data from 13 countries. *PLoS Negl Trop*
932 *Dis* 12:e0006110.

- 933 Gelman A, Hill J. 2007. Data analysis using regression and
934 multilevel/hierarchical models. Cambridge, UK:Cambridge University Press.
- 935 Giné-Garriga R, Jimenez A, Pérez-Foguet A. 2013. The issue of the design
936 effect in water, sanitation and hygiene studies. In: 35th WEDC International
937 Conference (WEDC, ed). Nakuru, Kenya.
- 938 Gleeson C, Grey N. 1996. The coliform index and waterborne disease:
939 Problems of microbial drinking water assessment.
- 940 Haque S, Joseph G, Moqueet N. 2017. Does arsenic-contaminated drinking
941 water limit early childhood development in bangladesh (Policy Research
942 Working Paper). Washington DC,:World Bank.
- 943 Howard G, Ince M, Schmoll O, Smith M, Godfrey S, Properzi F. Rapid
944 assessment of drinking-water quality: A handbook for implementation (draft).
945 2009.
- 946 Ince M, Bashire D, Oni OOO, Awe EO, Ogbechie V, Korve K, et al. Rapid
947 assessment of drinking-water quality in the federal republic of nigeria: Country
948 report of the pilot project implementation in 2004-2005. 2010. Geneva,
949 WHO/UNICEF.
- 950 Kandel P, Kunwar R, Lamichhane P, Karki S. 2017. Extent of fecal
951 contamination of household drinking water in nepal: Further analysis of nepal
952 multiple indicator cluster survey 2014. The American journal of tropical
953 medicine and hygiene 96:446-448.
- 954 Khan S, Hancioglu A. 2019. Multiple indicator cluster surveys: Delivering
955 robust data on children and women across the globe. Studies in family
956 planning 50:279-286.
- 957 Khan SM, Bain RES, Lunze K, Unalan T, Beshanski- B, Slaymaker T, et al.
958 2017. Optimizing household survey methods to monitor the sustainable
959 development goals sanitation and hygiene : A mixed-methods field-test in
960 belize. PLoS One:1-18.
- 961 Martel P. 2017. Review of options for reporting water, sanitation and hygiene
962 coverage by wealth quintile. New York:UNICEF.
- 963 Matthews RL, Tung R. 2014. Broader incubation temperature tolerances for
964 microbial drinking water testing with enzyme substrate tests. J Water Health
965 12:113-121.
- 966 Moreno L, Pozo M, Vancraeynest K, Bain R, Palacios JC, Jácome F. 2020.
967 Integrating water-quality analysis in national household surveys: Water and
968 sanitation sector learnings of ecuador. npj Clean Water 3:23.
- 969 Onda K, LoBuglio J, Bartram J. 2012. Global access to safe water:
970 Accounting for water quality and the resulting impact on mdg progress.
971 International journal of environmental research and public health 9:880-894.

972 Pakistan Punjab Bureau of Statistics. 2018. Multiple indicator cluster survey
973 2017-2018: Survey findings report.

974 Pruss-Ustun A, Wolf J, Bartram J, Clasen T, Cumming O, Freeman MC, et al.
975 2019. Burden of disease from inadequate water, sanitation and hygiene for
976 selected adverse health outcomes: An updated analysis with a focus on low-
977 and middle-income countries. *International journal of hygiene and*
978 *environmental health* 222:765-777.

979 Rompre A, Servais P, Baudart J, de-Roubin MR, Laurent P. 2002. Detection
980 and enumeration of coliforms in drinking water: Current methods and
981 emerging approaches. *Journal of microbiological methods* 49:31-54.

982 Rosa G, Kelly P, Clasen T. 2016. Consistency of use and effectiveness of
983 household water treatment practices among urban and rural populations
984 claiming to treat their drinking water at home: A case study in zambia. *The*
985 *American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene* 94:445-455.

986 Rosa G, Clasen T. 2017. Consistency of use and effectiveness of household
987 water treatment among indian households claiming to treat their water. *The*
988 *American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene* 97:259-270.

989 Shields KF, Bain RES, Cronk R, Wright JA, Bartram J. 2015. Association of
990 supply type with fecal contamination of source water and household stored
991 drinking water in developing countries: A bivariate meta-analysis.
992 *Environmental Health Perspectives* 123:1222-1231.

993 Stanaway JD, Afshin A, Gakidou E, Lim SS, Abate D, Abate KH, et al. 2018.
994 Global, regional, and national comparative risk assessment of 84 behavioural,
995 environmental and occupational, and metabolic risks or clusters of risks for
996 195 countries and territories, 1990–2017: A systematic analysis for the global
997 burden of disease study 2017. *The Lancet* 392:1923-1994.

998 Tadesse D, Desta A, Geyid A, Girma W, Fisseha S, Schmoll O. 2010. Rapid
999 assessment of drinking-water quality in the federal democratic republic of
1000 ethiopia: Country report of the pilot project implementation in 2004-2005.
1001 Geneva:WHO/UNICEF.

1002 UNICEF. 2017. Unicef target product profile rapid e. Coli detection. Available:
1003 [https://www.unicef.org/supply/files/UNICEF_TPP_Rapid_E_coli_Detection_v2.2](https://www.unicef.org/supply/files/UNICEF_TPP_Rapid_E_coli_Detection_v2.2_Final_2017.08.04.pdf)
1004 [_Final_2017.08.04.pdf](https://www.unicef.org/supply/files/UNICEF_TPP_Rapid_E_coli_Detection_v2.2_Final_2017.08.04.pdf).

1005 United Nations. 2017. Sdg indicators - metadata repository. Available:
1006 <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/files/Metadata-06-01-01.pdf>.

1007 Wang A, McMahan L, Rutstein S, Stauber C, Reyes J, Sobsey MD. 2017.
1008 Household microbial water quality testing in a peruvian demographic and
1009 health survey: Evaluation of the compartment bag test for escherichia coli.
1010 *The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene* 96:970-975.

1011 Wardrop NA, Hill AG, Dzodzomenyo M, Aryeetey G, Wright JA. 2018.
1012 Livestock ownership and microbial contamination of drinking-water: Evidence
1013 from nationally representative household surveys in ghana, nepal and
1014 bangladesh. International journal of hygiene and environmental health 221:33-
1015 40.

1016 WHO, UNICEF. 2012. Rapid assessment of drinking-water quality: A
1017 handbook for implementation. Geneva, Switzerland.

1018 WHO. 2017. Guidelines for drinking-water quality.

1019 WHO/UNICEF. 2017a. Thematic report on safely managed drinking water
1020 services.WHO/UNICEF JMP.

1021 WHO/UNICEF. 2017b. Progress on drinking water, sanitation and hygiene –
1022 2017 update and sdg baselines.WHO/UNICEF JMP.

1023 WHO/UNICEF. 2018a. Jmp methodology: 2017 update & sdg baselines.

1024 WHO/UNICEF. 2018b. Core questions on water, sanitation and hygiene for
1025 household surveys: 2018 update.

1026 WHO/UNICEF. 2019a. Water quality monitoring in multitopic household
1027 surveys. Available: [https://washdata.org/monitoring/drinking-water/water-](https://washdata.org/monitoring/drinking-water/water-quality-monitoring)
1028 [quality-monitoring](https://washdata.org/monitoring/drinking-water/water-quality-monitoring).

1029 WHO/UNICEF. 2019b. Progress on household drinking water, sanitation and
1030 hygiene 2000-2017: Special focus on inequalities. New York.

1031 Wolf J, Johnston R, Freeman MC, Ram PK, Slaymaker T, Laurenz E, et al.
1032 2019. Handwashing with soap after potential faecal contact: Global, regional
1033 and country estimates. Int J Epidemiol 48:1204-1218.

1034 Wright J, Gundry S, Conroy R. 2004. Household drinking water in developing
1035 countries: A systematic review of microbiological contamination between
1036 source and point-of-use. Tropical Medicine & International Health 9:106-117.

1037 Yang H, Bain R, Bartram J, Gundry S, Pedley S, Wright J. 2013. Water safety
1038 and inequality in access to drinking-water between rich and poor households.
1039 Environmental science & technology 47:1222-1230.

1040 Zou G. 2004. A modified poisson regression approach to prospective studies
1041 with binary data. American journal of epidemiology 159:702-706.
1042
1043

TABLES

Table 1: Nationally representative MICS that have integrated water testing, 2014-2019

Country (MICS round)	Fieldwork	Households interviewed (response rate)	Clusters	Samples at point of collection (response rate)	Samples at point of use (response rate)	Teams	Implementing agencies	Technical assistance for water quality testing	Training duration
Bangladesh (MICS6)	Jan-June 2019	61242 (99.4%)	3220	6069 (98.7%)	6140 (99.8%)	34	Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics	International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh	5 days
Congo (MICS5)	Nov 2014- Feb 2015	12811 (99.6%)	531	1277 (81.9%)	1507 (95.8%)	19	Institut National de la Statistique	Société nationale de distribution d'eau	5 days
Côte d'Ivoire (MICS5)	April-July 2016	11879 (96.6%)	511	1782 (92.5%)	1908 (99.1%)	21	Institut National de la Statistique	Institut National d'Hygiène Publique and Laboratoire National de Santé Publique	5 days
Gambia (MICS6)	Jan-April 2018	7405 (98.5%)	390	1764 (93.9%)	1865 (99.3%)	8	Gambia Bureau of Statistics	Ministry of Water Resources	5 days
Georgia (MICS6)	Sept-Dec 2018	12270 (94.2%)	706	2429 (79.4%)	2699 (88.2%)	13	National Statistics Office of Georgia	National Center for Disease Control and Public Health	3 days
Ghana (MICS6)	Oct 2017 – Jan 2018	12886 (99.4%)	660	3161 (98.1%)	3219 (99.9%)	25	Ghana Statistical Service	Water Research Institute and Ghana Water Company	4 days
Iraq (MICS6)	Mar-May 2018	20214 (99.5%)	1710	6687 (99.3%)	6724 (99.9%)	39	Central Statistical Organization & Kurdistan Region Statistical Office	Central Public Health Laboratory	2 days
Kiribati (MICS6)	Nov 2018 – Jan 2019	3071 (98.7%)	164	589 (94.1%)	622 (99.4%)	9	Kiribati National Statistics Office	Ministry of Health and Ministry of Infrastructure and Sustainable Energy	4 days
Lao PDR (MICS6)	July-Nov 2017	22287 (99.3%)	1165	3292 (98.0%)	3346 (99.6%)	25	Lao Statistics Bureau	Center for Environmental Health and Water Supply (Nam Saat).	4 days
Lesotho (MICS6)	April-Sept 2018	8847 (95.9%)	400	1339 (97.3%)	1373 (99.8%)	15	Bureau of Statistics	Ministry of Health and Ministry of Water Affairs	3 days
Madagascar (MICS6)	Aug-Nov 2018	17870 (97.7%)	774	3265 (94.9%)	3433 (99.8%)	30	L'Institut National de la Statistique de Madagascar	Ministre de Santé and the Ministre de l'Eau	3 days
Mongolia (MICS6)	Sep-Dec 2018	13798 (98.3%)	580	2598 (94.0%)	2736 (99.0%)	19	National Statistical Office	UNICEF Mongolia	3 days
Nepal (MICS5)	Feb-June 2014	12405 (98.5%)	519	474 (96.1%)	1492 (100.0%)	15	Central Bureau of Statistics	Environment and Public Health Organization	7 days
Nigeria (MICS5)	Sept 2016 – Jan 2017	33901 (98.9%)	2239	2722 (89.0%)	3053 (99.8%)	78	National Bureau of Statistics	Federal Ministry of Water Resources	5 days
Paraguay (MICS5)	June– Sept 2016	7313 (96.3%)	499	1750 (96.5%)	1790 (98.7%)	15	Dirección General de Estadística, Encuestas y Censos	Ente Regulador de Servicios Sanitarios	2 days
Sierra Leone (MICS6)	May-Aug 2017	15309 (99.6%)	600	1748 (98.0%)	1780 (99.8%)	24	Statistics Sierra Leone	Ministry of Water Resources	5 days
Suriname (MICS6)	Mar-Aug 2018	7915 (90.2%)	470	1619 (81.7%)	1701 (85.8%)	10	General Bureau of Statistics	Suriname Water Supply Company and the Bureau of Public Health	4 days
Togo (MICS6)	July-Oct 2017	7916 (98.2%)	420	1088 (94.0%)	1153 (99.7%)	16	Institut National de la Statistique et des Etudes Economiques et	Institut National d'Hygiène	5 days

							Démographiques		
Tunisia (MICS6)	Mar-May 2018	11225 (97.8%)	600	2664 (95.0%)	2769 (98.7%)	32	Institut National de la Statistique	Ministry of Health, Department of Environmental Hygiene and Environmental Protection	3 days
Zimbabwe (MICS6)	Jan-Apr 2019	11091 (98%)	462	2043 (95.6%)	2124 (99.3%)	17	Zimbabwe National Statistics Agency	Ministry of Health and Child Care	4 days
TOTAL	-	311655 (98.3%)	16620	48360 (94.2%)	51434 (98.3%)	464	-	-	-

Table 2: Proportion of population using improved and safely managed drinking water services

Country	Improved % (95%CI)	Improved and accessible on premises % (95%CI)	Improved and available when needed % (95%CI)	Improved and free from contamination % (95%CI)	Safely managed combined at domain-level % (95%CI)	Safely managed combined at household-level % (95%CI)	Difference between improved and domain-level safely managed % pt.	Difference between improved and household-level safely managed % pt.
Bangladesh	98.5 (98.2, 98.8)	82.5 (81.8, 83.1)	95.6 (95.2, 95.9)	59.6 (58.0, 61.1)	59.6 (58.0, 61.1)	49.1 (47.5, 50.6)	38.9	50.4
Congo	84.6 (82.3, 86.9)	55.9 (51.2, 60.5)	N/A	50.3 (43.7, 56.9)	50.3 (43.7, 56.9)	32.4 (26.1, 38.6)	34.3	52.9
Côte d'Ivoire	80.9 (78.3, 83.6)	53.1 (49.6, 56.6)	N/A	45.3 (40.8, 49.9)	45.3 (40.8, 49.9)	34.2 (29.7, 38.8)	35.6	47.7
Gambia	90.4 (88.0, 92.9)	45.2 (40.8, 49.6)	78.7 (76.1, 81.3)	54.1 (48.8, 59.4)	45.2 (40.8, 49.6)	27.7 (23.4, 32.0)	45.2	62.7
Georgia	97.5 (97.0, 98.0)	91.6 (90.4, 92.8)	75.6 (73.5, 77.7)	74.6 (71.5, 77.7)	74.6 (71.5, 77.7)	56 (52.1, 59.9)	22.9	41.5
Ghana	86.0 (83.0, 88.9)	24.5 (22.4, 26.7)	75.8 (73.0, 78.6)	50.9 (47.0, 54.7)	24.5 (22.4, 26.7)	15.7 (13.4, 18.0)	61.4	70.3
Iraq	86.4 (83.5, 89.4)	65.7 (62.5, 68.9)	65.9 (63.0, 68.7)	54.7 (51.0, 58.3)	54.7 (51, 58.3)	35.5 (31.9, 39.1)	40.0	50.5
Kiribati	82.1 (78.8, 85.4)	59.9 (55.8, 64.0)	51.6 (48.7, 54.6)	14.3 (9.4, 19.1)	14.3 (9.4, 19.1)	4.0 (1.9, 6.1)	67.8	73.8
Lao PDR	83.9 (82.1, 85.7)	77.5 (75.5, 79.4)	80.9 (79.1, 82.7)	16 (14.3, 17.7)	16.0 (14.3, 17.7)	15.1 (13.5, 16.7)	67.9	72.8
Lesotho	88.9 (86.6, 91.1)	34.0 (30.5, 37.5)	74.3 (71.8, 76.8)	63.6 (59.3, 67.9)	34.0 (30.5, 37.5)	24.5 (20.7, 28.2)	54.9	64.4
Madagascar	43.0 (40.1, 45.9)	15.4 (13.7, 17.1)	35.8 (33.3, 38.3)	17.1 (14.3, 20.0)	15.4 (13.7, 17.1)	5.7 (4.4, 7.0)	27.6	33.3
Mongolia	88.2 (86.0, 90.4)	33.8 (28.5, 39.1)	74.5 (71.9, 77.2)	79.4 (76.0, 82.7)	33.8 (28.5, 39.1)	22.7 (18.7, 26.7)	54.4	67.1
Nepal	93.9 (92.5, 95.3)	67.1 (64.1, 70.1)	92.9 (90.7, 95.1)	27.9 (21.6, 34.2)	27.9 (21.6, 34.2)	17.9 (10.9, 24.9)	66.0	78.1
Nigeria	69.0 (67.0, 71.0)	23.1 (21.8, 24.4)	56.8 (54.9, 58.7)	21.5 (18.8, 24.2)	21.5 (18.8, 24.2)	3.8 (2.8, 4.9)	47.5	51.3
Paraguay	95.4 (94.2, 96.5)	94.1 (92.8, 95.4)	78.9 (76.7, 81.2)	62.1 (58.1, 66.2)	62.1 (58.1, 66.2)	53.0 (49.1, 57)	33.2	41.8
Sierra Leone	67.8 (65.3, 70.2)	14.5 (13.2, 15.8)	47.4 (45.2, 49.6)	9.6 (7.2, 12.0)	9.6 (7.2, 12.0)	1.4 (0.7, 2.1)	58.2	66.6
Suriname	98.2 (97.6, 98.7)	96.7 (95.8, 97.6)	82.1 (80.3, 83.9)	57 (53.3, 60.7)	57 (53.3, 60.7)	48.3 (44.6, 52.0)	41.1	50.4
Togo	74.6 (70.9, 78.3)	17.3 (15.2, 19.4)	62.4 (59.1, 65.8)	33.2 (28.0, 38.5)	17.3 (15.2, 19.4)	6.2 (4.0, 8.5)	57.3	63.5
Tunisia	98.0 (97.4, 98.6)	89.8 (88.4, 91.2)	79.6 (77.8, 81.3)	78.5 (76.2, 80.9)	78.5 (76.2, 80.9)	58.8 (56, 61.6)	19.5	28.3
Zimbabwe	77.1 (74.3, 79.9)	29.3 (26.4, 32.2)	61.5 (58.9, 64.1)	40.1 (36.5, 43.7)	29.3 (26.4, 32.2)	10.1 (7.8, 12.5)	47.8	57.9

N/A: Availability questions not included in Congo and Côte d'Ivoire

*Proportion of piped water available

Table 3: Association between safely managed criteria and faecal contamination

	RR for contamination at point of collection^ (95% CI)							RR for contamination at the point of use^ (95% CI)						
	Improved water source		Accessible on premises		Available when needed		Obs.	Improved water source		Accessible on premises		Available when needed		Obs.
Bangladesh	0.373***	(0.345,0.404)	1.096 [*]	(1.004,1.197)	0.983	(0.838,1.154)	6069	0.883***	(0.854,0.914)	0.925***	(0.901,0.950)	0.967	(0.917,1.020)	614
Gambia	0.437***	(0.390,0.491)	0.446***	(0.371,0.537)	0.971	(0.842,1.121)	1764	0.780***	(0.739,0.824)	0.632***	(0.581,0.687)	0.964	(0.901,1.031)	186
Georgia	0.559***	(0.478,0.654)	0.730***	(0.627,0.851)	0.907	(0.799,1.028)	2429	0.620***	(0.553,0.697)	0.718***	(0.643,0.803)	0.919	(0.825,1.024)	269
Ghana	0.428***	(0.398,0.461)	0.788***	(0.703,0.884)	0.856 [*]	(0.751,0.975)	3146	0.781***	(0.757,0.807)	0.699***	(0.651,0.751)	0.890***	(0.840,0.943)	315
Iraq	0.697**	(0.561,0.867)	0.617***	(0.572,0.665)	0.726***	(0.669,0.787)	6687	0.739**	(0.600,0.909)	0.586***	(0.552,0.622)	0.751***	(0.702,0.804)	672
Kiribati	0.935 [*]	(0.885,0.987)	0.989	(0.926,1.057)	1.116 [*]	(1.011,1.232)	589	0.997	(0.941,1.055)	0.971	(0.923,1.021)	1.031	(0.976,1.088)	590
Lao PDR	0.873***	(0.845,0.901)	0.929***	(0.894,0.965)	0.946	(0.879,1.018)	3292	0.938**	(0.901,0.975)	0.942**	(0.905,0.980)	0.969	(0.906,1.036)	330
Lesotho	0.500***	(0.425,0.589)	0.417***	(0.303,0.573)	1.048	(0.831,1.323)	1339	0.733***	(0.664,0.808)	0.467***	(0.387,0.564)	1.097	(0.941,1.278)	1340
Madagascar	0.683***	(0.639,0.729)	0.930 [*]	(0.876,0.987)	1.014	(0.954,1.077)	3265	0.835***	(0.802,0.870)	0.874***	(0.832,0.919)	1.012	(0.968,1.058)	3266
Mongolia	0.329***	(0.271,0.398)	0.641**	(0.475,0.865)	1.175	(0.815,1.696)	2595	0.618***	(0.515,0.742)	0.457***	(0.340,0.614)	1.049	(0.770,1.429)	2596
Sierra Leone	0.867***	(0.835,0.901)	0.990	(0.930,1.053)	1.005	(0.966,1.046)	1747	0.972***	(0.957,0.987)	0.946**	(0.908,0.986)	1.003	(0.983,1.024)	1748
Suriname	0.783	(0.587,1.044)	0.643***	(0.499,0.829)	0.911	(0.794,1.045)	1618	0.900	(0.771,1.051)	0.747***	(0.661,0.844)	0.967	(0.882,1.060)	1619
Togo	0.563***	(0.520,0.609)	0.914	(0.812,1.030)	1.027	(0.906,1.163)	1086	0.871***	(0.840,0.903)	0.795***	(0.732,0.864)	0.934**	(0.889,0.982)	1087
Tunisia	0.600**	(0.435,0.827)	0.488***	(0.395,0.604)	1.122	(0.908,1.386)	2662	0.575***	(0.457,0.723)	0.601***	(0.509,0.710)	0.969	(0.825,1.138)	2663
Zimbabwe	0.486***	(0.448,0.526)	0.817***	(0.726,0.920)	1.199**	(1.067,1.347)	2043	0.829***	(0.801,0.860)	0.679***	(0.627,0.736)	1.104**	(1.029,1.184)	2044
Pooled estimate	0.636***	(0.519,0.778)	0.783**	(0.673,0.912)	0.935	(0.822,1.063)	40331	0.854***	(0.796,0.915)	0.749***	(0.653,0.859)	0.945	(0.861,1.039)	40332

Exponentiated coefficients; 95% confidence intervals in brackets

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

^Adjusted for safely managed criteria (improved, accessible on premises, available when needed)

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1: Study flow diagram

Figure 2: Proportion of population by level of *E. coli* in source of drinking water

Figure 3: Proportion of population by level of *E. coli* in a glass of drinking water within the home

Figure 4: *E. coli* in source of drinking water, by type of water source

Note: For source types with at least 25 samples

Figure 5: Location and time to collect water from of main source of drinking water, by type of water source

Note: For source types with at least 25 samples

Figure 6: Availability of drinking water, by type of water source

Note: For source types with at least 25 samples

Figure 7: *E. coli* contamination of drinking water source and household drinking water by wealth quintile Wealth quintiles from 1 (Poorest) through 5 (Richest). Orange lines: At least 1 CFU *E. coli*/100 mL sample; Red lines: Over 100 CFU *E. coli*/100 mL

Figure 8: Improved and safely managed services calculated at domain- and household-level

Note: No data on availability of drinking water were collected for Congo and Côte d'Ivoire. Availability in Nepal is for piped water only.

Figure 9: Risk ratios for association between improved, available and accessible drinking water faecal contamination. Includes MICS6 with standard questions on availability of drinking water (n=15)

Figure 10. Association between use of improved water sources, and availability and accessibility of improved drinking water sources, and faecal contamination. Includes MICS6 with standard questions on availability of drinking water (n=15). An RR of <1 implies a lower risk of detecting *E. coli*.

Figure 11. Association between use of improved water sources, and availability and accessibility of improved drinking water sources, and very high risk drinking water. Includes MICS6 with standard questions on availability of drinking water (n=15). An RR of <1 implies a lower risk of > 100 *E. coli* per 100 ml.

Figure 12. Adjusted relative risks for faecal contamination of drinking water at point of collection and point of use. Includes MICS6 with standard questions on availability of drinking water (n=15). An RR of <1 implies a lower risk of detecting *E. coli*.

52 **Figure 13. Adjusted relative risks for very high risk drinking water at**
53 **point of collection and point of use.** Includes MICS6 with standard questions
54 on availability of drinking water (n=15). An RR of <1 implies a lower risk of > 100 *E.*
55 *coli* per 100 ml.

56

57