Sanitary Inspection (SI) Program Assessment Tool

Use this tool to assess your organization's SI program — or your plans for starting one.

How to use this tool: Work through each section. Check the box when a statement is true for your program. Use the Notes column to add details, examples, or gaps. Rate your program at the end of each section using the rating scale provided.

This assessment is meant to drive meaningful improvement — not achieve perfect scores. Use it as a living document and revisit it in six to 12 months to track progress.



PROGRAM INFORMATION

PROGRAM / ORGANIZATION

ASSESSMENT DATE

COMPLETED BY

LOCATION / GEOGRAPHIC AREA

CONTEXT DESCRIPTION (100–150 WORDS): GEOGRAPHIC AREA AND POPULATION SERVED, NUMBER AND TYPES OF WATER SYSTEMS, STAFFING, HOW LONG THE SI PROGRAM HAS BEEN OPERATING, KEY STAKEHOLDERS, AND MAJOR CHALLENGES

Section 1: SI Package Selection and Application

Key Question: Do you have clear criteria for selecting the right SI packages for different water system types?		
Current Status: describe what is true for your program	✓	**Notes**
Written guidance exists for selecting which SI package to use for different types of water systems	☐	
Inspectors know which packages to use for each water system type in your area	☐	
Multiple packages are used together when inspecting complex water systems	☐	
Common package selection mistakes or points of confusion have been identified and addressed	☐	

Rating Scale	
1 = No guidance exists; inspectors are unclear on package selection and likely using wrong packages	Your rating: ☐
2 = Minimal guidance; frequent confusion about which packages to use; incomplete assessments are common	
3 = Some guidance exists but is not complete; inspectors are sometimes unsure which packages are needed	
4 = Clear guidance exists and is generally followed with only minor gaps	
5 = Complete guidance; inspectors confidently select the right packages for all system types	

Key Question: Do you have clear criteria for selecting the right SI packages for different water system types?	
Action Planning	**Notes**
Rationale for your rating:	
One priority action to improve:	
Resources needed:	
Timeline:	
Person responsible:	

Section 2: Standardized Operational Definitions

Key Question: Do you have documented guidance (with photos) defining what each risk factor looks like in your context?		
Current Status: describe what is true for your program	✓	**Notes**
Written guidance exists beyond the SI forms themselves (e.g., Technical Fact Sheets)	☐	
Inspectors have access to World Health Organization (WHO) Technical Fact Sheets	☐	
Local photo examples exist showing what each risk factor looks like in your context	☐	
Inspectors interpret key terms (such as “adequate,” “faulty,” and “dirty”) consistently	☐	
The most inconsistently interpreted risk factors have been identified and documented	☐	

Rating Scale	
1 = No guidance beyond SI forms; each inspector uses completely different interpretations	Your rating: ☐
2 = Minimal guidance; understanding of risk factors is highly inconsistent	
3 = Some guidance exists (e.g., access to Technical Fact Sheets) but is not adapted to the local context	
4 = Good guidance with some local examples; interpretation is mostly consistent with some variation	
5 = Complete photo guide and definitions tailored to the local context; high consistency across inspectors	

Key Question: Do you have documented guidance (with photos) defining what each risk factor looks like in your context?	
Action Planning	**Notes**
Rationale for your rating:	
One priority action to improve:	
Resources needed:	
Timeline:	
Person responsible:	

Section 3: Risk Factor Documentation and Corrective Actions

Key Question: Do inspectors consistently document corrective actions on-site with community input?		
Current Status: describe what is true for your program	✓	**Notes**
The corrective action column is completed on SI forms during inspections	☐	
Corrective actions are specific and actionable (not vague or generic)	☐	
Inspectors discuss findings with communities and water suppliers during inspections	☐	
Photos are used to document risk factors found during inspections	☐	
Communities understand what was found and what they need to do	☐	
A follow-up process exists to track whether corrective actions are completed	☐	

Rating Scale	
1 = Corrective actions are rarely documented; no community engagement; no follow-up	Your rating: ☐
2 = Corrective actions are sometimes documented but are vague and generic; minimal community discussion	
3 = Corrective actions are usually documented but community engagement or specificity is limited	
4 = Good documentation with community engagement; some gaps in specificity, photo use, or follow-up	
5 = Excellent documentation with specific, actionable recommendations developed with the community; systematic follow-up; photo documentation	

Key Question: Do inspectors consistently document corrective actions on-site with community input?	
Action Planning	**Notes**
Rationale for your rating:	
One priority action to improve:	
Resources needed:	
Timeline:	
Person responsible:	

Section 4: Inspector Training and Calibration

Key Questions: Do inspectors receive hands-on training with locally relevant examples? Do you conduct regular joint inspections for calibration? Are refresher training opportunities available?		
Current Status: describe what is true for your program	✓	**Notes**
Inspectors receive formal initial training that includes hands-on field practice	☐	
Training has been conducted within the past 12 months	☐	
Inspectors conduct joint inspections together for calibration purposes	☐	
Regular opportunities exist for peer learning and skill development	☐	
A structured process exists to onboard and mentor new inspectors	☐	
Refresher training is available and used on a regular basis	☐	

Rating Scale	
1 = No formal training; inspectors are learning on the job without guidance or support	Your rating: ☐
2 = Basic training provided but no hands-on practice, follow-up, or calibration	
3 = Adequate initial training but no ongoing calibration or refresher opportunities; skills drift over time	
4 = Good initial training with some ongoing calibration activities; minor gaps in frequency or coverage	
5 = Complete training program with regular joint inspections, refreshers, and continuous calibration	

Key Questions: Do inspectors receive hands-on training with locally relevant examples? Do you conduct regular joint inspections for calibration? Are refresher training opportunities available?	
Action Planning	**Notes**
Rationale for your rating:	
One priority action to improve:	
Resources needed:	
Timeline:	
Person responsible:	

Section 5: Quality Assurance (QA) Processes

Key Question: Do you have systems for supervisor verification, peer review, or re-inspections to ensure consistency?		
Current Status: describe what is true for your program	✓	**Notes**
A supervisor accompanies inspectors on field visits on a regular basis	☐	
Completed SI forms are reviewed by someone before filing or submission	☐	
Verification or re-inspections are conducted to check quality	☐	
Quality indicators are tracked (e.g., average scores by inspector, specific risk factor frequency)	☐	
A process exists to detect inconsistencies or problems across inspectors	☐	
Inspectors receive regular feedback on their performance	☐	
Regular team meetings are held to discuss findings and challenging cases	☐	

Rating Scale	
1 = No QA processes exist; no oversight, verification, or feedback; problems go undetected	Your rating: ☐
2 = Minimal QA; occasional supervisor review but no systematic process or follow-up	
3 = Some QA mechanisms exist but are applied inconsistently; reactive rather than proactive	
4 = Regular QA processes with some gaps in coverage, frequency, or follow-through	
5 = Complete QA system with multiple verification mechanisms, regular monitoring, and continuous improvement feedback loops	

Key Question: Do you have systems for supervisor verification, peer review, or re-inspections to ensure consistency?	
Action Planning	**Notes**
Rationale for your rating:	
One priority action to improve:	
Resources needed:	
Timeline:	
Person responsible:	

Section 6: Data Management and Use

Key Questions: Can you easily aggregate SI scores and track trends over time? Do you use SI data to prioritize actions and allocate resources?		
Current Status: describe what is true for your program	✓	**Notes**
SI data is collected in a consistent format (paper or digital) that allows for analysis	☐	
SI data can be compiled and analyzed without significant effort	☐	
Reports, maps, or visualizations can be generated from SI data	☐	
SI data is used to make decisions about prioritization, resource allocation, or advocacy	☐	
SI data is integrated with other data sources (e.g., water quality testing results)	☐	
SI data is shared with relevant stakeholders in a timely and useful way	☐	
Communities and water suppliers receive feedback on the status of their water system	☐	

Rating Scale	
1 = No systematic data management; forms are filed away and never used; data has no impact on decisions	Your rating: ☐
2 = Basic data entry but no analysis, visualization, or use for decision-making; data compiled only for reporting requirements	
3 = Data is compiled and basic reports are generated but rarely used to guide actions or prioritization	
4 = Good data systems with regular analysis and some use for prioritization and planning; minor gaps in integration or feedback	
5 = Strong data management with easy analysis, regular reporting, data-driven decision-making, integration with other data sources, and feedback loops to all stakeholders	

Key Questions: Can you easily aggregate SI scores and track trends over time? Do you use SI data to prioritize actions and allocate resources?	
Action Planning	**Notes**
Rationale for your rating:	
One priority action to improve:	
Resources needed:	
Timeline:	
Person responsible:	

Overall Program Assessment		
Overall Rating Scale	**Select**	**Primary Reason for Your Overall Rating**
1 = Minimal SI program; major gaps across most areas; limited impact on water safety	◯	
2 = Basic SI program functioning but with significant weaknesses; inconsistent quality	◯	
3 = Adequate SI program with clear strengths and gaps; moderate impact	◯	
4 = Strong SI program with minor gaps; good consistency and data use; clear impact	◯	
5 = Excellent SI program; complete systems; high quality; strong impact on water safety	◯	

Program Strengths and Critical Gaps	
Strengths — what is working well in your program and why	
Strength 1:	
Strength 2:	
Critical Gaps — what is missing and what is the impact	
Critical Gap 1:	
Critical Gap 2:	
Critical Gap 3:	

Top Three Priority Actions	
Priority Action 1	
Action:	
Section(s) addressed:	
Why this is Priority 1:	
Quick win or long-term investment:	
Expected impact:	
Resources needed:	
Who must approve or support:	
Timeline:	
Success indicators:	
Priority Action 2	
Action:	
Section(s) addressed:	
Why this is Priority 2:	

Top Three Priority Actions	
Relationship to Priority 1:	
Quick win or long-term investment:	
Expected impact:	
Resources needed:	
Who must approve or support:	
Timeline:	
Success indicators:	
Priority Action 3	
Action:	
Section(s) addressed:	
Why this is Priority 3:	
How this complements Actions 1 and 2:	
Quick win or long-term investment:	

Top Three Priority Actions	
Expected impact:	
Resources needed:	
Who must approve or support:	
Timeline:	
Success indicators:	

Implementation Planning and Reflection	
Strategic Sequence	
Should these actions be implemented at the same time or in a specific order? Why?	
If you could only do ONE action this year, which would it be and why?	
Challenges and Mitigation	
Biggest anticipated challenge:	
Mitigation strategy:	
Primary resource constraint:	

Implementation Planning and Reflection	
Creative solutions:	
Reflection	
Biggest surprise from this assessment:	
Most important insight:	
How will you use this assessment?	
Optional: Team Meeting	
Team meeting date:	
Attendees:	

Additional Resources

WHO SI Packages: Complete set — https://www.who.int/teams/environment-climate-change-and-health/water-sanitation-and-health/sanitation-safety/sanitation-inspection-packages | Individual packages available by water system type

Implementation Guidance: WHO Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality (Chapter 4 on Water Safety Plans includes SI guidance) | Technical Fact Sheets and Management Advice Sheets within each SI package

Global Water Center Training Resources | Risk Based Approach to Water Quality Monitoring and Management

This assessment is meant to drive meaningful improvement, not achieve perfect scores. Even well-established programs will have gaps. The goal is honest self-assessment that leads to actionable change. Revisit this document in six to 12 months to track progress.