Improving sanitation with equity?

Can CATS meet the challenge?
What this presentation will cover

Trend analysis of sanitation by wealth quintiles
What does the data tell us?
Why do we see different patterns among countries?
How can CATS address equity in sanitation?
What we still need to understand?
Concept of access to basic sanitation

Indicators:

- % of population that uses an improved sanitation facility
- % of population that uses an unimproved sanitation facility
- % of population that practises open defecation
4 Patterns

• High coverage – low inequality the poor have caught up
• Good overall and equitable progress across all quintiles, including the poorest.
• Inequitable progress - High coverage or progress in the top three quintiles, but limited to no progress in the two bottom quintiles
• Highly inequitable progress - High coverage in the richest quintile, good progress in the fourth, limited progress in the third quintile and virtually no progress or no coverage in the bottom two quintiles
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High coverage – Some inequity
Poorest are catching-up

Colombia
Middle-income countries: High overall coverage
Poorest are catching up
Low/medium-inequity

Drivers: Economic Prosperity and development and/or Social norms?
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Above average coverage – Some inequity
Poorest are catching-up

Uganda
Above average coverage – Equitable progress
Poorest are catching-up

Bangladesh
Above average coverage – Equitable progress? Poorest are catching up but inequity is still considerable

**Peru**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Poorest</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>Richest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Improved facilities**
- **Unimproved facilities**
- **Open defecation**
Low-/middle-income countries: Equitable progress
Poorest are catching up
medium-inequity

Uganda
Bangladesh
Peru

Drivers: Equitable policies? Social norms?
Above average coverage – Progress is inequitable

Poorest 40% made little progress

Zimbabwe
Above average coverage – Progress is inequitable
Poorest 40% made little progress
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Diagram showing the improvement in sanitation coverage between 1995 and 2008 for different income groups in Côte d’Ivoire. The poorest 40% made little progress compared to the richest 19%.
Average coverage – Progress is inequitable
Poorest 40% made little progress

Bolivia
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Low-/middle-income countries: Inequitable progress
Poorest hardly benefit from improvements in sanitation
Medium/high-inequity

Drivers: No Promotion, poor targeting, Wrong policies?
Low coverage – Progress is highly inequitable
Poorest 40% made little progress; large inequities

India
Low coverage – Progress is highly inequitable
Poorest 40% made little progress; large inequities

Nepal
Low coverage – Progress is highly inequitable
Poorest 60% made little progress; large inequities

**Burkina Faso**
Low-income countries: Inequitable progress
Poorest do no benefit from improvements
High-inequity

Drivers: Skewed investments, sector prioritization, implementation practices?
Who benefitted from improvements in sanitation?
1995 - 2008

India - National

Poorest: 3%
2nd: 9%
3rd: 21%
4th: 46%
Richest: 21%
Who benefitted from improvements in sanitation?
1995 - 2008

India – Urban

- Poorest: 12%
- 2nd: 27%
- 3rd: 20%
- 4th: 20%
- Richest: 20%

India – Rural

- Poorest: 2%
- 2nd: 7%
- 3rd: 11%
- 4th: 26%
- Richest: 54%
The poorest quintile is made up for 95% of rural people, while the only a quarter of those in the richest quintile are from rural areas.

Source: India, NFHS 2006
National averages still mask urban/rural divide
Most urban residents are in the top two national quintiles

India - national

India - urban

India - rural
National averages still mask urban/rural divide
Most urban residents are in the top two national quintiles
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So what does this mean for our Sanitation programmes?

Can CATS address inequities in sanitation?
CATS in action: Zambia

% sanitation coverage
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Chambwa
Sibajene
Macha
Dibbilizwe
OVERALL
Results in terms of latrine coverage in the 15 first ODF villages 3 month after triggering → latrine coverage increased from average of 30% to 100%
What we still need to understand

• Inequities beyond poverty – participation
Disparities in access to sanitation between female-headed and non-female-headed households

In some countries female headed households seemed to have prioritized sanitation while in other countries sanitation coverage in female headed households is significantly lower than in non-female headed households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Countries with negative values have lower sanitation coverage in female-headed households compared to non-female-headed households.
What we still need to understand

• Sustaining change – access and affordability

• Stigma

• Equitable programming and resource distribution

• How to bring CATS up the ladder
An equity-focussed approach examines ...

(a) **societal factors** i.e. which social norms, behaviours, practices are impeding access to services or fuelling discrimination and deprivations

(b) **services and systems** i.e. why are services not reaching those who are most in need? What are the barriers to access and what systems constraints are there?

(c) **political and “ideological” issues** i.e. what are the governance, accountability, policy, legislative etc issues that are not favouring equal opportunities for the disadvantaged children and communities?