



ISSUE SHEET

Sanitation governance

Sanitation governance refers to the rules, roles and relations that make sanitation systems work (or not) – at what cost and for whom. Rural and urban sanitation systems differ, as well as those in high- and low-income areas. The appropriate governance structure ensures that the selected technology and all parts of the system work sustainably in the given setting.

Background

Sanitation generally refers to the facilities and services for the safe disposal of human urine and faeces, including safe storage, transport, treatment, discharge and eventual reuse. Safe sanitation system promotes human health by way of multiple barriers to prevent disease transmission and faecal contamination. This includes important behavioural barriers like hand-washing with soap. Sustainable sanitation emphasises the containment of substances that are harmful to the environment and the reuse of nutrients.

Far too many people live without safe sanitation, and the Millennium Development Goals target for sanitation will not be met. Yet, access to 'improved sanitation' has at least increased more rapidly than the population: the estimated 2.7 billion people that lacked access to improved sanitation in 1990 represented nearly half of the global population, whereas the presently 2.5 billion without access (2012) represent just over a third.

The lowest access to sanitation is found in rural areas: where seven out of ten people without improved sanitation live. The worst situation is found in Sub-Saharan Africa where sanitation service coverage is as low as 30 per cent, and the increase has been lower than the global average of seven per cent.

Whereas safe sanitation can bring immediate convenience to the individual, it is only when sanitation systems function at the broader level that significant health gains are brought to society (and the individual). The type of system that brings the greatest health gains rely on private household facilities rather than shared or public sanitation facilities.

The health burden from diarrhoeal disease is going down: Recent estimates of mortality from diarrhoeal disease indicate some 842,000 deaths in 2012 from inadequate water, sanitation and hygiene, including 280,000 deaths ascribed specifically to poor sanitation. Most of this reduction is attributed to the improved management of diarrhoeal disease, primarily by way of oral rehydration, i.e. avoiding dehydration of those that suffer from diarrhoea.

Improved sanitation remains as a major challenge for reducing diarrhoeal disease and enhancing convenience and quality of life of billions of people. Yet, simply investing more resources into sanitation will not always solve the problem. In many cases, sanitation systems do not work as intended, with toilets constructed but not used, or effluents not contained or collected. Better governance, with clear rules, coordinated roles and collaborative relations, is required to enhance the effectiveness of investments in the area of sanitation.

The recognition of the human right to water and sanitation in 2010 puts the obligation on States to take all necessary steps to achieve universal access to adequate sanitation, as well as the safe disposal of wastewater and faeces. To ensure a coherent governance framework would be one such necessary step.



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.





Issues in sanitation governance

Progress in sanitation is not only hampered by political neglect and a lack of funding. Also, the effectiveness and success rate of interventions has been low. Despite some notable local successes, there is an urgent need for delivering ‘at scale.’ This challenge resides primarily in the realm of governance.

Fragmented responsibilities

Responsibilities in sanitation are fragmented between different sectors and line ministries. This increases the complexity in governance and the risk of administrative struggles: One ministry might be responsible for sewerage and construction aspects (typically Ministries of Water or Public Works), another for housing construction and related regulations (Housing or Urban Development), yet another for hygiene and sanitation promotion (Health) and another for effluent controls (Environment). Coordination is difficult, even when formal mechanisms are established. And even though responsibilities often overlap, the tendency has been for sanitation to fall between chairs.

Decentralisation

Decentralization of responsibilities, commonly to the local government level, is important. Local by-laws and the support of local government are critical for sanitation systems to function. Yet, capacities at the local government level are commonly insufficient, and the resources allocated rarely match the devolved responsibilities. This mismatch and insufficiency need to be addressed as policies place increasing responsibilities at the local level.

Multi-level, multi-stakeholder governance

Sanitation governance takes place at multiple levels and includes a range of stakeholders. There are the various levels of central and local government, along with the private sector and civil society which play crucial roles for the sanitation system to function in different settings, not to mention the paramount role of individual households.

Sanitation services cannot be rolled out in a centralized manner like some other infrastructure services, but depend ultimately upon the actions of a full range of independent actors without any single institution taking the full responsibility.

Incentives, compliance and enforcement – a balanced approach to regulation

There is commonly a great need for better enforcement of sanitary regulations and by-laws. Yet, a greater focus on the incentives for all actors in a system to comply with agreed or existing codes of conduct might be more conducive to reaching the objective of a functioning system.

Adherence to the governance principles of transparency and accountability, based on core values of honesty, equity and professionalism, i.e. “integrity,” is required to reduce corruption and pollution, and to enhance the efficiency of the whole system.

Responding to households’ aspirations

Despite the investments by national agencies or external support agencies; the bulk of the resources that go into sanitation are invested by households. The building of toilets forms part of house construction and their use is an integral part of the prevailing hygiene practices.

It is paramount to understand and respond to households’ aspirations and demands, including in the choice of technology. It is also paramount to assure that there are services, e.g. collection or disposal, match households’ individual investment.

A common problem of many sanitation interventions in the past relates to the non-use of toilet facilities and the lack of adherence to hand-washing ideals, which render the interventions ineffective. This state of affairs is behind the increasing focus on sanitation marketing approaches to stimulate action and demand from households.

Public investment in sanitation

The collective (public goods) nature of health gains from sanitation speak for collective organization of the financing of sanitation services. Yet, conventional public finance in sanitation has focused on subsidies for household and public toilets, and grants for urban sewerage and waste management systems. Subsidies for toilet construction, however, proved to be an ineffective strategy, since they failed to generate demand or stimulate innovation for low-cost products. These subsidies have thus not been able to address the needs of the poor.

Public funding needs to match households' own investments: In rural areas, public funds could be used for sanitation and hygiene promotion, capacity building of service providers, and ensuring sufficient resources for local governments to provide technical support and continuous monitoring of progress. In urban and peri-urban areas, public finance needs to support those capacities that make the often more connected systems work. Notwithstanding, scarce resources are commonly invested into hardware of a centralized sewer which serves only parts of a city. A more equitable use of public funding would ensure to support and improve those systems and services that actually cater for the majority of the population.

Financing for sanitation

The financing of sanitation has been neglected by governments and donors. Donors have started to correct the bias towards water, but national level funding is still scarce. Despite sanitation policies now being in place in most countries, few have a sanitation plan that is fully funded and implemented.

Financing of sanitation investments makes economic sense: Recent estimates find that global economic return on sanitation spending is USD 5.5 to every dollar invested. Most economic gains to society are realized by way of avoiding premature deaths, primarily among children.

Contradictions and taboos

Sanitation has often been seen as an 'unglamorous' or a taboo subject. As a result, it is frequently neglected by politicians, professionals and community leaders. Further, the taboo that surrounds sanitation and hygiene practices, problems and needs – including menstrual hygiene – renders information and policy directives to be contradictory and insufficient.

The private nature of hygiene and sanitation considerations also contributes to the common lack of coherence between private and official norms, e.g. around hygiene practices or building standards (informal and formal institutions). There are also contradictions between planning ideals and what there is on the ground, i.e. ideals of the networked city has given the world many sewerage authorities, but which lack actual sewers to manage.

Vulnerability and disrespect

Access to a convenient, safe and private toilet is an important contributor to human dignity. Moreover, in situations of open defecation, women are highly vulnerable, and even exposed to acts of violence.

Moreover, labour roles in water and sanitation are highly gendered. Cleaning in the house, including toilets, commonly fall upon women or servants. Some of the more important tasks for the sustenance of a household, as well as the maintenance of cleanliness in institutions like schools, hospitals or other establishments are all too often met with disrespect.

The lack of status and respect is an issue throughout the sanitation service chain, with low payments and esteem afforded to some of the more indispensable tasks for society. Attitudes need to change and remuneration to increase.

*“Water is Life.
Sanitation is Dignity”*

The WGF strives to improve access to sanitation for all by way of improving governance-related aspects, including:

- Awareness-raising on the governance gaps in sanitation.
- Research on the practical challenges for achieving sanitation services for all
- Support to policy and capacity development in sanitation through the UNDP GoAL WASH program in a number of countries (e.g. Paraguay and Niger)
- Promotion of the 'intercultural approach' for water and sanitation services access among indigenous peoples



REFERENCES

- WHO & UNICEF (2014) Progress on Drinking Water and Sanitation, 2014 update, WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply and Sanitation, New York and Geneva (Available: http://www.wssinfo.org/fileadmin/user_upload/resources/JMP_report_2014_webEng.pdf)
- Heijnen, M., Cumming, O., Peletz, R., et al. (2014) 'Shared Sanitation versus Individual Household Latrines: A Systematic Review of Health Outcomes'. PLOS ONE, vol 9, no 4: e93300, DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0093300
- Prüss-Ustün, A., Bartram, J., Clasen, T., et al. (2014) 'Burden of disease from inadequate water, sanitation and hygiene in low- and middle-income settings: a retrospective analysis of data from 145 countries'. Tropical Medicine and International Health, vol 19, no 8: 894–905, DOI: 10.1111/tmi.12329
- Cairncross, S., Bartram, J., Cumming, O. & Brocklehurst, C. (2010) 'Hygiene, Sanitation, and Water: What Needs to Be Done?'. PLoS Medicine vol 7, no 11: e1000365, DOI: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000365
- Carlei, V., Marra, A. & Pozzi, C. (2012) 'Public governance, human capital and environmental outcomes: an analysis based on self-organizing maps'. Environmental Policy and Governance, vol 22: 116-126,
- Jiménez, A., Mtango, F. F. & Cairncross, S. (2014) 'What role for local government in sanitation promotion? Lessons from Tanzania'. Water Policy, vol 16: 1104-1120, DOI: 10.2166/wp.2014.203
- Ekane, N., Nykvist, B., Kjellén, M., Noel, S. & Weitz, N. (2014) 'Multi-level sanitation governance: understanding and overcoming challenges in the sanitation sector in sub-Saharan Africa'. Waterlines, vol 33, no 3: 242-256, DOI: 10.3362/2046-1887.2014.024
- Cairncross, S. et al. (2010)
- UN-Water & WHO (2014) UN-water global analysis and assessment of sanitation and drinking-water (GLAAS) 2014 Report: Investing in water and sanitation: increasing access, reducing inequalities, UN-Water and World Health Organization, Geneva (Available: http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/publications/glaas_report_2014/en/)
- WHO (2012) Global costs and benefits of drinking-water supply and sanitation interventions to reach the MDG target and universal coverage, World Health Organization, WHO/HSE/WSH/12.01, Geneva (Available: http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/publications/2012/globalcosts.pdf)
- Kjellén, M., Pensulo, C., Nordqvist, P. & Fogde, M. (eds.) (2012) Global Review of Sanitation System Trends and Interactions with Menstrual Management Practices, Stockholm Environment Institute, Stockholm
- Ekane, N., Fogde, M., Kjellén, M. & Noel, S. (2012) Sanitation and Hygiene Policy – Stated Beliefs and Actual Practice: A Case Study in the Burera District, Rwanda, Working Paper 2012-07 Stockholm Environment Institute, Stockholm

