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Introduction

- WASH supply – nagging problem in Africa
  - Coverage in SSA: (30%)
  - Only 4 percentage point change (1990-2010)
  - OD increased by 33 million
- Progress not based on admirable solutions
- Safe WASH – a human right issue
Introduction

• universal access versus access quality
• Are technological options adequately dignifying?
• What values govern sanitation choices?
• Ethical insight will promote sustainability and scalability of options
Useful Reviews - Ethics

• Moral and ethical imperative
• Examines moral validity of choices
• Meaning
  – Right/wrong, good/bad, responsible/irresponsible (Pritchard, 2006)
  – Justice; rights; respect for human dignity, individuals and community
• Plethora of studies in ethics of water
• Limited efforts at studying ethics of SH
Useful Reviews – Universality WASH and Human Values

• Shared values – freedom, equality, solidarity, tolerance, respect for others, shared responsibility

• Shared valued have moral undertones

• Human values emanates from “inherent dignity of human being”

• Human values – source of motivation for ethical and moral choices
Useful Reviews – Universality WASH and Human Values

• Human values results in aligned, effective actions and results
• Human values in development motivates good character, morality and ethics
• Human values emphasize WASH for all to be protected, safeguarded and fulfilled
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Approximate reduction in diarrhea (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliable drinking water quality</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplying adequate quantity</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved hygiene</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved sanitation</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Esrey (1996)
Study Methodology/Approach

• Affordability and less quality access?
• What rights and choices exist?
• Effect on FSM value chain, scale up and sustainability?
• 30 respondents (Gessa and Koupela, BF)
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Study Results:
Characteristics of Respondents

- Religion (%):
  - Christians: 46.7%
  - Moslems: 53.3%

- Education (%):
  - No formal education: 93.3%
  - Primary education: 6.7%
Study Results:
Characteristics of Respondents

Occupation (%):
- Farmers: 80%
- Traders: 16.7%
- Artisanal: 3.3%

Age of Respondents (Years):
- Minimum: 28
- Maximum: 65
- Average: 47.5
Study Results:
Characteristics of Respondents

Household size

- Minimum: 2
- Maximum: 34
- Average: 10

Household Income (USD)

- Minimum: 11
- Maximum: 721
Study Results: Characteristics of Respondents

Household Income

- less than FCFA 100,000: 86.70%
- FCFA 100,000-199,999: 6.70%
- FCFA 200,000-299,999: 3.30%
- FCFA 300,000-399,999: 3.30%

30/10/2012
## Study Results:
**Desired Quality of Capture Technology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Response (%)</th>
<th>Desired quality</th>
<th>Applicable to own toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No smell</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to clean</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily used by children</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked by others</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer assistance for repairs or low O&amp;M cost</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the house</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting version</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squatting version</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Study Results: Choice of Capture Technology

• None of the respondents chose the current capture technology in use
• 80% chose sitting versions of improved capture technologies out of models presented
• 86.7% opined that they can afford the preferred technology
• Those who can’t afford in the short term can do so in the longer term (5-7 years)
Study Results:
Predictors of household choice

- **Model Summary**
  - Coefficient of determination = 0.611
  - Adjusted R-square = 0.463

- **Dependent variable** = type of technology choice

- **Independent variables**
  - Household monthly total income
  - Educational attainment
  - Occupation
  - Affordability
  - Type of house owned
  - Cost of water use per day
  - Number of males and females
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Conclusions

• Consider sanitation ethical issue in sanitation practice
• Although access is good, qualitative access is better
• Consensus on minimum and acceptable top-of-the-ladder access standard
• Promotion of non-dignifying capture technologies inflames current epidemics
• Globally elevated status for sanitation as accorded HIV/AIDS, Malaria, etc
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