Perception and Preference Analysis for Improved Decentralised Sanitation Services
Rationale

• 45% of the urban households with toilets in India are connected to either Septic Tanks or Pits*

• Desludging is a primary service required

• Perception and preference of primary end users will help improve service provision

* Census of India 2011
Study Objectives

I. Understand the perception of the different end-users for O&M services – Desludging

II. Preference analysis of factors associated with O&M – uninformed approach – informed approach

III. Assess willingness to pay for improved service
Study Area

Jigani/ Anekal district

- outskirts of Bangalore
- 4,437 households*
- No proper waste treatment mechanism
- Availability of multiple end-users who can be accessed as an independent unit

* Census of India 2011
Methodology

- Non-proportionate quota sampling
- Determining factors for perception and preference analysis of desludging service
- Ranking of factors – Uninformed and informed approach
- Conjoint analysis
Findings

No associated cost
- Quality and timeliness preferred
- Safety concerns are secondary

With costs
- Safety concerns become primary
- Quality and timely response secondary
Findings

Factors – Conjoint Analysis

- Regular & known service providers
- No major constraints
- Safety of workers – More preference and willing to pay extra
- Safe Disposal – High concern and willing to pay extra

Factors – Relative Ranking

- Timeliness – Quick response (within 24 hours)
- Work efficiency – Efficient and decent job
- Price worthiness – Moderate price – Regular service providers
- Hygiene – No smell, no insects, no issues
- Work safety – Not all safety equipments are used; not aware of disposal point

With costs
- Safety concerns are primary
- Quality and timely response secondary

No associated cost
- Safety concerns are primary
- Quality and timely response secondary

End user

Industries
## Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors – Relative Ranking</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Within 1-2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work efficiency</td>
<td>Efficient and decent job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price worthiness</td>
<td>Prices are higher for the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td>Smell not a concern/ Is a problem for school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work safety</td>
<td>Not all safety equipments are used; not aware of disposal point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors – Conjoint Analysis</th>
<th>Preferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>More preference and willing to pay extra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>High concern and willing to pay extra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of workers</td>
<td>Regular &amp; known service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Disposal</td>
<td>No major constraints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End user
Conclusion

Timely response can be improved in service provision

Quality of work can be improved by training (willingness to pay for improved quality)

Minimal increment in price is acceptable to end-user for improved quality of service and safety of workers

Service is over-priced (households, apartments, schools). High price of disposal and lack of awareness results in unwillingness to pay for treatment

Though price conscious - Householders have concern for workers and are willing to pay for the provision of safety equipments

Industries are not price sensitive and are willing to pay for safe disposal of wastes, safety of workers as well as improved quality and timeliness of service

Industries are satisfied with service
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