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Some basic points

- Meaningful change requires that the objective should be to improve sanitation conditions in cities as a whole.
- This requires some sort of ‘plan’.
- The plan will only be effective if it is realistic, recognising and starting from the realities of the existing situation.
- Plans cannot ignore limitations in existing institutions – you can’t build without foundations!
Aspects of the existing situation

• Sanitation services often poor – particularly but not only in peri-urban areas.
• Sanitation investment tends to be in central higher-income areas
• Main sanitation providers in low-income areas are often people themselves
• Planning systems are usually weak, particularly so in informal peri-urban areas.
• Sanitation often low priority for decision-makers
Examples of informal development

India

Yemen

India

Kibera - Nairobi
Implications for planning

• Local stakeholders are unlikely to have much interest in or capacity to plan.
• Outsiders can produce plans but with little likelihood that the plan will be implemented.
• Investments likely to continue in an ad-hoc way regardless of the plan.
• Individual organisations tend to work independently, perhaps making radically different assumptions and taking different approaches.
What to do in such circumstances?

• Work for the creation of improved municipal level institutions (often requires action at higher levels of government)

• Where suitable partners are available, work to develop a strategic planning process from the local level (neighbourhood, ward, district as appropriate).
Preconditions for local planning

• Local partner – might be NGO working in the area, particularly active CBO or ward councillor,

• Technical capacity to guide the planning process

With regard to the second, one constraint may be a lack of people with the analytical skills required to assess situations and evaluate initiatives.
Supply, demand or both?

- Traditionally plans were supply driven
- The received wisdom now is that they should be demand responsive.
- This should not mean that the supply side should be ignored. People may know what they want but professionals will usually be needed to help plan to achieve what they want.
- This implies need to engage with local professionals – often requires reorientation and training
Some key principles

Key principle  Don’t waste time with technologies and approaches that cannot be replicated because:
• They are too expensive
• They take too much space
• They cannot be operated and maintained
  Recognise that different situations need different approaches (even within the same area).
Never forget need to replicate/upscale
Focus on sanitation systems – not components, but recognise that some improvement may be better than no improvement at all
Different situations requiring different solutions - Maputo

- **Shared toilet option**
- **Communal toilet for clearly defined community**
- **Sewered interceptor tank option possible – but what are disposal options?**

Possibility of upgrading existing household/shared toilet
Possible steps in local strategy

• Engage with local stakeholders (including political leaders and officials)
• Map existing communities and facilities (could involve combination of using Google Earth images and community mapping on ground)
• Develop strategy, identifying approach to be used in each sub-area
• Cost strategy
• Implement and evaluate
Potential problems and issues

• What to do when ‘on-site’ provision dependent on deficient/non-existent off-site facilities

• We know less than we think we do about some options – in particular arrangements for desludging – also some areas are really difficult.

• Are planning skills available? How to stop local planning producing a series of unconnected actions without a strategic perspective?
Some examples of issues

What to do in areas with shallow groundwater?

How to deal with sludge?

What to do when technology is expensive or people resist concepts?

How to deal with maintenance?

What to do when poor practice is assumed to be the norm?
Examples

• OPP’s work in Karachi
• ASB in Faisalabad
• Some examples of community groups working together without external input – Saifabad 2, Faisalabad
• Water Trusts in Lusaka – currently only dealing with water but plans to expand into sanitation, particularly sludge management.
• CHALLENGE IS THAT THESE HAVE ACTUALLY HAD LIMITED OVERALL IMPACT – WHAT IS THE WAY FORWARD?
Can we answer the last question?

That is the crux of the matter. Clearly local planning on its own is not enough. What are the conditions that need to be met for it to lead to widespread change? Is the focus on the MDG’s distracting us from the focus on incrementally building the foundations that alone can lead to lasting development?