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Global monitoring and the Joint Monitoring Programme

The WHO / UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply and Sanitation (JMP)

- A joint programme between WHO and UNICEF
- Established in 1990 to monitor progress and trends of access to drinking-water and sanitation
- **Official UN mechanism to monitor MDG Target 7c:**

**MDG 7 Target 7c**

“Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking-water and basic sanitation”
Berlin Consultation (May 2011): Recommendations

- **Improve** rather than replace existing global water and sanitation monitoring system
- **Expand** targets and indicators: drinking water quality; waste management; hygiene; beyond HH
- Attention to the **human rights** criteria and equity dimensions – disaggregations and sub-indicators
- Aspire to **universal access** with interim targets
- Explore **different standards for rural and urban** areas, and intra-urban disparities
- Targets and indicators **globally relevant**
- Promote greater **alignment** between global and national monitoring

**WASH = drinking-water, sanitation and hygiene**
International consultative process

- **Four working groups**: drinking-water, sanitation, hygiene, equity and non-discrimination

- **Broad consultation** with experts and stakeholders through international fora, and virtual exchanges to help formulate the post 2015 WASH goals, targets and indicators

- Outcomes of WG discussed at second consultation (The Hague) Dec 2012, **consolidated menu of options** before consideration by UN MS and tabling at UN GA in Sept 2013

- JMP developing **communication strategy** to invite further inputs through consultation
Preparing Post-2015 monitoring
What will be the new areas to be monitored?

Proposed targets (still in development)

- **Target 1:** By 2025 no one practices open defecation.
- **Target 2:** By 2030 everyone uses basic drinking water supply (improved sources within 30 minutes) and handwashing facilities when at home. All schools and health centers provide basic drinking water (improved sources on the premises), adequate sanitation (improved latrine, may be shared by limited HH) and hygiene facilities (hand washing & menstrual hygiene).
Preparing Post-2015 monitoring
What will be the new areas to be monitored?

- **Target 3:** By 2040, everyone uses adequate sanitation at home, the proportion of the population not using an intermediate drinking water supply (improved, on premises, water quality and functional) at home reduced by half, the excreta from at least half of schools, health centres and households with adequate sanitation are safely managed.

- **Target 4:** All drinking water supply, sanitation and hygiene services are delivered in a progressively affordable, accountable, and financially and environmentally sustainable manner.
Why Equity?

• With a focus on average attainment, MDGs silent on discrimination, inequalities and disparities
• Need to redefine progress – it must not be called progress when significant parts of the population are left behind
• Monitoring non-discrimination and equality: how is progress distributed? who is excluded?
• Targets must ensure that the most disadvantaged, marginalized and discriminated against are reached
• How? Equality checklist, and wealth quintile analysis
Progressive reduction of inequalities
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Future monitoring – which groups should be monitored for reduction in inequalities?

- Rural and Urban
- Slums and Formal Urban Settlements
- Disadvantaged groups and the general population
- Rich and Poor (quintile analysis)

Data should be disaggregated by gender, age and disability.
Disparity between rich and poor: Wealth quintiles analysis

Some elements

- **JMP analysis**
  - Based on nationally representative household surveys with providing information on both:
    - Use of water and sanitation facilities
    - Economic status of households (asset variables)
  - Asset variables are used to provide for each household with a certain weight on a scale divided into five categories (from poorest to richest).
  - Analysis of the results of the particular use of water and sanitation facilities.
  - If enough data sets, analysis of the trends of access into each quintile to see the evolution within each quintile.
Disparity between rich and poor: Wealth quintiles analysis
A case study of 3 Eastern European countries: Hungary

- Use of improved is 100% for both Urban and Rural
- Differences in level of service Piped connection (vs public standpost)
  - Urban richest: 97.7%
  - Urban poorest: 88.5%
  - Rural richest: 99.1%
  - Rural poorest: 66.4%
Disparity between rich and poor: Wealth quintiles analysis
A case study of 3 Eastern European countries: Hungary

- Use of improved is 100% for both Urban and Rural
- Differences in level of service: Piped to sewerage (vs septic tank)
  - Urban richest: 81.0 %
  - Urban poorest: 100 %
  - Rural richest: 50.0 %
  - Rural poorest: 100 %
Disparity between rich and poor: Wealth quintiles analysis
A case study of 3 Eastern European countries: Serbia

- No significant gap in use of improved facilities in both urban and rural except rural poorest only 96.5%.
- Piped connection is lower in rural. Rural and for the lowest quintile both in urban (94.5 against 98.8) and rural (51.0 against 72.1)
Disparity between rich and poor: Wealth quintiles analysis

A case study of 3 Eastern European countries: Serbia

✓ Urban has a better level of access than rural.
✓ Urban: Unimproved only with lowest quintile in urban (6.6%)
✓ Rural: Unimproved higher in lowest quintiles (31.1% for poorest against 1.9% for richest)
Access is higher in urban than in rural but little difference between quintiles. Gaps are greater in the level of services (piped connection).

Progress in urban piped connection affects the poor especially the poorest as the level of connection is decreasing.

Progress in rural is similar in all quintiles.
Disparity between rich and poor: Wealth quintiles analysis
A case study of 3 Eastern European countries: Moldova

- Access is higher in urban than in rural.
- Similar progress in urban in all quintiles except for the poorest where it is declining.
- Very little disparity between rural quintiles and similar progress and even slightly faster pace for the lowest quintile.
Disparity between rich and poor: Wealth quintiles analysis
Lessons learned and way forward

• Wealth quintiles analysis demonstrate to be useful to assess disparity between rich and poor: access, level of service and their evolution including on the progressive reduction of inequalities – however must be complemented for national relevance.

• JMP is extending its analysis to cover nearly 60 countries including 6 countries part of the Protocol (Ukraine, Kasakstan, Uzbekistan, Serbia, Hungary, Moldova)

• To prepare Post-2015 monitoring: need further research, including assessing additional ways to monitor disparities (i.e. wealth deciles) and work to be conducted (establish a baseline, address questions of alignment/comparability).
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JMP work addressing disparities and equity

(Extracts of JMP presentation of September 2012)
Striking Disparities: Between regions

Low access in sub-Saharan Africa (61%) and Oceania (51%)
Striking Disparities: Between countries

Over 40 countries under 50% coverage

Proportion of the population using improved sanitation in 2010

- 91-100%
- 76-90%
- 50-75%
- <50%
- INSUFFICIENT DATA OR NOT APPLICABLE
Striking Disparities: Urban-Rural access

- Most unserved live in rural areas (653 million) compared to urban (130 millions).

- Urban population growth impeding progress – number of unserved still increasing (109 in 1990 to 130 million in 2010).
Striking Disparities: Urban-Rural level of service

Improved water: 93% vs. 44%, Safe water at home: 45% vs. 0.2%
Striking Disparities: Richest / Poorest


Why monitoring Non-Discrimination and Equality

- How is progress distributed? Who is excluded?
- Set incentives to reduce inequalities and focus on the most disadvantaged
- Targets must ensure that the most disadvantaged, marginalized and discriminated against are reached
- Disaggregation needs to go beyond rural-urban
- Current wealth quintile analysis is very powerful, but not sufficient
- Link to prohibited grounds of discrimination to understand who lacks access and why
Wealth quintile analysis

- JMP analysis to date
  - Based on survey/census data
  - Around 100 developing countries
  - 60 developing countries by end 2012

Vision:
Incorporation of such analysis in future JMP reporting should increase attention of national policy makers for better policy and targeting of resources to improve equity and to accelerate progress
Wealth quintiles: Methodology

- Used to approximate the economic status of the households
- Based on the assumption that an underlying economic status exists which is related to the wealth of the households in terms of the assets they own

**Assets:** bicycle car radio tv refrigerator

**Type of floor:** dung bamboo cement parquet

**Type of toilet:** nature open pit pit with slab flush

**Wealth quintiles:**

- **Assets**
  - Type of floor:
    - dung
    - bamboo
    - cement
    - parquet
  - Type of toilet:
    - nature
    - open pit
    - pit with slab
    - flush

**Standardized scale**

Methodology based on Principal Component Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household 1</th>
<th>Household 2</th>
<th>Household 3</th>
<th>Household n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>-3.18</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Index score**

- Household 1
- Household 2
- Household 3
- Household n
Wealth quintiles: separate for urban-rural

- Separate wealth indexes have been built for each urban and rural.
Wealth quintiles: trend analysis

Trends inside Wealth Quintiles
Evolution (1995-2008) by wealth quintiles

Piped onto premises | Other improved sources | Unimproved sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poorest</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Rich</th>
<th>Richests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poorest: 0
Second: 10
Middle: 20
Fourth: 30
Richest: 40

DHS 1993
DHS 1999
DHS 2003
WHS 2003
MICS 2006