Critical building blocks in Scaling-up Rural Sanitation

Equity and reaching the poor: Experience from the Philippines
How are we doing on equity in EAP?

The degree of urban-rural disparity varies significantly

Use of improved sanitation facilities: urban-rural range in East Asia and the Pacific Countries, 2010
Economic inequities are very significant in East Asia and the Pacific

- The poorest households have much lower access to improved sanitation facilities than richer households in many countries in the region (such as in Lao PDR where coverage is only 7% in the poorest quintile but 98% in the richest)
- Open defecation levels are generally much higher for poorer households, such as in Indonesia and Lao PDR
Why have an equity focus?

• Improve the understanding of decision-makers, partners and all other stakeholders
• Support national and decentralized planning and development processes including influencing policies, strategies, budgets and national laws to improve targeting
• Strengthen national and sub-national capacities to monitor the situation, principally regarding vulnerable and disadvantaged groups
Status of Sanitation

- The disparity between urban and rural sanitation coverage was greatly reduced from 24 percentage points in 1990 to only 10 percentage points in 2010.

- 7.4 million Filipinos openly defecating – 3rd highest in the South East Asian Region

- 4 times more open defecation in rural areas compared to urban

- Richest 20% of rural population have 100% access to sanitation, Poorest 20% have 39% access

- Average Student-toilet bowl ratio in elementary schools is 55 to 1 and approaches 300 to 1 in poor regions such as ARMM
To increase rate of access the poor and vulnerable need special targeting.
Use of Improved sanitation in the Philippines, per cent. Sources: JMP 2012 and Philippines DHS, 2008
# Regional inequities for rural sanitation

**FEIS, NHTS 2009**

## Top 3 regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Improved Sanitation</th>
<th>Open Defecation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Luzon</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilocos</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cagayan Valley</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Bottom 3 regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Improved Sanitation</th>
<th>Open Defecation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Visayas</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Visayas</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Key equity challenges

- Land tenure continues to be a barrier for household sanitation investment.
- Affordability and access prove challenging in more geographically isolated areas and places with more challenging environments like coastal and marshlands.
- Household sustainability is difficult in disaster affected areas.
- Programs are not targeted hence not reaching the poorest and disadvantaged.
- Long history of untargeted subsidy that tend to favor the able.
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