

## WASH News and Policy Update e-Newsletter of India WASH Forum Issue # 37, Sept 2014

1. **India WASH Forum News**
2. **Critique of CLTS Approach**
3. **Swachh Bharat Abhiyan**
  - a. **Of Dirt and Cleanliness – Swachh Bharat Abhiyan: Nityanand Jayaraman**
  - b. **Womens “maryada” could not find men to build toilets**
  - c. **Not Just Toilets; V. Kurian Baby**
  - d. **Toilets for All? Maybe a Crappy Idea; Sopan Joshi**
4. **Effectiveness of a rural sanitation programme on diarrhoea, soil-transmitted helminth infection, and child malnutrition in Odisha, India: a cluster-randomised trial**
  - a. **Blog on the study; Oliver Jones**
5. **Critique of CLTS:**
  - a. **Response from Deepak Sanan**
  - b. **Response from Sisir**
  - c. **Response from Vinod Mishra**
  - d. **Response from Kamal Kar**
  - e. **Response from Robert Chambers**
6. **Swachh Bharat Abhiyan : Key Highlights of the new programme**
7. **About India WASH Forum**

## India WASH Forum News

India WASH Forum stands for an independent credible voice in the water, sanitation and hygiene sector. We bring out one WASH News and Policy Update in two months. It is an open platform for engagement on contemporary issues in WASH sector in India and elsewhere. We are pleased to share the 37<sup>th</sup> Issue of our WASH Policy Newsletter that is produced once in two months consistently from 2009.

The WASH Policy Newsletter promotes information and knowledge sharing, research and analysis for advocacy on critical issues. We try to highlight critical WASH issues that are often ignored by specific WASH sector agencies who are sometimes engaged with promoting a specific approach or a WASH theme only for example the popular focus in WASH sector today is on Menstrual Hygiene and Sanitation while research is showing that no single WASH intervention should be prioritised. We are also conscious that WASH sector is increasingly being dominated by market led approaches, often drowning the voices of the people and real issues experienced on the ground. There is no dearth of funding in WASH sector because this is a politically sensitive sector. Yet we are witnessing a shift of funding focus away from real issues and investments in creating adequately staffed service provisioning for operations and maintenance, for behavior change and awareness promotion, to more and more infrastructure creation that may not be required. Increasing dependence on NGOs and privatization (often in the PPP mode) of WASH services.

Our newsletter provides an analytical perspective on contemporary WASH issues. We are conscious of the need to engage with and understand other larger debates in the social and economic development scenario, of which drinking water and sanitation is a part. Hence we include in our news analysis and policy updates, events and developments from other related development fields, besides the WASH sector. We invite readers to share their experiences and reports that can be disseminated from this WASH Policy Newsletter.

**“A house of Solutions”** - Rahul Bannerjee has transformed his house into a self sufficient water treatment home, not connected to the municipal water and sewerage supply. Grey and black water is treated in a simple and effective manner and used to recharge ground water.

A short film by Makarand Purohit of the India Water Portal on the decentralised water and energy



# India WASH Forum

conservation system implemented in the office of the Dhas Gramin Vikas Kendra in Indore has been awarded the Delft Urban Water Movie Prize. The citation (<http://www.delfturbanwatercontest.org/>) says - "In this 6 minutes film we were guided through a household with different water solutions. In the movie, Rahul Banerjee, an urban water expert tells about how we can manage our water and sanitation problems in our home by using a water and energy saving model. Water problems in India's cities are many, but Mr Purohit shows inventive solutions to (almost) close the urban cycles of water and energy. The jury "was especially impressed by the creative use of few resources that led to massive improvements to the water use of the house". Furthermore, "the combination of creativity and the range of inventive and practical solutions" was inspiring."

The movie can be seen here - [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ldy-QFHU\\_ml](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ldy-QFHU_ml)

## Critique of CLTS: Editorial comment

We received some responses to the 36<sup>th</sup> issue of WASH policy Newsletter that covered CLTS. We share all the responses received and our editorial comment.

The IWF WASH Policy Newsletter has only compiled different critiques of CLTS approach to sanitation promotion. These critiques include eminent professionals and academics and NGOs who have critiqued CLTS - a human rights approach, from colonial experience of coercive development approaches, scholars who have studied coercion and exclusion in CLTS and critiques by international development agencies like WaterAid that have supported the first trials of CLTS in Bangladesh.

CLTS is a sanitation promotion approach and like all other approaches in the past, it has contributed to sanitation promotion and we have no doubt about it. Once a development approach is practiced, it is bound to undergo variations and trials by practitioners who will want to modify it to serve their purpose. This should be welcomed and seen as an affirmation of the value of the CLTS approach, not its negation or dilution or debasement. Addressing disability exclusion in CLTS is now a discussion issue at IDS. How can caste, class and gender differences in a rural community be addressed in CLTS promotion strategy of 100% ODF status almost instantly as a result of hygiene and health outcome awareness, what nuances does it take to even achieve less than 100% coverage - could be addressed in CLTS to make it relevant. The problem

of unhygienic CLTS toilets and toilets that turn unhygienic after a relatively short time - was first raised in the Bangladesh experience and the CLTS approach now considers hygienic toilets as a given minimum. Slippage was seen as a major problem.

There are also examples of successful sanitation promotion approaches other than CPTS that are using subsidy – Gram Vikas in Orissa and those with more traditional awareness generation work – BRAC in Bangladesh. These approaches have promoted sanitation, water and livelihoods as community development initiatives at scale already. Even government subsidy approach of TSC in India was not a failure in all the states of India, the entire north east Indian states have sanitation coverage lower than the national average. Punjab and Haryana too have a low open defecation rate. To therefore say that all subsidy led approaches to sanitation promotion have failed in the past is incorrect and that one approach will work in future in all contexts as equally wrong.

Census 2011 sanitation results need to be carefully analysed. Success in Himachal is not the only exception over the 2010-11 period. In Punjab, Kerala, Sikkim and Goa – sanitation coverage increased substantially, without CLTS or TSC subsidy. A large part of the sanitation increase over the 2001-11 census for India, even given the slippage from official data of TSC, is a result of septic tank sanitation by people on their own - in many states – than to CLTS or NBA/TSC. We know this is an expensive option, not what CLTS promotes as a first choice.

During the last decade we witnessed the heady days of promotion of Nirmal Gram Puraskar(NGP) as the flagship government of India initiative to promote rural sanitation. In its heydays of 2006-08, NGP was touted as the most successful sanitation promotion approach, incentivizing the entire community to build toilets. Its proponents claimed that both high subsidy and CLTS approaches are not suitable for India. The Census 2011 data showed that the high sanitation coverage reported during 2006-10 period was an over reporting, perhaps as a result of the

The IWF WASH Policy Newsletter does not claim to have the most exhaustive critique of CLTS practice. Much has been written about in appreciation of CLTS approach and there are institutions like IDS and CLTS Foundation that are actively promoting CLTS.

The purpose of the Newsletter critique was not to document CLTS. There are several other elements of CLTS promotion approach that can be critiqued as

well. Does subsidy for toilets question the self respect of the poor, while subsidy for industry (and urban consumers) is seen as an incentive for growth? How does CLTS engage with other development actions and community led approaches that do not use coercion? How does CLTS merge with Right to Sanitation and Water, what are we asking as a Right? If septic tank based rural sanitation coverage is the preferred option of the people, how does CLTS engage with this demand? In urban areas where demand for sanitation is not an issue but accountability of the government to provide toilets, what is it that we need to promote as community lead sanitation in urban areas?

The WASH Policy Newsletter Editorial on CLTS was based on the understanding of how CLTS works. We could be wrong in this but certainly there is no antipathy to CLTS. An evangelical defense of CLTS does more harm to the "Church of CLTS", than all its critiques put together.

Please read the full text of the Editorial critique of the WASH Policy Newsletter # 36, a part of which is enclosed again for reference:

CLTS is propagated for two reasons. One that financial incentives for constructing and using latrines by individuals has not worked in achieving desired outcomes (usage of toilets). Secondly, promoting individual toilets is not the aim of a sanitation that is a public health improvement goal. CLTS is hailed by World Bank and some other agencies because it hits at the rationale for welfare subsidies for sanitation. While rural sanitation subsidies have indeed not produced the desired results in India, it is also true that in some states sanitation/toilet subsidies have been successful in promoting sanitation behavior change. Perhaps the World Bank logic in promoting CLTS is that more could be achieved with less money, sustainability and health outcomes. However as of today, there is little evidence that CLTS can be hailed for achieving 100% open defecation free communities at scale in India.

CLTS as a sanitation and hygiene promotion approach started with promotion of fixed point defecation, as opposed to open defecation. Any toilet that people can build using their existing

available resources, as an outcome of social triggering of shame and disgust, without external support and government subsidy. The VERC CLTS project boasted of promoting a toilet costing as low as \$1 to any amount, depending on people's ability and willingness to pay. The whole idea was to promote improved sanitation behavior of using toilets and hand washing with soap that should not cost much money. The idea of "sanitation ladder" was promoted as an integral component of CLTS, let people first start using a basic toilet and then they will invest in upgrading it later on their own. When criticism came from international WASH agencies that CLTS was promoting kuchha toilets that do not provide hygienic safe disposal of human feces, CLTS approach shifted gear to promoting hygienic safe toilets at the lowest sanitation ladder. Hence one core pillar of CLTS approach got diluted in the process."

In order to take this discussion forward, it is interesting to see the way forward as shared by Deepak Sanan -

"Many including those involved in this write up want to see CLTS only as a set of triggering tools that will create demand for toilets which can then be fulfilled through subsidized toilets. This is not only a debasement of CLTS as something that appeals only to some feelings of disgust (the authors wrongly also mention shame) or fear but also do not recognize that this kind of approach is doomed to failure. In the Indian context we as CLTS adherents seek a level playing field where states are not forced to follow a central subsidy policy but have a choice to decide on the policy they wish to pursue in order to secure sanitation outcomes. If states choose to dole out subsidy so be it but if they wish to follow an alternative allow them a choice. Let CLTS have a chance to be implemented in the right spirit. Then we shall see which states really deliver and by which approach."

Agree that states should not be forced into following a central government sanitation promotion approach. With tight fiscal conditions prevailing in India, the central government is most likely to cut welfare subsidies rather than cutting infrastructure spending. Rural sanitation subsidy has been raised, but the increase has come from state contribution to Swachh Bharat Abhiyan, not from the central share. We are now seeing a restricted NGREGA already.



# India WASH Forum

How will removing sanitation subsidy allow CLTS to be implemented at scale in India? Who will implement CLTS at scale – volunteers promoting CLTS? For the 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan Working Group on Sanitation and Drinking Water, an input was given to set up teams of 5-6 sanitation promoters per block, paid by the government, to cover the entire Block in 5 years with promotional face to face meetings and triggering activities, and district level teams of professionals to coordinate this. The proposal did not get through because of the implications of spending on staff, even contractual staff were not acceptable. Spending on infrastructure is never questioned, but spending on operations and maintenance and behavior change promotion, where salaries and overheads are incurred, is always met with resistance. This is evident in the changed guidelines for Swachh Bharat Abhiyan (SBA, 2014) where IEC component has been reduced from the erstwhile 15% to 8% of the central allocation and a faint mention of “Mechanism of **‘Trigger’ plus Incentives** to construct quality toilets will also be used.”

Should we stop all sanitation promotion work in the meantime that use subsidy and only rely on CLTS? Who will decide that CLTS is being “implemented in the right spirit”, will we need gatekeepers who certify the purity of CLTS approach? In order for the child to grow, parents need to let them go. CLTS as a sanitation approach is perhaps asking the same from its mentors and well wishers.

October 2<sup>nd</sup> 2014, marked the launch of the Swachh Bharat Abhiyan, a national campaign flagged off by the Prime Minister of India. It received good media coverage and several influential people wrote articles and gave interviews in support of this campaign.

The issues/concerns highlighted in the media coverage of SBA ranged from the need to raise public awareness and sense of individual responsibility on one end, to the need for a systemic planning and funding to deal with solid waste management in cities that cannot be simply left to individual actions and behavior change. Will the push for building more toilets become a construction drive? Building more toilets alone will not solve the problem of low usage and safe disposal of feces. From where will the water come for rural and urban toilets to make them usable and clean?

In this WASH policy Newsletter we share a range of responses to the SBA that highlight the concerns and priorities from different perspectives.

In all modern cultures, cleaning up merely

involves moving “dirt” from one place to another. Five decades ago, cleaning up may have been easier. It would have meant restoring the predominantly organic and compostable discards in the waste stream to its rightful place – namely, the soil – and facilitating its transformation into manure. Over the past two decades, India has transformed from a sleepy nation living in its villages to an economic powerhouse with an urban population bursting at its seams. We can, as Modi did in the UN General Assembly, invoke our ancient culture to claim that Indians have a special relationship with and reverence for nature. But that does not take away from the fact that Indians or Americans, Hindus or Muslims, we are all worshippers of the same homogenising religion of consumerism. We are what our garbage is. Our garbage which once bore no resemblance to American garbage is increasingly peppered with the same brand names, the same indestructible material, such as styrofoam and plastics, that can be found in US landfills.

## Dirt as a Metaphor

Chennai disgorges more than 6000 tonnes of mixed wastes everyday into what used to be a wetland in Kodungaiyur. The dumpyard is a stinking heap of refuse that assaults your sight and sense of smell. Smouldering mounds of garbage are piled higher than the tallest building in the vicinity. Everybody who can afford to leave this area in search of better living conditions has left. Those left behind are people without a choice or the means to leave.

Simply focusing on toilet construction and cleaning the streets in urban areas, but not having a system to deal with the garbage, will only shift the garbage from our door to our neighbours and from the posh colonies in cities to the slums and city fringes. As rural population expands, sewerage systems in rural areas and the need to treat waste water from septic tanks is already a concern. What is being done to address this in the SBA?

Handling solid waste, treatment of sewerage and drainage – require a systemic effort that needs to be spelt out to ensure that the target of 2019 for a Swachh India is achieved.

The flagship rural sanitation programme of government

# India WASH Forum

of India has been revamped, with individual toilet subsidy raised (from Rs.9,100 to Rs.12,000 per household) with the additional funds coming from state government budgets and reduction of IEC budget from erstwhile 15% to 8% of the total SBA budget of government of India.

We share in this newsletter, highlights of the SBA as shared by the Government of India recently.

## Of Dirt and Cleanliness – Swachh Bharat Abhiyan: Nityanand Jayaraman

<http://kafila.org/2014/10/05/of-dirt-and-cleanliness-swachh-bharat-abhiyan-nityanand-jayaraman/>



The Swachh Bharat Abhiyan (Clean India Campaign) is powerful in its simplicity, and problematic for the same reason. The absence of complexity in the presentation of the campaign, and the inherent contradictions between Modi's consumerist growth agenda and Swachh Bharat's objectives fuels my skepticism and raises many questions: Which parts of India will be cleaned, which not and why not? What will we do with the wastes we remove? Where will we put it?

If cleanliness is to be the result, dirt would have to be the starting point. In a 1966 classic called "Purity and Danger," anthropologist Mary Douglas points out that "If we can abstract pathogenicity and hygiene from our

notion of dirt, we are left with the old definition of dirt as matter out of place. . .It implies two conditions: a set of ordered relations and a contravention of that order."

Cleanliness is a loaded word particularly in the Indian context with a notion of caste that is fine-tuned around social and physical interpretations of pure and impure, clean and unclean. Cleanliness, in this context, can be achieved by keeping the clean and the unclean separate.

It is not just things and places that can be unclean, impure, dirty or unsightly. When DMK was last in power in Tamil Nadu, the then Minister of Local Administration M.K. Stalin launched a campaign called *Singara* Chennai or Beautiful Chennai. Like with Swachh Bharat, it is difficult to argue against a campaign to beautify a place we love. But beauty, like dirt, is in the eye of the beholder. Post *Singara* Chennai, the city is no different now in terms of garbage. But in the process, at least 20,000 slum dweller families have been evicted in the name of beautifying the city; they were relocated to tenements in Kannagi Nagar and Semmencheri which lie between 20 and 30 km from the city. Dirt here is a metaphor that could just as easily refer to people as to material objects.

Given this historicity, simple campaign slogans without sub-text and caveats will remain superficial and perpetuate historical injustices and modern forms of casteism.

The oath that Narendra Modi administered to school children and bureaucrats alike reminds them of their patriotic duty to restore order by cleaning up. "*Ab hamara kartavya hain ki gandagi ko dhoor karke Bharat Mata ki sewa karein.*" (Now, it is our duty to serve Mother India by removing the dirt.) Where will the dirt be removed to is left unsaid. Everything does not have to be spelled out. If dirt is matter out of place, it will have to be moved to its rightful place.

In all modern cultures, cleaning up merely involves moving "dirt" from one place to another. Five decades ago, cleaning up may have been easier. It would have meant restoring the predominantly organic and compostable discards in the waste stream to its rightful place – namely, the soil – and facilitating its transformation into manure. Over the past two decades, India has transformed from a sleepy nation living in its villages to an economic powerhouse with an

urban population bursting at its seams. We can, as Modi did in the UN General Assembly, invoke our ancient culture to claim that Indians have a special relationship with and reverence for nature. But that does not take away from the fact that Indians or Americans, Hindus or Muslims, we are all worshippers of the same homogenising religion of consumerism. We are what our garbage is. Our garbage which once bore no resemblance to American garbage is increasingly peppered with the same brandnames, the same indestructible material, such as styrofoam and plastics, that can be found in US landfills.

## Dirt as a Metaphor

Chennai disgorges more than 6000 tonnes of mixed wastes everyday into what used to be a wetland in Kodungaiyur. The dumpyard is a stinking heap of refuse that assaults your sight and sense of smell. Smouldering mounds of garbage are piled higher than the tallest building in the vicinity. Everybody who can afford to leave this area in search of better living conditions has left. Those left behind are people without a choice or the means to leave.

A pedestrian bridge over a black ooze of leachate that was once the Captain Cotton canal is used by ragpickers and local residents to enter the city's largest dump. About a 100 metres into the dump, a solid door with auspicious tantric motifs guards a ramshackle hut that is falling apart at the roof and on all sides. Every last item that went into the making of Kamatchi Devi's house was locally mined, hand-picked by her from the garbage dump within which the house is located. Barely five metres in front of her house runs a stream carrying a foul-smelling reddish-orange liquid — juice from the rotting mountains of garbage stretched out on all sides of her house. Across the juice river is a ramshackle temple to the God of Wars, Murugan.

No matter the wind direction, Kamatchi's house is assailed by toxic smoke from the perennially smouldering dump. Hers is one of 15 dalit households in the cynically named Panakkara Nagar (Rich Man's nagar). Several thousand people, including ragpickers, make a living by extracting, sorting, processing and trading in resources relegated to the dump by the city's consumers.

Across the road from the main entrance to the dump is RR Nagar. About 1500 households live here in squalid

conditions. Tamil Nadu Slum Clearance Board constructed RR Nagar tenements to house Chennai Corporation's conservancy staff in the early 1990s. The workers refused to move into the dump-view apartments. Eventually, families that were forcibly evicted as the city grew and sent to RR Nagar — the same place where Chennai sent its trash.

A major proportion of these people — the ragpickers in the dump, the residents of Panakkara Nagar and RR nagar, the conservancy workers for whom the government built the dump-view apartments, the oustees who eventually took up residence in the tenements — belong to scheduled caste/scheduled tribe communities. Kodungaiyur itself is in a reserved constituency with a substantial Scheduled Caste population.

In 2010, during a statutory environmental public hearing held for expanding and modernising the dump, the then Mayor of Chennai justified continued dumping at this location. He said that just as our homes need toilets, the city too needs a toilet, and that local residents should be proud of serving the city by hosting the dump.

The Kodungaiyur yard is illegal on many counts. It does not have the statutory clearances under Air and Water Acts from the Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board. It operates in total violation of the Municipal Solid Waste Rules that were notified in 2000. A scientific analysis of an air sample taken in Kodungaiyur in 2012 revealed 19 toxic chemicals, including three carcinogens. Benzene, which can cause childhood leukemia, was found 50 times above safe levels. The fact that the Madras High Court has sat on the matter nearly a decade should be an embarrassment to the judiciary.

It is not that such dumps cannot be shut down. In fact, in Chennai, until recently, there was a second dump — also in a waterbody, the Pallikaranai marshland — in Perungudi. Perungudi's demography has changed considerably since the time that dumping began here. Chennai's famed IT corridor has now been built on the waterbody within sniffing distance of the dump. When the stench of rotting garbage and the acrid smell of burning trash began assaulting sensitive middle-class, upper caste noses, action began to be taken. Perungudi's gentrification forced the Corporation to

shut down the dump and reroute garbage to Kodungaiyur.

You clean up one place and dirty another. Where you clean and where you dirty will follow the established social order governing notions of worth, value and worthlessness.

## Growth is garbage

Garbage and the manner in which it is currently mishandled is a sociological problem. Any real solution to this problem cannot but upset the established social order. That is why local bodies prefer engineering interventions that sidestep the social problem. Elite engineers are called to design modern, industrial waste-management facilities. These engineering interventions are fancy variations of dumping, burying or burning. To make it more attractive, the engineers may call their intervention a sanitary landfill, or package incinerators as waste to energy plants. But be that as it may, one thing is certain: In caste-ridden and race-ridden societies like India and the United States, these self-proclaimed “state-of-the-art” facilities will not be located where people of “worth” live; they end up being located amidst the same communities that were burdened with the earlier version of waste management.

As American sociologist Murray Millner Jr observes, caste-reinforcing notions of garbage in societies like ours may believe that a certain amount of dirty and impurity is inevitable. The strategy here would be redistribution not elimination. In casteless, western societies, Millner writes, the belief is that it is possible to eliminate waste by destroying it. Both have to contend with different limitations. Where the former bumps against a social limitation, the latter is confronted by an ecological cul-de-sac.

Economic growth refers to a growth in the production and consumption of material goods and services. The pace at which natural resources are extracted, converted into consumables, consumed and disposed determines the rate of growth of the economy. The greater the growth, the greater the garbage. The post-consumer waste, which is the preoccupation of the broom-wielding bourgeoisie, is merely the tip of the iceberg. In manufacturing the consumables – be it steel for much needed infrastructure, or electricity or plastic packaging – massive quantities of toxic trash is

generated that is disposed on land and inside waterways. Will SwachhBharat deal with just the tip or the whole iceberg?

The iceberg is big, and poised to grow. If Modi’s Make in India dream comes true, SwachhBharat will turn into a nightmare. Just as industries externalise their environmental costs by polluting land, water and air, consumerist economies externalise the environmental and social costs of garbage to politically weak and historically oppressed communities. If the option of dumping on others is closed to us, our consumerist economy will be drowned in its own shit. Attempting a clean up without a strategy to reduce growth or redistribute consumption is like trying to mop up a flooded bathroom without turning off the faucet.

A few days ago, I posted on Facebook that the “Clean India campaign is bourgeois environmentalism, superficial and devoid of commitment not unlike the Clean Ganga campaign.” In response, a friend urged me to drop my cynicism and give this wake-up call and our new leader a chance. I promised her I would. But days after the oaths were administered, I still do not see any details added to the call to remove the dirt and clean India.

If the Prime Minister is serious about his campaign, he could add a few more declarations of intent – all of which are far more doable than cleaning the Ganga or the country by 2019. For starters, he could:

- make the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Bhopal gas disaster a milestone by declaring that he will get the polluter to clean up the toxic contaminated site in Bhopal.
- announce that other similarly contaminated industrial sites, like Hindustan Unilever’s mercury-tainted thermometer factory and surroundings in Kodaikanal, Tamil Nadu, will also be cleaned up in a time-bound manner at the polluter’s cost.
- declare that India will eschew activities that generate intractable wastes – like nuclear power plants – and abandon plans for setting up new plants in Gujarat, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Haryana and Tamil Nadu.
- commit to phasing out indestructible material such as in packaging even while phasing in alternative material or practices that do not burden the environment.

# India WASH Forum

- announce his Government's commitment to ending the dehumanising practice of manual scavenging.
- commit resources to allow local bodies to pay decent wages and offer better living and working conditions to conservancy workers.
- acknowledge the contribution of ragpickers and others involved in resource recovery by facilitating their access to segregated discards at or close to source.
- promote decentralised composting or treatment of organic discards so that a major portion of the garbage stream is diverted from dumpsites or landfills.

If India is to chart a different course than the West, then it will have to lead by pursuing the goals of development with minimal or no growth. It will have to clean up the centuries-old muck of casteism, racism and gender discrimination as part of the Swachh Bharat campaign. It will have to drastically curtail consumption among the minority class of overconsumers to enable growth-less development. No number of broomwielding schoolchildren will be able to clean India as long as our government pursues an economic model that exploits nature.

## Womens "maryada" could not find men to build toilets

<http://indianexpress.com/article/india/india-others/mp-linked-womens-maryada-to-toilets-but-could-not-find-the-men-to-build-them/#sthash.yeAwLXiV.dpuf>

[Pritha Chatterjee](#) | Morena District (Madhya Pradesh)

### MORENA DISTRICT

**Population:** 19.65 lakh; **Literacy:** 71.03%  
**Sanitation status:** Nirmal Gram Puraskars to 15 villages between 2008 and 2011

Mohini Sahariya is in Class VI, one of the rare girls to reach middle school in her Maanpur village surrounded by the forests of Pahadgarh block in Morena district. Unlike most other members of her nomadic community who bathe only once every few days — with soil — she

bathes daily, and as she points out, combs her hair "sometimes even twice a day".

When it comes to going to the toilet though, Mohini has little choice. Every morning, the 13-year-old heads into the jungle along with her mother, aunts and grandmother. The women of Sahariya tribe don't look for a clearing deep in the bushes or wait for the dark. It's acceptable for them to go in groups, squat together and

A road being built nearby and other construction activity, however, have made Mohini more wary. She heads deeper in, she says, to protect herself from "prying boys and men who whizz past in bikes".

Lately, she has enforced a change among the women of her family too. The Sahariyas usually clean with soil after their morning rituals, but she and her relatives now carry a lota of water to wash themselves.

Most of the panchayats of Pahargarh block are dominated by the Sahariya tribe. They are still to "even smell" the benefits of the UPA's Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan (NBA), says Zakir Hussain of NGO Sujagriti Sansthan.

Or those of the BJP-ruled Madhya Pradesh government's own 'Maryada (honour) campaign', launched three years ago. A policy document introducing the campaign to district officials states, "Mahilaon ke liye swachhata sirf swasthya ki drishti se hi avashyak nahin, balki yeh unki maryada aur suraksha ka bhi prashna hai (Cleanliness is vital for women not just in terms of health but is also a question of their honour and protection)".

The Maryada programme encourages weekly meetings of women in villages, and toilets for women employees such as anganwadi workers and midday meal cooks at the village level. Says project incharge of the Total Sanitation Campaign division of Morena district, Kamal Yadav, "We see women as natural leaders. Our programme started with Nal Jal Yojana, focusing on providing toilets to 122 panchayats with access to water."

However, against a target of 30,000 toilets in 2012-13, only 6,462 toilets had been made in Morena; in 2013-14, against 35,267 targeted toilets, only 9,672 could be



realised. This year the target has been lowered to 33,487 toilets, of which 4,252 had been constructed till August.

The Sahariyas, notified as a special backward tribe by Madhya Pradesh, routinely hit the news over high incidence of malnutrition, and starvation death and pulmonary tuberculosis cases. Their children live on chillis with roti or rice. Mohini's own diet of a daal made of dry roots or berries and bajra rotis is a treat in comparison. The families mostly live off forest produce, making around Rs 1,500 a month, apart from MNREGA wages. Syaru and Kemara village from Pahargarh block won the Nirmal Gram Puraskar for 'eliminating open defecation' in 2009 and 2010 respectively, but in both, Sahariyas are not the dominant caste. Many of the houses where toilets were constructed under NBA, such as Mala Sahariya's in Kemara, have stopped using them. "It is a 1-ft pit and the toilet has no electricity. I feel scared going in," says Mala, 32.

Goth village in Ambah block in the Chambal region of Morena was awarded the Nirmal Gram Puraskar in 2009. Thakurs, more specifically the Tomars, dominate the village. Rekha Tomar, 35, one of the two cooks employed for midday meal at a primary school, stares wide-eyed when told of the Rs 9,100 grant she is entitled to for a toilet. A widow for 13 years now, and mother of two sons aged 13 and 18, she earns Rs.1,000 a month, and has never used a toilet in her life. "No one from the government has come here," she says. "NGOs have come, district officials visit, but I have only requested them to arrange my widow's pension. I did not know there is a scheme for toilets."

Astounded at the "big amount" allotted for a toilet, Rekha admits she probably wouldn't use the money to construct one. "I would send one of my sons to the city first to make a living." About 60 km away, Labhakaran village in Kailaras block got the Nirmal Gram Puraskar in 2009. Homes here bear slogans of the Maryada campaign, such as "Save the honour of daughters, daughters-in-law; build toilets at home".

But in the village with a population of 2,500, mostly OBCs such as Dhakars and Jatavs, most people have never heard of the Nirmal Gram Puraskar. While sarpanch Umesh Dhakar claims the Rs 1 lakh they received was used to install toilets and clean drains, there are few signs of either.

Kamla Dhakar came to Labhakaran as a young bride six years ago. She was a graduate; her husband, a farmer, dropped out after school. Shock awaited the 22-year-old. "I had a toilet in my maternal home. My parents checked everything about my prospective in-laws except a toilet," she smiles. "When I was newly married, my husband would come with me when I went out. Still it would take me an hour or two to gather the courage to squat. I wondered how my mother-in-law who didn't take off her ghunghat before even her husband could squat so comfortably. People would laugh at me," Kamla recalls.

Now she is used to their extended family of 10 depending on the fields. The family got Rs 1 lakh under the Mukhya Mantri Awas Yojana last year but, as Renu says, they built a pucca house with it. Her husband "never even considered" building a toilet. Dhakar says around 50 families from the village were sanctioned NBA funds to build a toilet in January — the second lot since 2009. But only Rs 4,600 for each has reached the panchayat. About 40 toilet seats and doors purchased with this money have been gathering dust. Unlike states such as Haryana that transfer NBA funds along with MNREGA wages to accounts of beneficiaries directly, in Madhya Pradesh, the funds are sent to the panchayat account. This, officials say, is one reason the district has repeatedly failed to meet its targets for toilets, despite the Maryada campaign's "strong and targeted branding".

In Sabhalgarh block, bordering Rajasthan, four villages won the Nirmal Gram Puraskar — the highest in the district. In one of those, Kemari, dominated by Bramhins and OBCs, many Brahmins who do not own land defecate in the open. OBCs such as Jatavs who have homes have built toilets. The biggest hurdle thus is not caste-related but cultural. In the Porsa block of Chambal, also dominated by Tomars, not one village has won the Nirmal Gram Puraskar. NBA efforts here have been intense. Kamal Yadav of the Total Sanitation Campaign says the Thakurs are difficult to convince, so they have targeted mothers-in-law, "who are the first to keep a check on their daughters-in-law's honour".

Meera Bhadoria of Nandkapura village is one such mother-in-law. Standing next to the Maryada slogans painted on her house walls, she talks at length about

how defecating in the open is embarrassing. The moment she realises The Indian Express questions are not regarding a survey though, she breaks into a loud laugh. They have a functional toilet at home, she says, but she has not been letting her daughter-in-law use it since last year. She hopes to get the Rs 9,100 from the government this way for a toilet. "If she does not go to the field, we will lose out on the Rs 9,100 just because our forefathers were silly enough to build a toilet before anybody in the village," she says. "I make her wear two ghunghats and go out with her. It's a small sacrifice."

## Not Just Toilets; V. Kurian Baby

<http://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/not-just-toilets/99/#sthash.b1SeOfMA.dpuf>

*Possibilities of 'Clean India' will only be realised if we look at the entire sanitation chain.*

Prime Minister Narendra Modi deviated from convention and made sanitation a central theme of his Independence Day speech, making it a political priority, and Swachh Bharat Abhiyan, launched today, aims to make the country open defecation-free by 2019. India is become the world's largest open defecator, and of the 1 billion people worldwide who have no toilets, India accounts for 600 million. Effective sanitation service delivery is critical not only for health outcomes, but also for dignity, livelihoods, safety and security.

But sanitation has not been a key development priority for many years. The general apathy on the part of leaders and the administration, coupled with poor awareness of improved hygiene behaviour, led to low sanitation coverage. Earlier programmes like the Total Sanitation Campaign and Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan, with decentralised, community-led strategies, were reduced to hardware-supply target-driven programmes in many states, resulting in low coverage and usage.

Research by IRC indicates that building toilets alone will not solve India's sanitation woes. One should view the possibilities of "Clean India" with cautious optimism in the context of critical gaps in the existing national programme and its delivery. First, the programme apparently misses the big picture by not looking at the entire sanitation chain, beyond constructing toilets.

States like Kerala with high sanitation coverage, have poor health outcomes due to second generation issues, like the lack of treatment facilities when pits fill up. Second, attention continues to be on hardware-subsidy driven solutions, despite high rates of non-use and millions of non-functional or missing toilets that are financed but simply not there. Third, India's sanitation programme lacks the professionalism and high-quality management critical to bringing about desired behaviour change.

Still, there are some success stories within India and other developing countries where contextual and adaptive solutions have been designed. For instance, the Nandigram II block (East Medinipur District, West Bengal) in the 1990s achieved the distinction of being the first block in the country to have saturated all rural households with sanitary toilets. The key to success was effective coordination at the district and block levels, the commitment of the Ramakrishna Mission Lok Siksha Parishad and implementation facilitated by good technical assistance. The programme ensured timely flow of funds to match demand, and was monitored by the state sanitation cell. Adopting a community-led strategy, it had strong political support and leveraged social capital to induce behavioural change. There are success stories from Maharashtra, Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Kerala and Sikkim. All models were community-centric and rolled out in campaign mode under strong and credible local leadership. Globally, successful sanitation programmes share similar qualities, including a sound implementation plan; high-profile political leadership driving a national campaign for collective behaviour change, invoking national pride; a decentralised, community-driven strategy; a clear, accountable institutional home and workable coordination mechanisms; affordable financing options; and outcome-based monitoring.

The key to improving sanitation lies in achieving the needed behavioural change and generating demand for sustainable sanitation services. Social norms around the acceptability of open defecation have to change. "Clean India" should bring the best marketing brains in the country together with effective panchayati raj institution-led networks. To create demand for sanitation and encourage safe hygiene habits, the campaign should utilise both mass media and face to face contact. A key challenge in rolling out the

sanitation programme, especially in rural areas, is the acute shortage of professional and managerial support. A national sanitation corps with, say, a hundred professional volunteers in each of the 640 districts for troubleshooting and technical assistance should be created. Religious leaders should be engaged to play a major role to change behaviour.

To make "Clean India" a success, it needs to become a bureaucratic priority in addition to a political priority. My discussions with many district collectors have revealed that sanitation has never been a top priority for them. Rather than promoting a one-size-fits-all sanitation solution, India should encourage innovation and adaptive solutions suited to its diverse conditions. Finally, the current focus on corporate social responsibility partnerships should go beyond funding to look for an infusion of private sector management practices in sanitation, specifically in designing communication strategies to encourage behaviour change. The Centre and states should develop a comprehensive sanitation policy, covering the full sanitation chain with required legal enactments, to make it a rights-based service.

*The writer, an IAS officer, is India country director, IRC WASH, Sweden. Views are personal*

## Toilets for All? Maybe a Crappy Idea; Sopan Joshi

<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/home/stoi/deep-focus/Toilets-for-all-May-be-a-crappy-idea/articleshow/44378636.cms#>

The Clean India drive has left people flush with excitement, but where will the water for these toilets come from, and where will the untreated sewage go?

The prime minister launched the Swachh Bharat Andolan on Gandhi Jayanti amid much fanfare. Sanitation desperately needs attention. You are probably sick of reading that 60% of the global population that defecates in the open lives in India. Now we have a new government, elected with a clear majority. There is a mood of elation, of possibility.

However, those who have followed such efforts must

have a sense of déjà vu. For government efforts to discuss sanitation are ridden by the burden of positive thinking. Be it UPA's Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan or NDA's Swachh Bharat Andolan, the language of the government is politically correct. There is talk of a clean India without acknowledging that most of India is terribly unclean and polluted.

For all his stress on non-violence, MK Gandhi's appeals for sanitation were not couched in a soft, feel-good language. He was quite direct and graphic in describing the filth of India. Even if he was critical of the terrifying accounts of a filthy India in American researcher Katherine Mayo's 1927 diatribe Mother India -he called it a report of a "drain inspector" - Gandhi was more bothered about the reality than India's image. He had no problem with the truth and could tell people in no uncertain terms that their lack of sanitation was a public hazard. But Gandhi did not have to contest elections or convince investors that India is the next economic superpower.

The sanitation discussion among India's elites is driven by a concern about India's international image. People with several immigration stamps on their passports have experienced firsthand the orderliness and cleanliness of the industrialised West. The India of their aspirations has a similar level of hygiene. Open defecation and garbage strewn across the landscape smudges their aspirational roadmap. It also causes shame and disgust towards our people and our country. Are we a lower strata of human material that we cannot maintain basic hygiene?

This creates a desperation that permeates the sanitation sphere. This desperation selects what gets highlighted and what gets left out. Consider toilet talk to rid the country of the great shame of open defecation. It's tautological to say everybody should have access to the privacy of a toilet. But there is little attention on the consequences of current toilet design. Most of our rivers and other water bodies are horribly polluted with untreated sewage -from existing toilets. The rivers do not have any water to dilute this sewage, because the clean water is taken out upstream to supply to households.

Given that a sizeable proportion of toilets built under various government schemes are unused for lack of water to flush them, how will these toilets get water? With only half our population having toilets, our rivers have turned into large sewers. What happens when sewers. What happens when everybody has toilets (remember: cleaning up the Ganga is a priority of this government)? India's total sewage treatment capacity is less than one-third of the sewage its cities are estimated to produce. (Estimated, because nobody knows how much sewage we produce, neither do we know how much water we use, as the Centre for Science and Environment has said repeatedly.) About one-fourth of India's total sewage treatment capacity is in Delhi. You can go see and smell the Yamuna river to know how well the 30-odd plants in Delhi work. This, when Delhi has money and power and capacity; other cities battle worse conditions. There are examples of municipalities failing to pay their electricity bills, thereby failing to pump sewage to treatment plants. Where sewers exist, they often have to be cleaned by safai karamcharis at the risk of life and limb. They are invariably from communities traditionally burdened with manual scavenging. On August 30, two such workers died in Bengaluru during routine maintenance. Such deaths barely make news, common as they are. Numerous localities, even in the bigger cities, are not connected to sewerage - about half each in Hyderabad and Bengaluru. Their grey water is let into pits, from where it contaminates groundwater. With municipal water supply increasing failing to meet demand, reliance on groundwater is increasing. As is the pollution of aquifers. The future is contaminated.

About 99% of sewage is water. The remaining 1%, however, is food that has gone through the human guts and kidneys. Food that was grown on land, from crops that take out soil nutrients. Instead of returning these nutrients to land, the sewage system deposits them in waterways. As the water sources get polluted, farmland becomes barren. An estimated 10 million tons of soil nutrients are washed out to sea in India each year. There is no estimating the real value of this soil nutrient. But just to get an idea, remember that the government's soil fertiliser subsidy bill is around Rs.65,000 crore.

Sanitation links the rich to the poor, the land to the water, the clean to the unclean, the sacred to the untouchable. It asks serious questions of our development plans. There is no doubt that Modi has succeeded in focusing the country's attention on sanitation. But if this evades our dirty realities, SBA will not go beyond an attempted image makeover.

### **Effectiveness of a rural sanitation programme on diarrhoea, soil-transmitted helminth infection, and child malnutrition in Odisha, India: a cluster-randomised trial**

<http://www.indiaenvironmentportal.org.in/files/file/rural%20sanitation%20programme%20on%20diarrhoea.pdf>

Our findings raise questions about the health effect of sanitation initiatives that focus on increasing latrine construction but do not end open defecation or mitigate other possible sources of exposure. Although latrine coverage increased substantially in the study villages to levels targeted by the underlying campaign, many households did not build latrines and others were not functional at follow-up. Even householders with access to latrines did not always use them.

Combined with other possible exposures, such as no hand washing with soap or safe disposal of child faeces, suboptimum coverage and use may have vitiated the potential health effect generally reported from improved sanitation.

Another possible explanation for our negative findings is that improvements in household sanitation alone are insufficient to mitigate exposure to faecal-oral pathogens. Hands can be contaminated by anal cleansing of oneself or a child that is not followed by handwashing with soap, and food can be contaminated during production or preparation. Animal faeces could also be contributing to the disease burden—a possibility that we are exploring in our sub study of microbial source tracking. Exposure to rotavirus or zoonotic agents such as *Cryptosporidium* spp, both of

which have been reported to be a major cause of severe to moderate diarrhoea in India, might only be partly prevented by sanitation.<sup>39</sup>

Another explanation could be that the latrines themselves were ineffective at containing excreta; however, no evidence showed that latrines contaminated water sources. Additionally, the 14-month construction period and 18-month surveillance period might not be long enough to eliminate the risk of pre-intervention faeces in the environment. Some soil-transmitted helminth eggs and protozoan cysts can persist for extended periods outside a host, and some enteropathogenic bacteria can multiply in suitable environments.

All these possible explanations are important areas for further research. For now, however, increasing of village-level coverage and use would seem to be a priority. The levels achieved in our study are not unusual under the Total Sanitation Campaign and thus cannot be dismissed as an aberration.<sup>36,37,41</sup> From 2001 to 2011, only two of 509 districts in India increased latrine coverage by more than 50%.

However, our results show that the health benefits generally associated with sanitation cannot be assumed simply by construction of latrines. As efforts to expand sanitation coverage are undertaken worldwide, approaches need to not only meet coverage-driven targets, but also achieve levels of uptake that could reduce levels of exposure, thereby offering the potential for genuine and enduring health gains.

## Blog on the study; Oliver Jones

<http://blogs.lshtm.ac.uk/news/2014/10/13/trial-shows-need-stronger-sanitation-interventions/>

Prof. Steve Luby, commenting on the study paper, asks the question, “is targeting access to sanitation enough?”<sup>[5]</sup>. The question is posed in light of the fact that this study has reported no improvement in health outcomes. A single study that assessed an

intervention that left 4 out of 10 households without a latrine is not a solid basis for answering this question. But, irrespective of this study’s findings the answer to Prof. Luby’s question is no. In tackling diarrhoeal disease, the public health community must mobilise the many proven measures available and do so within a context of stronger health systems and well-maintained public health infrastructure. Alongside sanitation, the interlocking interventions of water supply and hygiene promotion are critical. Alongside water, sanitation and hygiene, we must scale-up coverage for other important interventions such as rotavirus vaccination and ORT. What we must also do is ensure that the sanitation interventions that are prioritised are effective in increasing access to and use of safe facilities.

See more at:

<http://blogs.lshtm.ac.uk/news/2014/10/13/trial-shows-need-stronger-sanitation-interventions/#sthash.tGfmlqP.dpuf>

## Critique of CLTS: response by Deepak Sanan, 01.08.2014

I would like to add to what Sisir has written below with regard to the critique of CLTS sent out in a WASH newsletter.

This entire write up appears to be inspired by the idea of putting down CLTS. The write up misrepresents CLTS and goes on to twist and mis-state facts to run down the approach. There is no clear statement of what constitutes CLTS in the write up. At one point, it is stated that CLTS is a sanitation and hygiene promotion approach to stop open defecation and bring about fixed point defecation. An emphasis on sanitation ladder and safe confinement of excreta is stated to be a dilution of a core pillar of CLTS! The absurdity of this statement is enough to reveal the intention to denigrate CLTS.

What comes out most clearly is that the perspective of this write up has a deep rooted antipathy to the CLTS emphasis on facilitating empowered communities to take collective action to tackle their sanitation problems on their own. Sanitation is not seen as a public good that everyone must adopt for everyone to gain. CLTS

based on this cardinal principle, facilitates a process of self realization in the community which then decides on achieving the goal of safe confinement. An aware community's decision to ensure safe confinement of excreta by all its members is being seen as negative social control actuated by a colonial mindset that seeks to change behaviour which favours open defecation! (It would be interesting to see the reaction of the First World authors of these studies and views, to the sight of open defecation being practiced outside their airports by visitors who refuse to observe colonial rules and negative social control over their behaviour!).

It needs to be understood that CLTS does not originate from some aversion to financial incentives or subsidies. It is rooted in an understanding that sanitation is a public good that requires collective behaviour change. Subsidies from above are antithetical to achieving the objective of collective behaviour change for a number of reasons. The focus of a programme becomes the object of subsidy (the toilet) and not behaviour change. The focus on individual toilets means that sanitation becomes the delivery of a private goal (a toilet) and not sanitation per se. Subsidies from above mean the community members see this as someone else's problem that they (others) want to address. Subsidies for some or first for some and later for others, similarly removes the problem from the domain of a community's problem that it must address urgently even as the subsidy divides the community. CLTS recognizes that the poor may need assistance but it is the aware, empowered community that will make available this assistance to achieve the objective of an open defecation free environment with safe confinement of excreta.

This approach has delivered gains in far too many places to require recounting here. It has delivered in both homogenous and heterogeneous settings. It has delivered best and at scale when governments have adopted a clear supportive policy (not when limited to NGO initiatives).

The best example in India for this is the state of Himachal Pradesh. The pursuit of CLTS and no subsidy adopted in 2005 showed up in the remarkable improvement in rural sanitation exhibited in the figures of the 2011 census. Rural household coverage jumped from 28% to 67%. Countrywide the change was only

from 22% to 31%. On the other hand subsidy based attempts have showed dismal results in every state in the 2011 census figures even as they have shown exemplary performance in expenditure on construction of toilets!

Many including those involved in this write up want to see CLTS only as a set of triggering tools that will create demand for toilets which can then be fulfilled through subsidized toilets. This is not only a debasement of CLTS as something that appeals only to some feelings of disgust (the authors wrongly also mention shame) or fear but also do not recognize that this kind of approach is doomed to failure. Subsidies from above inevitably convey the messages mentioned earlier. In state after state, the triggered communities have, in waiting for toilet subsidies, relapsed in their behaviour. All that has been achieved is a bad name for CLTS. It is this misuse of CLTS that gives even more ammunition to critics who wish to continue to dole out patronage and condemn communities to live without safe sanitation. In the name of getting government to ensure the right to sanitation (by handing out toilet subsidies as an entitlement) they refuse to recognize that empowered communities are both capable and more likely to secure safe sanitation for themselves and it is in this direction that public policy must be directed.

In the Indian context we as CLTS adherents seek a level playing field where states are not forced to follow a central subsidy policy but have a choice to decide on the policy they wish to pursue in order to secure sanitation outcomes. If states choose to dole out subsidy so be it but if they wish to follow an alternative allow them a choice. Let CLTS have a chance to be implemented in the right spirit. Then we shall see which states really deliver and by which approach.

## **Critique of CLTS: Response from Sisir Pradhan, 01.08.2104**

Good morning. I got a forwarded mail from Dr. Kamal Kar on the wash news letter and learnt about an interesting debate on CLTS. After reading the piece, I thought I should write something on it. As Kamal wrote, the debate on CLTS is quite old. It's not new. Secondly, any innovative idea that challenge the age-

old perception and practice often goes through serious intellectual debate. By saying this I am not averse to the continuous learning that is required to make any approach relevant, timely and context fit. It must evolve and adapt to different socio political realities over time and space. However, I am little baffled with the arguments put forward in the wash news letter that lacks sufficient understanding on CLTS. As far I understand CLTS is a community driven approach, against any technological prototype and in fact challenge the straight jacketed approach on Sanitation which followed across the world over five decades.

Further the basic premise of the argument about homogeneity of the society as well as cast and class divide does not appear to be quite convincing to me. It is rather the homogeneity in impact of faecal oral contamination across class, caste that matters, not the social structure. Secondly it does not suggest blue print of triggers rather it provokes thinking. Administering tools without analysing its efficacy in a given context does not make sense. If tools and schemes with money would have solved the problem, TSC and NBA would have been resounding success. At the same time I am also not in favour of fixed point defecation. Communities must have safe confinement of excreta and the faecal-oral contamination routes must be broken with a long term perspective. This brings me to think about the sanitation ladder issue.

The issue of sanitation ladder is definitely a coherent and inbuilt assumption in the CLTS. But what the policy did so far to support this? in fact nothing. We treat the communities as collective during triggering and afterwards we keep on counting individual toilets and also consider individuals as beneficiaries in fact ignoring the collective action as key determinant even to engineer the sanitation ladder. Why can't government plan indirect subsidy, in fact supply chain incentivisation to produce low cost good toilet and make the distribution/supply channel pro-poor with the ideas of setting of sanitation park, promotion of local masons groups, linking mass ions with distribution channels by incentivising their service etc.

I think India is not at all a place to refer to when we debate on CLTS. It never offered an enabling macro political environment for such a powerful approach to succeed. I put Indian initiative on sanitation so far is

coming from arrogance of money, we can offer the solution and people must be reduced to passive recipient without really having any analytical ability to decide what is good for them and what is not so good them. It is highly politically motivated with all schemes aims to create captive vote bank by counting beneficiaries which is the easiest way to reenergise the political cadres. When we discuss the political realities we must also discuss these factors which has nothing to do with sensitisation, adoption of safe sanitation facilities etc.

I hope this will add to this interesting debate.

## **Critique of CLTS Approach: Response by Depinder**

Dear Vinod - We are not criticising the CLTS approach. We have only compiled critiques from reputed experts and researchers and added an editorial in the Newsletter.

If these critiques are not right then they should be questioned and addressed one by one. Instead of claiming that CLTS is the best sanitation promotion approach and if it fails it is because people have not understood or implemented it in the right spirit. Even IDS is now addressing social exclusion, as part of its CLTS hub work.

If there are concerns that the understanding of CLTS is based on a simplistic acceptance of caste, class and gender divided rural communities in India – as simply “communities” who can come together and decide to enforce coercive control mechanisms to prevent open defecation using CLTS – then these concerns need to be answered by theoretical and practical examples how this has been addressed in successful CLTS practice. Instead of simply saying that there is no scope of exclusion of marginalised communities in CLTS.

How are caste, class and gender differences that are so sharp in Indian rural society – addressed in CLTS – should be a matter of interest for CLTS practitioners and not something to be dismissed as antipathy to CLTS. How these have been addressed in other development approaches with subsidy or without, in social and political action, should also be of interest. Health outcomes are not easily visible in sanitation promotion – how does the convincing of “community” of health benefits works in CLTS? Is triggering role play to

evoke disgust more effective than communicating health impacts, as a behaviour change process? Can triggering be enough as a one time intervention? Simple basic toilets that are built from triggering – even if these are not sanitary toilets – should we consider them as indicators of successful behaviour change? What is it that works in CLTS and why, what can be used effectively – that is the point of our critique.

## Critique of CLTS Approach: Response by Vinod Mishra

Dear Depinder, Thanks for sending new addition of WASH newsletter. Actually in India there is fashion to use CLTS word under sanitation program. I have seen many triggered villages in Uttarakhand, Haryana, Himachal, Madhya Pradesh, Odisha, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand and Bihar. At most of the places implementing agencies are using CLTS for construction of toilets, only a few places people are using CLTS for behavior change. CLTS approach always focuses on social solidarity, if whole community is analyzing their present situation and taking collective decision to for change then CLTS approach is working in it true sense. There is no scope of exclusion of marginalized community in CLTS. CLTS is not only showing disgust and shame to community or abusing community. It breaks dependency syndrome of community and gives way to think for independency. If community is still waiting for outside support in my view they are not doing CLTS.

Again CLTS approach is not to control anyone; it gives total freedom to community to think about their present living situation and take own decision for change. You can criticize program, those who are using name of CLTS and not getting results but not CLTS as an approach.

## Critique of CLTS Approach: Response by Kamal Kar

This is an old debate, which the critiques of CLTS raised in the past. There had been discussions and rich email exchanges between critiques, the practitioners, policy and decision makers and large programme

managers in the past, which contributed in better and wider understanding of CLTS approach, how and where it works well and where it doesn't.

Instead of commenting on the issues you have raised, I would at this stage, rather prefer to pass it on to a few practitioners, programme managers and others with global experience on CLTS including those in the governments of countries, UNICEF, GSF, WSSCC and others to comment first. I hope you would also like to bring the discussion in public domain.

## Critique of CLTS Approach: Response by Robert Chambers

Thanks Depinder. I cant download this where I am (intermittent very limited connections) so wont be able to read it now and so wont comment at this stage, except to say that the success of CLTS in other parts of the world – many African countries, Pakistan where it has been evolved as PATS, Nepal, Indonesia – has been associated with no or almost no individual household hardware subsidy. In countries where IHHS prevails – India, Burkina Faso, South Africa – CLTS can be made to work (though not so far in BF) but with much effort. Different countries have different trajectories, and India is especially problematic for several reasons. To go to scale India needs its own solutions... Are these known? **What would you advise the new Prime Minister?** I look forward to reading the critique. On skimming your summary I expect to agree with some, qualify others, and disagree with some. What is undeniable and good is that our learning continues, and the search is active for good ways forward.



# India WASH Forum



## The Swachh Bharat Abhiyan(SBA) : Key Highlights

### Objectives

- To make India Open Defecation Free (ODF) India by 2019, by providing access to toilet facilities to all;
- To provide toilets, separately for Boys and Girls in all schools by 15.8.2015;
- To provide toilets to all Anganwadis;
- Villages to be kept clean with Solid and Liquid Waste Management.

All figures in crores

<b>A)</b>	<b>Total Number of rural HHs in India</b>	<b>17.13</b> <b>{B(a) + B(b)}</b>
<b>B)</b>	<b>(a) HHs with Toilets</b>	<b>7.41</b>
	<b>(b) HHs without Toilets</b>	
	(BPL + Identified APL) those eligible for Incentives	<b>8.84</b>
	Non Identified APLs those not eligible for Incentives because of category	0.88
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9.72</b>
<b>C)</b>	<b>Out of 7.41 crore (B)(a), Number of Household with Defunct Toilets which are defunct or dysfunctional</b>	<b>1.39</b>
	<b>Thus, Grand Total of</b>	<b>11.11</b>

### Toilets needed (B) + (C)

- Incentive IHHL** for all **APLs belonging** to all SCs/STs, Small and Marginal Farmers, Landless Labourers with Homestead, Physically Handicapped and Women Headed Households, and **all BPLs**
- The **unit cost of the Individual Household Latrine (IHHL)** is enhanced from Rs. 10,000 to **Rs. 12,000**
- Central share for IHHLs to be Rs. 9,000 (75 percent). The State share to be Rs. 3,000 (25 percent).** For North Eastern States, Jammu and Kashmir and Special category States, the Central share and the State share (90%:10%).
- Discontinue the part funding from MGNREGA
- Solid and Liquid Waste Management (SLWM)** a cap of Rs. 7/12/15/20 lakh to be applicable for Gram Panchayats having up to 150/300/500/ more than 500 households on a Centre and State/GP sharing ratio of 75:25. Additional cost requirements to be met by State/GP.
- Support for **Community Sanitary Complexes** to be Rs. 2.00 lakhs at a sharing ration of 60:30:10.
- IEC at 8 percent of total project cost, with 3 percent at the Central level and 5 percent at State level.
- Administrative Cost** at 2 percent of the project cost.
- School toilets** - Department of School Education and Literacy **Anganwadi toilets** - Women and Child Development.
- Triggering 'Behaviour change' by intensifying IEC campaign and Inter Personal Communication (IPC).**
- Outputs (Construction) and Outcomes (Usage)** will be monitored.
- Innovative, **Low cost and User friendly technologies** for toilet and Solid and Liquid Waste Management to be pursued.
- States, which performs well in their IEC campaign, behavioural change and toilet construction effort under the Swachh Bharat Mission to be **Incentivised**.



# India WASH Forum

In the absence of a formal document, we share the SBA Strategy highlights that the Ministry of drinking Water and Sanitation(MDWS) has released on its website.

1. Create demand by **Triggering** 'Behaviour change' by **intensifying IEC campaign and Inter Personal Communication (IPC)**.
2. IEC/IPC programme will be **assisted by Multilateral Agencies** like UNICEF, World Bank's WSP etc, national NGOs working on sanitation and groups like Rotary, Nehru Yuva Kendra etc.
3. **Outputs (Construction) and Outcomes (Usage)** will be monitored.
4. Mechanism of '**Trigger**' plus **Incentives** to construct quality toilets will also be used.
5. Strong **Administrative structure** required for the Mission at Central, State and district level. Foot soldiers required at GP level.
6. Use of Technology to Monitor Household coverage through a Hand held device to capture photos of beneficiary, toilet and Lat/Long. coordinates. – *Pilot done*
7. Innovative, **Low cost and User friendly technologies** for toilet and Solid and Liquid Waste Management to be pursued.
8. States, which performs well in their IEC campaign, behavioural change and toilet construction effort under the Swachh Bharat Mission to be **Incentivised**. Gram Panchayats performing well under the Mission will be incentivised with funds for Waste Water Management.
9. Launching the **Swachh Bharat Award** –for Individuals; Institutions; GPs, Districts; States who do exceptional work.
10. Priority shall be accorded to cover households having:
  - Old Age Pensioners / Widow Pensioners / Disability Pensioners (National Social Assistance Programme {NSAP} beneficiaries)
  - Pregnant and lactating mothers covered by Maternal Health Programmes of Central and State Governments, including Janani Suraksha Yojana under National Rural Health Mission; and

- Girl children covered by any Scheme benefiting the girl child.
11. Aim is to saturate coverage in the first instance the States/ Districts/ GPs in all major river basins of India e.g. Sutlej , Ravi, Beas, Ganga, Yamuna, Godavari, Narmada, Tapti, Kaveri, Brahmaputra

## India WASH Forum Trustees

**Mr. Ashok Jaitly (Chairperson)**  
**Mr. SS Meenakshisundaram(Vice Chairperson)**  
**Ms. Nafisa Barot**  
**Mr. Ramisetty Murali**  
**Mr. Bunker Roy**  
**Dr. Pawan Kumar Jha**  
**Mr. Darryl D'Monte**  
**Dr. Joe Madiath**  
**Ms. Geetha Jegan - Gramalaya**  
**Mr. RK Roul - AFPRO**  
**Dr. AK Sengupta - Sulabh International**  
**Mr. Depinder S Kapur (National Coordinator)**

## About India WASH Forum

India WASH Forum is a registered Indian Trust since 2008 with Trustees from all over India. It is a coalition of Indian organizations and individuals working on water, sanitation and hygiene. The coalition evolved out of WSSCC support to national WASH sector advocacy.

**The mandate/charter of India WASH Forum is Hygiene and Health outcomes** from sanitation and water sector;

- **Promoting knowledge generation** through research and documentation which is linked to and supported grassroots action in the water-sanitation-hygiene sectors. Special emphasis is given to **sector-specific and cross-cutting thematic learnings**.
- **Supporting field-based NGOs and networks in their technical and programmatic work**. The IWF would also consistently highlight gender and pro-poor considerations, and provide a national platform for interest groups working in the sector to come together.



# India WASH Forum

- **Undertaking policy advocacy and influence work through**
  - Monitoring and evaluations
  - Media advocacy and campaigns, and
  - Fact finding missions
  - **Undertaking lobbying and networking to promote common objectives** in the sector.

In order to undertake credible independent WASH advocacy work in India, the national coalition got registered as an Indian charity in 2008 and has undertaken a number of significant research and advocacy work that includes:

## **Knowledge Networking and Advocacy initiatives undertaken by India WASH Forum;**

- Gender and Sanitation South Asia Workshop with National Foundation of India in Delhi; 2005
- Review of Swajaldhara and TSC Programme Guidelines; 2007
- Input to the Technical Expert Group set up to review the National Drinking Water Mission(RGNDWM); 2007
- Civil Society Input, Urban Sanitation Policy 2009
- Review of TSC in 4 states of India 2009
- Organisation of SACOSAN 3 in Delhi. CSO session and a CSO Statement of Action, 2009
- National Right to Water and Sanitation Workshop 2009 with participation from the Ministry and CSOs
- Start up of the GSF programme in India
  - Launch workshop 2009 with stakeholders in Delhi, 2009
  - Developing and finalising the Country Programme Proposal, 2010
  - Leading the PCM of GSF, as an institutional host and Chair and Convener.
  - Providing oversight for programme review.
- Member Govt of India 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan Working Group on Drinking Water and Sanitation 2010. Recommendations on behaviour change priorities and staffing for national sanitation programme.

- Recommendations for Urban and Rural Water and Sanitation inputs: national consultations on drinking water and sanitation by Planning Commission Govt of India and Arghyam 2010
- National Pro poor Urban Water and Sanitation Consultation, 2010
- National report and a South Asia Report for SACOSAN 3 : Peoples Voices – a National Study project, Reports for India and South Asia, 2011
- Formal Input to the National Water Policy 2012, with a focus on drinking water and sanitation
- Report to the Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation: UNDP international consultation – Greening of Rural Water Supply Programme and Guidelines, 2012
- FANSA-IWF Review of national commitments and progress since Sacosan 4, and preparation for World Water Forum 2012
- School Sanitation Baseline Research by GIZ for Tirupati and Mysore, 2012

Since 2010, India WASH Forum is actively engaged in the Global Sanitation Fund(GSF) and currently hosts Programme Coordination Mechanism(PCM), of the **GSF in India**. The role of the PCM is to provide a governance oversight to the GSF Programme in India. The Programme is being implemented by an Executing Agency called Natural Resources Management Consultancy(NRMC) that makes NGO sub grants in the two states of Jharkhand and Assam. The Programme is managed directly from WSSCC Geneva and with the support of the PCM and an Auditor(called the Country Programme Monitor) that is KPMG for India.

A unique feature of IWF is its non-hierarchical set up. Most of the Trustees of India WASH Forum are represented in their individual capacity and do not represent the organisations they are associated with. The agenda and activities that India WASH Forum are determined at the initiative of the Trustees and support from organisations and individuals.

**Registered office of India WASH Forum:**

**K-U, 6 Pitampura, Delhi-110034.**

Email: [kapur.depinder@gmail.com](mailto:kapur.depinder@gmail.com)