

---

Subject: Guinea - improved sanitation

Posted by [mledger](#) on Tue, 17 Jun 2014 14:22:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I was wondering if anyone had any ideas as to why the % of the population with access to improved sanitation decreased from 94.3% (urban) and 59.9% (rural) in 2005 to 39.4% (urban) to 12.3% (rural) 2012?

I have gotten this information from the MDG indicator tables at the front of the reports.

---

---

Subject: Re: Guinea - improved sanitation

Posted by [Bridgette-DHS](#) on Tue, 17 Jun 2014 16:15:41 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Following is a response from Michelle Winner, Guinea Country Manager:

The 2005, tables are on access to improved sanitation.

In 2012, that access was divided into two:

- 1) Access to improved and not shared sanitations
- 2) Access to improved but shared sanitations

In the MDG tables, we only reported access to improved and not shared sanitations, as shared sanitations are not considered hygienic. Please reference table 2.2 in the report.

---

---

Subject: Re: Guinea - improved sanitation

Posted by [mledger](#) on Wed, 18 Jun 2014 17:04:51 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi, thank you for the response. Unfortunately I am still confused.

If the 2005 table on page XXV shows access to improved sanitation at 94.3% in urban areas yet access to improved sanitation is recorded as 39.4% in urban areas in 2012 (p.xvii) does that mean that something happened in Guinea to reduce access to improved sanitation by so much in urban areas? Or did you actually mean that for Guinea 2005 there is no distinction between shared and non-shared sanitation, in which case this would make a lot more sense but is a shame as that makes it incomparable to the other tables showing MDG achievement.

In the table on page 52, table 2.5 (2005 Guinea) adding together the 4 categories which have been included in the MDG table (p.XXV) comes to 97.6%. Is this because weighting was applied for the MDG table calculations?

---

---

Subject: Re: Guinea - improved sanitation  
Posted by [Bridgette-DHS](#) on Fri, 20 Jun 2014 12:20:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Your post is being reviewed, and we will have an answer for you sometime next week.

Thanks

---

---

Subject: Re: Guinea - improved sanitation  
Posted by [Bridgette-DHS](#) on Mon, 23 Jun 2014 11:49:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Following is a response from DHS Specialists: Fred Arnold & Kia Reinis.

The 2005 Guinea DHS reported on improved sanitation facilities without distinguishing whether or not the facility was shared with other households. The 2012 Guinea DHS report included in "improved sanitation facilities" only those households that did not share their facility with other households.

Note however, that since both surveys included the same question on whether or not facilities are shared, the time trends can be calculated by excluding shared facilities from the estimates in both surveys.

The 97.6% reported in Table 2.5 (that appears on page 27, not page 52) is based on households. The figure in the MDG table is based on population. The difference you are seeing is because they are based on different denominators. Differences are NOT due to weighting the sanitation tables and the MDG tables are all weighted. DHS surveys are sample surveys, so all estimates in DHS reports are weighted, unless otherwise specified. The 2012 report gives both household and population estimates in Table 2.2.

---

---

Subject: Re: Guinea - improved sanitation  
Posted by [mledger](#) on Mon, 23 Jun 2014 11:56:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Thank you very much for the clarification. This has helped a lot.

---

---

Subject: Re: Guinea - improved sanitation  
Posted by [Bridgette-DHS](#) on Mon, 23 Jun 2014 12:04:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You are welcome.

---