



*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

*No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.*

## Working Paper 134

FLORENCE MC BAIN

### Health insurance and health environment:

India's subsidized health insurance in a context of limited water and sanitation services



ZEF Working Paper Series, ISSN 1864-6638  
Department of Political and Cultural Change  
Center for Development Research, University of Bonn  
Editors: Joachim von Braun, Manfred Denich, Solvay Gerke and Anna-Katharina Hornidge

### Authors' address

Florence Mc Bain  
Center for Development Research (ZEF), University of Bonn,  
Walter-Flex-Str. 3  
53113 Bonn, Germany  
Fax 0228-731869  
E-mail: [fmc bain@uni-bonn.de](mailto:fmc bain@uni-bonn.de)  
[www.zef.de](http://www.zef.de)

# **Health insurance and health environment:**

## **India's subsidized health insurance in a context of limited water and sanitation services**

Florence Mc Bain

# Abstract

Recently, many emerging countries have established subsidized health insurance schemes to provide financial protection and support access to health care to poor households. The challenge to ensure the long term sustainability of such schemes is huge. In this paper, the impact of the health environment on the long term sustainability of a health insurance is explored, focusing on water and sanitation. India offers an interesting case to explore this question. Indeed, since 2008 India launched a fully subsidized health insurance Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojana (RSBY) in a context where 56% of its population does not have access to safe sanitation and 8% do not have access to safe water (JMP, 2012). A framework is proposed linking water supply and sanitation; health status of the insured population; health insurance and the productivity of households. Next, based on a literature review, the outcomes of investments in water and sanitation and health insurance are reviewed and the potential synergies and trade-offs of combining these investments are explored. In a last section, the case of India is analysed in detail, with international comparisons and further research lines are proposed.

Keywords: Health insurance, financial sustainability, water and sanitation, India

# 1 Introduction

Whether established universal health insurance systems in developed countries or newly launched health insurance for a targeted population in emerging countries, all face the challenge of offering sustainable and adequate health care and financial protection when seeking health care to its population. In many emerging countries, where the capacity to levy resources for health insurance is limited and where the epidemiologic transition poses a double threat of non-communicable and communicable diseases, this problem is particularly acute. The need to identify cost-effective policies that reduce or prevent the health burden and the health care costs is essential.

In such a context, this paper analyses the potential synergies and trade-offs which arise from investments in health insurance and water and sanitation services (WSS). The provision of safe drinking water and sanitation not only fulfills fundamental basic needs and offers convenience; but has huge health benefits by preventing many water-related diseases and is cost-effective. Thus, investments in WSS could be an effective policy to improve health outcomes and contribute to cost containment of health expenditures for health insurances in emerging countries.

The analysis focuses on India, which offers an interesting case of limited public resources; an ambitious health insurance program for the poor and poor environmental conditions. In 2008, India launched the Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojana (RSBY) a fully subsidized health insurance for its below poverty line (BPL) households. It aims to cover 69 million BPL households and offers a wide coverage for secondary and tertiary health care services. The WSS situation in India remains critical. In 2012, 8% of the population or 97 million people do not have access to safe drinking water and 56% of the population does not have access to improved sanitation (JMP, 2012). The health impact of these poor WSS conditions is significant. According to the National Commission on Macroeconomics and Health (2005), diarrhea accounts for 8% of the total disease burden in India, making it the most burdensome communicable disease and it is the second cause of child mortality<sup>1</sup>.

The paper is structured as follows: a first section presents the importance of the environmental context in which a health insurance is being rolled out for the financial sustainability of the insurance as well as health outcomes and productivity of the targeted population. In a second section, the literature on health insurance in low income and emerging countries is reviewed to understand to what extent health insurances deliver their aims in terms of financial protection and increasing access to health care in a sustainable manner. The third section reviews the literature on the benefits and the limits of WSS programs to improve health and welfare of their population. The last section focuses on India's particular case and provides some international comparison to identify directions for further research to better understand the synergies or trade-offs of investments focusing on both the environment and health insurance.

---

<sup>1</sup> The estimates are based on figures from 1998, but no contemporary estimates are available at the WHO.

## **2 Importance of the environmental context for health insurances**

Traditionally, public health insurance schemes are either tax-funded or financed via workers' social contributions. In most emerging countries, both types of funding are often critical because of weak tax raising capacities and a low share of formal workers. India is no exception. Only 2,8% of the population were paying income taxes in 2011 (Ministry of Finance, 2012) and according to the latest ILO statistics, 83,6% of its workers were employed in the informal sector (ILO, 2012). With limited financial resources, identifying policies or investments that reduce health expenditures; improve health outcomes and the welfare of the population is a necessity. Investments in the WSS sector have the potential to do so. The intertwined relation between WSS, health and productivity, make WSS investments attractive to potentially contain health care costs, reduce insurance costs, and improve health status. In addition, the overwhelming burden of poor WSS falls on poor households, thus investments in WSS can enhance together with health insurance pro-poor development.

### **2.1 Water and sanitation, health, productivity and health insurance- a framework:**

Socio-economic and environmental conditions have been recognized as determinants of health, independently of individual risk factors (Commission on Social determinants of health, 2008). In this context, as figure 1 illustrates, the role played by water and sanitation deserves particular attention because of its direct link to water-related diseases; health care costs and its short and long term impact on people's labor productivity.

Inadequate WSS conditions such as poor water quality, insufficient domestic water supply, the absence of/ or unhygienic latrines and unhygienic behavior have well-established health consequences. Diarrhea, dysentery, gastroenteritis, typhus, trachoma, worm-diseases are amongst the most well-known and most burdensome of these water-related diseases. It is estimated that water-related diseases account for 9,1% of global DALYs (Prüss et al. 2008) and 6,3% of all deaths, while diarrhea alone is estimated to be responsible for 4,3% of the global DALYs (GHE, WHO 2013) in 2011. In India the situation is particularly acute. In 2010, diarrhea is the third major cause of premature death and responsible for 6,8% of all Years of Life Lost (GBD, 2010).


Such illnesses affect poor households' income- by their frequency and their gravity. Like any other illness, water-related diseases affect household income by creating a disruption in earning activities and adding to the households' expenditures when seeking health care or self-medication. Most water-related diseases when treated on time can be treated at the primary health care level. The costs of one diarrhea event is usually not catastrophic, but on the medium or long term- repeated bouts of diarrhea induce a sum of small expenditures which affect poor households' income. Based on the 60<sup>th</sup> NSSO on morbidity and health care, Bandhari et al. (2010) find that 79% of the 11,8 million households pushed into poverty via health care expenditures are due to outpatient care, with small but frequent expenditures. Moreover, all authors agree that drugs constitute the bulk of health expenditures, accounting for between 49% and 77% of all health care expenditures in India (Dror et al. 2012). Thus, even when individuals practice self-medication in the case of diarrhea, household income is affected. In addition, untreated diarrhea in particular amongst children under five can lead to complications with dehydration and dysentery, which require expensive hospitalisation. According to Mahal et al. (2010), the NSSO data shows that diarrhea/dysentery is the most frequent single cause for hospitalisation in India in 2006. In sum, frequent diarrheal diseases which involve small but frequent expenditures and the costs linked to deterioration of untreated water-related diseases can lead to consequent health expenditures.

Besides, poor WSS conditions significantly reduce the time available for productive activities. When water is not available on the premises, the time spent to fetch water can be considerable. For example, in rural South Africa the general household survey finds that households spend on average eight hours fetching water per week in 2005 (Anderson et al. 2010). In India, several studies report that households with water sources away from the premises spend a few hours a week on water fetching (Motiram and Osberg, 2010). Treating water before consumption; finding a place to defecate when no latrines are available are all time consuming and time lost for productive activities or to look after the children to the benefit of the human capital development.

Further time losses arise from the negative health effects of poor WSS. Every water-related disease episode creates a direct interruption of productive activities when the disease affects an earning household member or indirectly when it affects a non-earning member, either by taking care of the affected person or accompanying them to seek health care.

Lastly, productivity is often reduced in the long term, because of health effects of some water-related diseases. Chronic diarrhea, probably through its association with malnutrition, is often associated with lower cognitive capacities, thus affecting future productive capacities (Fischer-Walker et al. 2012; Niehaus et al. 2002).

Figure 1: Links between water, sanitation and health insurance



Source: designed by author

Health insurance brings financial protection to households and supports their access to health care. Nevertheless, in a high risk environment, the financial protection of households and the long-term sustainability of the health insurance are challenged. Firstly, although health insurance provides financial protection against health expenditures, this protection will always be incomplete as health insurance cannot cover all expenditures and income reductions associated to ill-health. The higher the risks linked to the environment with poor WSS; the more frequent water-related diseases exacerbate the financial burden on poor households. Secondly, as the targeted population is more affected with water-related diseases, the higher the health expenditures linked to such preventable diseases are taken in charge by the health insurance, which raises the problem of cost containment and medium/long term sustainability of the insurance, in a context of limited financial resources.

Thus, to improve the benefits of health insurance, investments that prevent and promote good health cost-efficiently (Cutler and Zeckhauser, 2000) are needed. Because of the effects of WSS on




health, health expenditures and productivity, we propose a framework that explicitly links health insurance with investments in WSS to explore potential synergies and trade-offs that could arise from such investments.

Synergies are expected in terms of health risks mitigations; support to households' productivity and containment of health care costs. Investments in WSS improve health by preventing and decreasing the frequency of water-related diseases (Esrey et al. 1991; Fewtrell et al. 2005). An improved health in turn smoothens the households' income and reduces their financial vulnerability against major health shocks. Households' financial vulnerability is further reduced by the health insurance when seeking health care. In addition, by lowering the financial barrier to access health care, health insurance supports earlier and better access to health care, which has been shown to reduce the health burden and health expenditures (Kraft et al. 2009), while increasing the households' productivity (Dizioli et al. 2012). Additional productivity gains are expected from WSS investments from time saved previously used for unproductive activities. Indeed, all cost benefit analyses of WSS investments estimate that the main benefit from WSS improvements comes from the time gains that enable households to dedicate more time to productive activities (Hutton et al., 2007; WSP, 2008) to increase their income and develop their human capital. Further positive health spillovers of WSS improvements are expected because of the strong association between diarrhea and malnutrition, which should also decrease (Fischer-Walker et al. 2012). As healthier individuals are more resistant to disease, their productivity is increased, further protecting their income from financial vulnerability and eventually helping them to lift themselves out of poverty, while contributing to cost-containment of health expenditures for the health insurance.

Nevertheless, this logic must be weighed against potential trade-offs which might occur in terms of the demand for health care and people's attitudes towards health risks. Indeed, as figure 2 illustrates, key to both types of investments is the private behavior of households. On the one hand, health insurance has a positive impact on health seeking behavior as it lowers the costs of health care but it can also influence private attitudes towards health risks. On the other hand, WSS investments are expected to influence private attitudes towards hygiene and thus impact WSS health related risks. If trade-offs are at play, the outcomes in terms of water-related disease frequency, the productivity of households and the level of health expenditures for water-related diseases might not be as positive as expected.

Figure 2. The impacts of health insurance and WSS interventions on private behavior



Source: designed by author

To analyse the synergies and trade-offs which occur when investing jointly in WSS and health insurances, the following questions should be investigated: are people seeking more health care under health insurance or not? Does the provision of improved WSS infrastructure lead to the expected health outcomes in terms of diarrhea frequency and Body Mass Index (BMI)? Is there an increase in productivity of insured households with improved WSS reflected in household incomes? Is there a reduction of health expenditures for water-related diseases at the household level and at the health insurance level?

*Beyond the potential synergies of investing in health insurance and WSS which benefit the insurance and the beneficiaries, the burden of poor WSS and water-related diseases on poor households are an additional argument to investigate the question of synergies and trade-offs between health insurance and WSS.*

## **2.2 Water and sanitation, water-related diseases and poverty**

Health and poverty are intertwined in different ways with the crude consequence that poorer people have poorer health (Marmot, 2005). This inverted relationship between good-health and poverty has been observed across and within countries (Marmot, 2005, Ruger et al. 2006, Whitehead, 2001) and is particularly true for water-related diseases. Indeed, poorer people living in riskier environments and with riskier life-styles (CSDH, 2005) have a higher burden of water-related diseases.

Poorer people have less access to safe drinking water and safe sanitation. Here again the gradient can be found across countries, as well as within countries. Thus 88% of the 884 million people living without access to improved sources of drinking water live in lower income countries. Within countries, disparities of access are high. In India for example, only 3% of the poorest quintile have access to improved sanitation facilities in 2008, compared to 94% of the richest quintile (JMP, 2010).

With poorer access to WSS, the health burden of water-related diseases is concentrated on the poorest. Worldwide, Prüss et al (2002) estimate that water and sanitation are responsible for 94% of all water related diseases and that of 4.3% of the global DALYs attributable to diarrhea alone, the disease burden is 240 times higher in developing regions compared to developed regions. Analysing diarrhea prevalence amongst children under five within countries using DHS data from 1990 until 2005, Forsberg et al (2009) systematically find that diarrhea prevalence is higher in the lowest quintile compared the highest one, whether in Europe, the Pacific or Sub-Saharan Africa. Globally they find that 16,3% of children in the lowest quintile recall a diarrhea episode in the two weeks preceding the survey, compared to 11,6% in the highest quintile.

Consequently, the economic burden of poor WSS and water-related diseases is higher on poorer countries and poorer households. As WSS as such is not a major concern in developed countries, most analyses on the costs of poor WSS exclude these countries. In fact, the only cost evaluations which can be found have been done by the World Bank and focus on the costs of sanitation. The WSP initiative evaluates that the costs of poor sanitation range from 1,6% in Ghana in 2010 to 7,2% of GDP in Cambodia in 2005, and costs 6,4% of GDP in India in 2006. Other studies estimate the cost-benefits or cost effectiveness of WSS interventions for different countries or different world regions, taking into account the costs of different interventions and the benefits linked to avoided premature deaths; productivity loss; health expenditures and time loss. In their study, Hutton et al. (2007) find that intervention costs to improve water and sanitation infrastructure are higher in more developed regions than in less developed ones when measured in per capita costs. Furthermore, because of a lower frequency of these illnesses in more developed regions, the benefits of WSS interventions in terms of health care costs saved is much smaller in more developed regions than in Africa or South-East Asia. The economic burden of poor WSS within countries has also not been studied very extensively. The only study that comes closer to such an analysis is from Rheingans et al (2012) where the authors examine the costs structure of child diarrhea across income quintiles across and within 3 African countries and 3 South-Asian countries. . The authors find that in all countries the

total household costs of diarrhea are lower in lower income quintiles than in higher ones, which can be interpreted by differed health seeking behavior and lower costs associated to productivity loss. Nevertheless, both studies are based on absolute terms analyses and do not refer to total disposable income, which could give a better estimate of the relative financial burden of such disease episode for different wealth quintiles. In addition, the frequency of the diarrhea episodes, is not captured in these two cross-sectional studies. As seen previously, children in poorer wealth quintile are more subject to water-related diseases, thus in sum it is expected that costs of diarrhea are higher for the poorest households.

Lastly, the gender inequality of poor WSS and its socio-economic impact must be underlined. Poor WSS access affects women and children most. Fetching water is mainly a task carried out by women and young girls, thus often leaving children on their own or shortening the time available for home work, to the detriment of their human capital formation (JMP, 2012). The lack of latrines also burdens women and girls more than men, leading to repeated school absence during menstruation and exposing women to violence as they practice open defecation. In the JMP's most recent report of 2012, it reports an analysis based in 25 Sub-Saharan countries where 71% of women and girls are responsible for water collection. Furthermore, in their study on household costs for child diarrhea, Rheingans et al. (2012) find that in all countries, with the exception of Bangladesh, boys' diarrhea episodes are associated to higher household costs compared to girls diarrhea episode, reflecting the gender inequality in terms of access to health care, which on the long run increases morbidity and mortality risks of girls and of women.

The clear association between poverty, poor WSS and its health and economic consequences highlight the need to take environmental conditions into consideration when developing policies that aim to protect the poor from ill-health hazards.

*Having presented the reasons to look at the potential synergies of investing in water and sanitation interventions when rolling out a subsidized health insurance for the poor, the next section reviews the literature on the effects of health insurance and WSS investments for the poor and highlights some of the underlying considerations on private behavior which need to be taken into account.*

### **3 Evidence from health insurance for the poor**

Targeted subsidized health insurances aim to protect households from health care expenditures and support their access to health care. This section reviews the literature on these issues and explores how private behavior in terms of health seeking behavior and attitude towards environmental risks can be affected by the introduction of health insurance.

#### **3.1 Health insurance and financial protection:**

The main objective of health insurances is to reduce households' direct health expenditures by providing them with adequate financial protection when seeking health care. Therefore, health insurance programs for the poor are traditionally evaluated according to their effectiveness to offer financial protection to its beneficiaries either by looking at the average health expenditures or the share of catastrophic health expenditures, as a share of total household expenditures.

Surprisingly, as a recent review on health insurance programs in low and middle-income countries for informal population highlights, the goal of financial protection is often not met (Acharya et al. 2013). While authors such as Jutting et al. (2001), Sepehri et al.(2006), Bauhoff et al.(2011), find clear positive evidence of household financial protection in Senegal, Vietnam and Georgia, others found more mixed evidence in China with an actual increase in OOP for members (Wagstaff et al. (2009); Lei and Lin (2009) and Liu (2011)) or an increased likelihood in catastrophic health expenditures in both Zambia and China (Ekman (2007) and Wagstaff (2008)). These latter results can be explained by either an increase in the utilization of health care services, in particular when co-payments are used or a rise in the use of expensive services induced by health care providers when health care providers are paid or reimbursed on a fee-for-service basis (demand induced by health care providers).

#### **3.2 Health insurance and health care utilization:**

By introducing health insurance, the lower costs of health care can lead to an increase in the utilization of health care services. This behavior, called ex-post moral hazard, leads to an over-utilization of health care services that usually contributes to the inefficiency of an insurance. Newhouse (1993) was the first to observe it in the Insurance experiment, whereby people enrolled in schemes with lower co-payments used health services more than in schemes with higher co-payment rates, *ceteris paribus*. This phenomenon is well-known to the insurance market and policy makers try to find ways to limit it. Nevertheless, in poorer countries, where access to health care is low, one of the secondary aims of a health insurance is to increase the access and the utilization of health care services. Indeed, in many developing countries delayed health care, self-treatment or alternative treatments are often observed with negative consequences both in terms of health burden and health expenditures (Kraft et al. 2009). Thus another important evaluation criterion is the utilization of health care services, which reflects health seeking behavior and access to health care.

In general, evidence from different types of health insurances show an increase in the utilization of health care services. Whether in CHIs (Baeza et al (2002), Devadasan et al. (2004), Jütting, (2004)), subsidized health insurance or social health insurances (Jowett et al. (2004); Trujillo et al. (2005); Wagstaff (2007); Liu et al. (2011)), all studies find an increase in the utilization of health care services amongst the insured. Most programs are voluntary and thus individuals and families that are more likely to need treatment are likely to enroll first in the insurance, increasing the utilization of health care services (adverse selection/self-selection). Most studies mentioned above rely on propensity score matching to deal with this problem. Nevertheless, self-selection cannot always fully be dealt with. Increases in the utilization of health care services have to be taken carefully and may not always reflect an actual change in health seeking behavior but the consequence of self-selection.

Some recent studies on the utilization pattern of insured and uninsured with subsidized health insurances schemes, point to less conclusive results though. Hassan et al. (2010) for example find opposite results to Trujillo et al. (2005) with no increase in health care service utilization between insured and uninsured from the Colombian subsidized social health insurance program for preventive or inpatient care. In China and Georgia, Lei and Lin (2009) and Bauhoff et al. (2011) respectively do not find an increase in the utilization of medical services under the NCMS and the Medical Insurance Program for the Poor. The reasons for a non-increase in health care utilization can often be attributed to either design mistakes in the insurance scheme (Robyn et al. 2012) which can induce negative attitudes from health care providers towards insured when seeking health care; or deterring high levels of copayments (Lei et al. 2009) as hypothesized in the case of China's NCMS; or a lack of interest to seek care at the providers empanelled in the scheme, reason invoked by Bauhoff et al (2011) in the case of Georgia.

### **3.3 Health insurance and attitudes towards health risks: ex-ante moral hazard**

As Trujillo et al (2005) emphasizes: "The potential distributional gains from [...]subsidized health insurance schemes are, however, usually accompanied by efficiency losses, which occur because of distortions in both the participants' behavior and in the allocation of resources to the health care sector as a whole".. This section reviews what is known in terms of behavior change under health insurance and how this can affect households' attitudes towards environmental health risks.

Insurance can affect private behavior at different levels. As seen previously, a lower price of health services can induce an over-utilization of health care services, called ex-post moral hazard. In addition, it can also influence the behavior of insured before they fall sick, via ex-ante moral hazard.

To better understand ex-ante moral hazard, one needs to consider the risks which the insurance covers. Erlich and Boeck (1972) were the first to recognize that risks can be measured in terms of severity and probability. Traditionally, insurance decreases the severity of the losses as a risk materializes, but does not influence the probability of risks materializing. Ex- ante moral hazard refers to changes in behavior that can influence this probability, such as life-style choices; prevention or early detection of diseases (Bates et al. 2010).

Until recently, the evidence for ex-ante moral hazard has quite extensively been observed in certain insurance sectors, such as car insurance (Abbring et al. 2008) or work disability insurance. In the case of car insurance for example, it has been observed that taking up an insurance has led to, in certain cases, an increase in the number of claims, as insured take up more risks when driving and anticipate the insurance coverage in case of an accident (Abbring et al. 2008). Similarly for work disability insurance it has been observed that people take more risks at work and thus increase the number of accidents when they are insured (Dave et al., 2009). Insurances have learnt from these attitude changes and provide incentives to individuals to avoid risk taking behavior. In the case of car insurance, the level of the premium typically increases when the insured has had an accident, to encourage careful driving. In the case of health insurance, incentives to influence private behavior can be given by linking the level of the premium or of the co-payment to certain preventive practices.

In the case of health insurance, ex-ante moral hazard has drawn less attention as it is expected that, unlike with other material goods, people will always want to decrease the probability of falling sick (Cutler & Zeckhauser, 2000). Indeed, the utility loss due to illness is not only a financial matter and can never be completely compensated for (Dave et al., 2009). According to Ehrlich and Boeck (1972), when the marginal costs of self-protection are low, prevention and insurance should be complements. Nevertheless as Dave et al. (2009) have found in their review, when the price of curative care under health insurance is low, the incentives for self-protection and prevention are also lower. Individuals anticipate compensation from the insurance pay less attention to self-protection

or prevention, thus increasing the probability of falling sick. In the case of water-related diseases, the question is whether health insurance leads to an increase or a decrease in preventive attitudes such as hand washing after defecation and treating water before drinking it. So far, research on ex-ante moral hazard in the health sector reports mixed evidence. Some authors find no evidence of ex-ante moral hazard, while others find a positive effect of health insurance on individuals' attitude towards prevention and health risks and yet others find evidence of an increase in health risks. Dave et al. (2009) explain this variety of outcomes by the fact that most health risk attitudes have a long time span to materialize into health hazards, thus quite independently to health insurance. In addition, the incentives (or disincentives) to change attitudes towards health risks are low and often difficult to influence. In addition, the authors argue that there are two dynamics at play: ex-ante moral hazard that increases people's attitudes towards health risks, which can be partly offset by the contact with health staff which counsels and encourages lower health risk attitudes.

Newhouse (1993) drawing on the US RAND Health Insurance Experiment does not find that lifestyle habits are affected by varying degrees of health insurance generosity. Similarly, Courbage et al. (2004) find that life style habits such as smoking and exercise activities are not affected by private health insurance take-up amongst British households.

Mensah et al. (2010) find in Ghana that health insurance increased pre- and post-natal preventive visits, seeming to indicate that insurance enrollment is associated with an increased awareness of health risks and prevention. The insurance has a positive effect on private behavior to decrease the probability of health risks related to pregnancy. Similarly, Trujillo et al. (2010) find a positive effect of insurance on the use of preventive care amongst a cross-sectional survey of diabetic patients, even though these services are not covered for.

On the other hand, Klick et al. (2007) find that the inclusion of diabetes treatment in health insurance plans dissuades behavioral improvements in the US, resulting in an increase of the body mass index of diabetic patients after the adoption of such policies. Dave and Kaetner (2009) also find evidence that Medicare, a US health insurance for elderly, reduces prevention and increases unhealthy behaviors among men, although this is partly off-set by the positive effects of medical counseling. More recently, Yilma et al. (2012) explored the impact of enrolling in Ghana's National Health Insurance Scheme (NHIS) on ownership and use of insecticide treated bed nets as preventive behaviors against malaria. The authors use a propensity-adjusted households fixed effects model and find clear evidence of ex-ante moral hazard, with a decrease in ownership and use of treated bed nets as people enroll in NHIS.

Water-related diseases can partially but significantly be prevented by hygiene measures such as washing hands after defecation and household treatment of water (through boiling, chlorine, filter etc...) before drinking it. When health insurance is introduced, will this influence households' attitude towards environmental health risks, either by decreasing their attention and time given to prevention or by increasing their awareness for the need to have hygienic habits? If ex-ante moral hazard is observed, households pay less attention to hygiene habits related to water-related diseases, as they anticipate the health coverage and increase their probability of catching water-related diseases. If ex-ante moral hazard exists, the benefits of the health insurance will be limited as health expenditures increase and there is no health improvement amongst the insured. To observe ex-ante moral hazard requires a good understanding of how the insurance functions by the insured, which is not always the case amongst poor households (Platteau et al. 2013); an awareness of the health consequences of hygiene practices and/or high costs for households to engage in self-protection.

Having reviewed the evidence of health insurance, the next section presents evidence of water and sanitation improvements on health, health risks and income for the poor.

## 4 Evidence from water, sanitation and hygiene interventions on the poor:

As seen previously poor WSS have consequent effects both in terms of health burden (directly) and in terms of productivity loss (directly and indirectly), thus it is expected that WSS interventions bring about significant positive health benefits as well as productive ones. Nevertheless, as the review shows results are not always as strong as expected and this can be at least partly explained by some behavioral trade-off concerning WSS related health risks.

### 4.1 WSS interventions, health outcomes and economic impact:

While the link between poor water and sanitation conditions and water-related diseases is undeniably high; the WHO estimates that 94% of all water-related diseases can be attributed to poor WATSAN conditions, precise estimations of the positive impact of WSS interventions on health are still quite limited and with a large variance in their positive health outcomes (Pattanayak et al., 2007). As Pattanayak et al. (2007) underline: *“mechanisms to achieve [improved water and sanitation] are broad and varied in terms of the types of services (water supply, water quality, sanitation, sewerage, and hygiene); the setting (urban, peri-urban, rural); and the typology of delivery (public intervention, private interventions, decentralized delivery, expansion or rehabilitation)”*. In addition, as Overbey (2008) underlines, some studies suffer from self-selection bias making it difficult to attribute the observed health benefits to the intervention itself and not to the motivation/ awareness in WSS of households. As a consequence, systematic reviews find a large span in terms of the effectiveness of WSS interventions to reduce the frequency of diarrhea or other water-related diseases. In their systematic review, Esrey et al. (1991) find that interventions reduce the frequency of diarrhea between 0% and 84%. More recently, Fewtrell et al. (2005) find effectiveness of WSS interventions to vary between 11% and 89% in terms of diarrhea morbidity reduction. Curtis et al. (2000) in their review find that hand washing with soap interventions can reduce diarrhea episodes between 27% and 89%.

Another possibility to measure the health benefits of WSS interventions is to estimate the avoided health care costs and averted DALYs. In an estimation by Haller et al. (2007) on 10 WHO sub-regions, the authors find that WSS interventions have a cost-effectiveness that varies from 20\$ per DALY averted in the case of disinfection of water at point of use to 13.000\$ for piped water and sewage connections, with the greatest health impact from piped water connections. Another study in small water supply communities of America, Europe and Western Pacific by Hunter et al. (2009) estimate that the total costs of diarrhea and post-infectious irritable bowel syndrome mounted to US\$ 16 567 million and the costs of water supply intervention and maintenance to be US\$ 14 507 million. Thus, the study concludes that water supply intervention, even in remote rural areas involving heavier infrastructure are cost- beneficial.

Surprisingly, although one important benefit of WSS interventions is expected to be the time gains for households' productive activities, little evidence evaluate interventions in this dimension. Indeed, most studies concerned with the economic dimension of WSS are prospective and use valuation of time to estimate benefits or cost effectiveness ratios. No study could be found that tried to estimate the productivity of households and/or the income of households after WSS interventions.

Thus, although evaluations of the costs of poor WSS converge and all cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit analyses evaluate that WSS are highly profitable because of its impact on averted health care costs, averted mortality and time gains, little evidence exists beyond the pure health impact of WSS.

## 4.2 WSS interventions and behavior change:

Private behavior of households is essential to the success of WSS interventions and has been a concern for the field for the past decade. The presence of health insurance might complicate behavior changes by affecting the opportunity cost of self-protection via hygiene.

As past experience has shown, without ownership, willingness and acceptability from households WSS interventions fail<sup>2</sup> (Sugden et al., 2005). A first step to improve the outcomes of WSS intervention has been to ensure that projects are based on the willingness of households. While the demand for improved water supply is either existent or can easily be triggered because of the inconvenience felt by communities and households to have intermittent water and the burden of fetching water, creating demand for sanitation is more difficult. Indeed, as Banda et al. (2007) reveal in their study on knowledge and practices of water handling and sanitation, traditional defecation practices are often fully accepted and for some associated to positive values (“a social outing”) and a clear lack of association with health outcomes. Social marketing approaches and community-led-total-sanitation (CLTS) campaigns have recently become common practice to create community norms and awareness of the health risks associated to unhygienic practices to support the demand for sanitation.

Beyond supporting demand for WSS improvements, WSS requires more complex behavior change amongst communities to fully benefit from WSS improvements. Indeed, without addressing household behavior, as a recent World Bank evaluation of demand-driven WSS projects in India showed (Pattanayak et al. 2010), the expected health benefits and the reduction in health expenditures do not materialize and the frequency of water-related diseases remains unchanged. Analyzing the effectiveness of different household water treatment (HWT); Enger et al. (2013) conclude that compliance to any HWT was more important and a pre-requisite to the efficacy of any treatment. Thus, to lead to behavioral changes it is necessary to raise awareness and offer communities medium or long-term support to manage the infrastructures and make sure that the communities understand the risks associated to certain practices and how to change them. In a project in 400 sample villages in Peru, Bolivia and Ghana with community water supply interventions and external expertise to maintain the water supply systems, Whittington et al. (2009) find much higher rates of success with 95-90% of functional hand pumps in the 3 countries, compared to previous studies where ownership and expertise were neglected. More interestingly though, the authors also find that up to 38% of the households were still using unsafe water supply sources even when communal hand pumps are available, revealing the importance of convenience in usage and awareness of the health benefits of using safe water.

Not only are behavioral changes towards WSS difficult to trigger, but other phenomena at play increase the complexity of behavioral change in WSS interventions. In an ex-post evaluation 6 months after a 3 year intervention on HWT and hand washing practices in Guatemala, Arnold et al. (2009) find that when compared to control villages, the intervention led to modest but significant gains in water treatment behavior but no difference in self-reported hand washing behavior, spot-check hygiene conditions, or the prevalence of child diarrhea. Similarly, systematic reviews by Esrey et al. (1991), Fewtrell et al. (2005) and Luby et al. (2006) all report that combined interventions have a similar health impact to single interventions. Thus, it indicates that multiple interventions act as substitutes rather than complements. If so, there is either a loss in the efficiency of multiple interventions in their implementation; a difficulty for households to adopt to multiple changes with a general loss of compliance to different changes or a trade-off in behavior taking more risks than previously, assuming a safer environment. Supporting the latter hypothesis, Bennett et al. (2008) find that improvements in water supply have in the Philippines led to a decrease in sanitation hygienic behavior, indicating a negative trade-off being operated in terms of health behavior. Nevertheless, even though behavioral trade-offs might be at play, other authors argue that independent



interventions cannot always be successful and that not only behavior should be looked at but also infection paths of water-related pathogens. Eisenberg et al. (2007) for example simulate the impact of interdependent transmission paths and find that with poor sanitation; water quality improvement will always have minimal health impact.

As this section highlights private attitudes towards WSS is complex and crucial. Can health insurance support demand for WSS and the adoption of hygienic practices via an increased contact with health care services that raises the awareness of risks linked to a poor WSS environment? Or does it negatively affect the motivation to engage in self-protection in the presence of ex-ante moral hazard? Research in this field benefit both WSS interventions, to better understand the importance of external motivation factors to environmental risks and for the sustainability of the health insurance, as previously discussed.

*Having reviewed the literature on the benefits and limits of health insurance programs for the poor and WSS interventions, the next section focuses on the case in India, where the recent implementation of RSBY offers an interesting example of health insurance in a high health risk environment to explore the synergies and trade-offs of investing in health insurance and WSS.*

## 5 India's RSBY and WSS situation: an international comparison and specific challenges

Since 2008, India launched an ambitious health insurance programs for below poverty line households, which has largely been acclaimed by the international community for its boldness, its quick implementation and some innovations that will be highlighted below. Nevertheless, the medium and long term development of this scheme will depend on its sustainability. As the water and sanitation sector has persistently been critical in India, it offers an interesting case to analyse the risks of implementing health insurance in a high risk environment and detect synergies or trade-offs of coupling health insurance with WSS investments to tackle the persistently burdensome level of water-related diseases.

### 5.1 Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojna:

The aim to have a universal health care system in India was set as early as 1946 by the Bhole Committee, but limited financial resources, a lack of human resources and policies have made this aim a distant mirage. Instead as Patel (2011) notes India developed into "one of the most fragmented and commercialized health-care systems in the world". Supply of health care is overwhelmingly done by private health care providers, accounting for 82% of outpatient visits and 65% for inpatient visits in 2004 (Dilip, 2012)<sup>3</sup>. Similarly, the financing of the health sector is characterized by a high fragmentation, whereby public health expenditures account for 26,5% of total health expenditures, while private expenditure represented 73,5% in 2007 (WHO, 2008). 90% of these private expenditures are household out-of-pocket (OOP) expenditures, producing high inequality. In an attempt to correct the flaws of such a system, the Central Government and several State governments have launched ambitious health insurance programs for the poor, RSBY in 2008.

Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojna (RSBY)-the Central government's scheme is the largest insurance plan in India, but at least three other successful state funded hospital health insurances targeted to the poor are also contributing to the recent upsurge in health insurance membership: Rajiv Aarogyasri in Andhra Pradesh (2007), the Tamil Nadu Insurance Scheme for Life Saving Treatment (2009), and the Vajpayee Aarogyasri (2009) in Karnataka. All schemes are quite similar in design, but vary slightly in their target population and their benefit package<sup>4</sup>.

Estimates show that prior to these schemes 10% of the population was enrolled in some health insurance arrangements (Selvaraj, 2012) and mostly through state sponsored schemes for civil servants, private insurance and community health insurances. Beginning of 2012, four years after being launched, RSBY alone covers 20% of the population (Dror, 2012) and as of latest approximately 35 million BPL households. Nevertheless, these figures have to be taken carefully as RSBY only records total cumulated membership and it is not possible to know how many households have renewed their membership or not. Thus, it is likely that the coverage rate is over-estimated. Taking into account the three other State insurances, latest figures estimate that 50,2% of the BPL population<sup>5</sup> have benefited from an insurance coverage.

---

<sup>3</sup> This figure is for Kerala only, but similar figures of 60% have been found at the national level

<sup>4</sup> While RSBY's package covers mainly secondary care hospitalizations, Vajpayee Aarogyasri covers both secondary and tertiary health care and Rajiv Aarogyasri and the Tamil Nadu Life Saving scheme cover only tertiary surgical interventions. The amounts covered by the schemes vary as well: RSBY has the most modest coverage of Rs. 30. 000 per family per annum, while Vajpayee Aarogyasri and Rajiv Aarogyasri cover up to Rs 2 lakh per annum. The Tamil Nadu scheme covers 1 lakh for a family on a 4 year basis (Selvaraj, 2012). The extent of RSBY, which covers 31 million BPL families and is planned to cover up to 302 million people.

<sup>5</sup> This figure was calculated adding all members of the 4 schemes and compared to the Lakshmeep estimate of the total number of BPL households.

As Das (2011) writes RSBY “combines cutting edge technology with an unusual reliance on incentives to provide inpatient insurance coverage”. Salient features of RSBY are:

Cashless transactions: members receive a smart card that gives them access to health care in the empanelled facilities without paying anything, all transactions going through the card.

Health insurance: private or government-run health insurers are selected at the district level<sup>6</sup> through competitive bidding and are attracted by the guarantee that full premium will be paid by the central government (75%) and the state government (25%) and up to Rs. 750/household. Health insurances can decide whether they rely on TPA to administer claims.

Health care providers: both private and public health care providers can be empanelled by the health insurance into the scheme. Transactions are cashless and are directly addressed to the insurance. This increases the prospect for the providers of being paid compared to previous models.

Household enrollment: all BPL individuals or households are eligible. They are identified by each state. Up to five members of a household can be enrolled. The annual registration fee is Rs. 30, to avoid any financial barriers to enroll and thus encourage wider membership and not only of households who know they will need health care (lower adverse selection)

Coverage: RSBY provides coverage up to Rs. 30 000 per annum and per family for some 700 secondary surgical and medical interventions. It also covers indirect costs such as transportation to health care facilities on a reimbursement basis.

As shown in the table 1 in annex, RSBY is currently implemented in 26 states<sup>7</sup> with 17 States having implemented the scheme in all districts. States with a high coverage of its population are Himachal Pradesh where 79,5% of the BPL households enrolled and Nagaland where 77,1% of the target population is enrolled. The national average of the coverage of the targeted population is almost 50%. According to current enrollment rates, how long RSBY has been running in a State seems unrelated to the percentage of the BPL population covered.

Early evaluations have pointed to some weaknesses of RSBY in terms of the benefit package and the problem of long term cost containment. The Public Health Foundation of India underlined the mismatch between the benefit package that focuses on secondary and tertiary health care and evidence that points to the importance of primary health care and in particular of drugs in households' health expenditures (PHFI, 2011) and their subsequent impoverishing effects. This has led RSBY to launch a pilot experience since 2013 whereby out-patient and drugs are included in the benefit package. In addition as Dror (2012) had already pointed and PHFI note the long-term financial sustainability of RSBY is uncertain. In 2010, certain states report a high utilization rate amongst RSBY insured with insurances making losses. The loss by insurances is bound to push the price of future premiums higher, increasing the financial costs of the insurance.

## **5.2 Water supply and sanitation in India and its health burden:**

Unlike health, which is a responsibility of the Central government, WSS is constitutionally the responsibility of the States. Nevertheless, because of the persistently critical WSS situation and low funding, the Central government has become increasingly involved in the sector both politically and financially. Since 2011, a Ministry of Drinking Water and Sanitation has been created to coordinate activities and programs for rural areas nationally. Besides, the financing from the Central government

---

<sup>6</sup> Depending on how big the state is, it is divided by RSBY into different regions, regrouping districts with similar levels of health care demand and prices. Each region then offers a bidding.

<sup>7</sup> [www.rsby.gov.in](http://www.rsby.gov.in) last consulted on 15.10. 2012

has increased over the five-year plans and reached 55% of total investments in the sector in the 11<sup>th</sup> Plan, compared to 24% a decade earlier (Planning Commission, 2011).

A major shift in WSS policies was observed a decade ago, when WSS policies evolved from a supply-driven approach to a more demand-responsive one, involving lower levels of governmental structures (Sijbema, 2009). In rural India, Village Water Supply and Sanitation Committees (VWSCs) and in urban areas Urban Local Bodies have been encouraged since then to deal with the day-to-day management of water supply and sanitation and the planning of new schemes (Jha, 2010). These committees are voluntary and as Jha (2010) and the Planning Commission (2010) underline, the financial means frequently do not reach these lower levels, limiting the tasks of these committees.

As a result, progress in the WSS coverage has been improving over the last decade, although slowly. In terms of safe domestic water supply, the latest Census reveals that in 2011 43,5% of the households have access to tap water, 11% rely on well (protected and unprotected) and 42% on tube-well water and hand-pumps<sup>8</sup>. Disparities between rural and urban areas and between states are persistently high. In rural areas, only 30,8% of the households have access to tap water compared to 70,6% in urban areas. Furthermore, while some states such as Tamil Nadu, Goa and Himachal Pradesh rely for more than 75% on tap water (from treated and untreated sources), other states such as Bihar only have 4% of their population relying on tap water.

Concerning sanitation coverage, the 2011 Census estimates that for that year 36,4% of the population uses water closet as a latrine, another 9,4% uses pit (ventilated and unventilated) and that 53,1% have no latrines<sup>9</sup>. Compared to 2001, the percentage of households that have gained access to some type of latrine has increased by almost 10%, but this still leaves an estimated 800 million people without access to latrines. Figures in terms of coverage vary again across States and rural and urban areas. In Sikkim 75% of the population has access to water closet, while in Orissa it is less than 20% of the population. The States with the highest access to all types of latrines are in Kerala, where more than 95% of the population has access to some type of latrine, followed by Tripura and Mizoram, with almost 90% of coverage. The lowest sanitation coverage is found in Bihar, Orissa, Chattisgarh and Madhya Pradesh, where more than 75% of the population still practices open defecation. The urban-rural divide is also striking: 69,3% of the rural population has no access to any types of latrines compared to 18,6% of the urban population. According to the JMP definition of safe latrines, 44% of the population uses improved sanitation facilities (water closet with piped sewer system, septic tank, other system, ventilated improved pit), with 27,6% in rural areas and 79% in urban areas. Nevertheless, as the JMP underlines these figures might be overestimations as crucial operating and maintenance (O&M) are not estimated.

In terms of socio-economic gradient in the access to WSS, India is no exception and WSS is highly unequal across wealth quintiles. Although progress on safe water access has encouragingly been “equity neutral” according to the JMP (2012), the inequalities in terms of access both to safe drinking water and toilets remains. Taped water is provided to 64% of the top income quintile, compared to only 2% in the lowest one (JMP, 2012). In terms of sanitation coverage, the inequalities are even more striking (Bonu and Kim, 2009), with 97% of the top income quintile with safe latrines, compared to only 4-5% in the lowest income quintile in 2005-2006.

It is therefore not surprising that India bears a particularly high share of water-related diseases. Diarrhea alone constitutes more than half of all death rates due to infectious and parasitic diseases and is estimated to cause still 8% of all deaths in India between 2001 and 2003 (Office of the Registrar General, 2004). Hughes and Delauey (2001) estimated that environmental risks account for nearly 20% of the total burden of disease in India, with water and sanitation being the first risk.

---

<sup>8</sup> These figures differ from the JMP estimates, which seems to overestimate safe water supply. Indeed, according to the latest JMP figures safe water supply had an overall coverage estimation of 92% in 2010, with 97% coverage in urban areas and 90% in rural areas.

<sup>9</sup> The estimation in terms of sanitation coverage match those of the JMP, with 34% of the population having access to safe latrines

No data enables to estimate the specific burden of water-related diseases or diarrhea in the lowest income quintiles but total child mortality rates across income quintiles and total child mortality rates indicate that the burden of water-related disease is higher amongst poorer households. Subramaniam et al. (2008), based on NHFS-2 data, find that individuals from lowest quintile of standard of living are 86% more likely to die compared to those in the highest quintile. Child mortality, a very sensitive health outcome to household income and material deprivation in the first years of life (Marmot, 2005), also reveals deep inequalities. According to NFHS-3 data for 2005-2006, wealthier households experience only a third of the under-five mortality of poorer households (NHFS-3, 2005-2006).

Diarrhea is one of the two diseases that account for 50% of all deaths amongst children in India, along with pneumonia (Bassani et al. 2010). According to Bassani et al. (2010) in 2005 diarrhea caused 300 000 deaths among children under five, from a total of 1,34 million fatalities for this age group. These figures and the under-five mortality rates according to income, show a clear burden of diarrhea amongst lower income quintiles.

Table 1. Childhood mortality rates according to wealth quintiles

Early childhood mortality rates 2005-2006 ( in 1000)					
Wealth quintiles	Neonatal mortality	Postneonatal mortality	Infant mortality	Child mortality	Under-five mortality
Lowest	48,8	21,9	70,7	32,5	100,9
Second	44,9	24,2	69,2	22,8	90,4
Middle	41,2	19,4	60,6	13,8	73,6
Fourth	32,4	9,9	42,3	7,1	49,1
Highest	24,3	9,2	33,6	2,7	36,2
Source: NHFS-3 final report, GoI					

In addition, similarly to other countries, poor WSS mostly affects the most vulnerable. Water fetching in India is essentially a task for women and children, with according to some estimates three times as many women as men fetching water (James et al. (2002)). In terms of health burden, diarrhea claims 10% of all deaths amongst women, compared to 7% of men in 2001-2003 in India (Office of Registrar General, 2004). Lastly, Rheingans et al (2012) find that child diarrhea episodes for girls in India are slightly less expensive than for a boy, suggesting less expenditure for the latter.

### 5.3 Challenges for India:

India's ambitious RSBY program fits into a recent trend amongst middle and low income countries to try and provide social protection nets to their poor population. In this section, comparing India to other countries, several specific challenges to ensure the sustainability of RSBY and improve WSS are raised.

As the table 2 below illustrates, several countries have also recently developed tax based schemes to provide health insurance coverage to vulnerable sections of their population. Countries, such as in Philippines, Indonesia and Columbia (Wagstaff et al. (2009) and Obermann et al. (2006)) choose to cross-subsidize the scheme from their existing social health insurance program to enroll poor households; while Mexico and China developed separate subsidized public health insurance programs for the most vulnerable; an option that India has also taken. Ghana, on the other hand, has designed an entirely new universal health insurance scheme to cover its entire population.

Contrarily to India, most other countries have developed schemes which are not entirely free and households have to pay either a flat-based contribution, or an income-based one, with full subsidization for only a portion of the targeted population. India in contrast aims to fully-subsidize 33% of its total population. On the other hand, it must be underlined that India is also the only country that has opted to fully exclude outpatient care and drugs from the benefit package, although it is currently trying to extend the coverage in certain States (Out-Patient experiment).

These characteristics raise two concerns for India's scheme. One links to the nature of the benefit package and the second to cost containment. As Desai (2009) and PHFI (2011) underline it is still unclear if the nature of the benefit package of RSBY is best adopted to financially protect poor households when seeking health care. Indeed, there is an ongoing debate in India about the nature of health care expenditures that push households into poverty or aggravate their poverty. For Mahal (2010) inpatient health care expenditures have the most impoverishing effects, while for others outpatient care expenditures, less expensive but more frequent, have a greater impoverishing effect (PHFI, 2011). All authors agree that drugs constitute the highest source of health expenditures, which are fully excluded from the benefit package. In the specific case of diarrhea, Rheingans et al (2012) find that in India medication accounted for 75% of the direct medical cost linked a child diarrhea episode. By excluding primary health care, which is justified on the grounds of avoiding moral hazard and prioritizing public resources to prevent catastrophic hospitalisation expenditures; this can give incentives for households to delay seeking health care when hospitalisation is not necessary, which could have perverse effects.

Water-related diseases are not foreseen in the benefit package unless hospitalisation is required. This means that the high Indian burden of water-related will continue to be either carried by private households or at an excessively high price by the health insurance. Both could be avoided by appropriate public investments and incentives to reduce health risks linked to WSS. Second, by opting for a fully-subsidized scheme with no cross- subsidization (although this is now under consideration by extending the program to above poverty line households) RSBY faces the challenge in terms of cost containment and long-term sustainability. In the current set-up, health insurance companies can exert a control on the price of health care services when empanelling hospitals in the scheme and health insurances are themselves selected on the basis of public bidding with capped premiums of Rs. 750. Nevertheless some authors expect the premium to rapidly rise (Dror, 2012) and costs are expected to rise as membership increases and demand for health care is supported.

**Table 2. Selected health insurance programs in middle-income and low income countries**

Country	Scheme	Financed	Began in	Target	Population	Services included
<b>China</b>	New Cooperative Medical Scheme	Flat-rate contribution, subsidised by gov. for the poor	2003	Rural population	96% of targeted population = 832 million by 2011	Inpatient services and defined at county level according to needs of the population. Most counties include outpatient care. Cost-sharing.
<b>Indonesia</b>	Jamkesmas- National Health Insurance for the Poor and near poor	fully subsidised	2005	30-40% poorest of the total population, exact figure not given	76,4 million individuals in 2010	Outpatient and inpatient; drugs are covered if prescribed within rules, no cost-sharing
<b>Philippines</b>	PhilHealth	Slided according to income	2003	informal workers	43,5 million individuals or 90% of targeted population by 2010	Inpatient care with limits on payments by health insurance in private hospitals and free in public hospitals. Special packages for TB, DOTS, Maternal and neonatal care- fixed rate with no balance billing. Outpatient for consultation with general physicians, lab test are sponsored by the insurance.
<b>Mexico</b>	Seguro popular	contribution according to income	2003	informal workers	52,6 million individuals, almost 50% of total population and almost 100% of target population	primary and secondary care for 284 interventions and covers 522 pharmaceutical products. Interventions were chosen on cost-effectiveness basis.
<b>Columbia</b>	Regimen subsidiado	subsidised to purchase insurance amongst private and public insurers	1993	poor households	80% of the population in 2007 or approx. 36,8 million individuals	primary health care and selected high-cost catastrophic services. In addition municipalities offer additional services
<b>Ghana</b>	National Health Insurance scheme	slided contribution with exceptions for informal workers	2005	All	Almost 17 million individuals by end of 2010 or almost 70% of total population	Basic health care services, including outpatient consultation, essential drugs, inpatient care and hospitalisation, maternity care, eye care, dental care and emergency care. Approx. 95% of the diseases in Ghana are covered
<b>Georgia</b>	Medical insurance program for the poor	fully subsidised	2006	poor households	0,75 million individuals by 2009 or 20% of the total population	(a) urgent outpatient and inpatient treatment; (b) planned inpatient services; (c) chemotherapy and radiation therapy; (d) outpatient care and limited diagnostic and lab; (e) child delivery costs (f) a small benefit for outpatient pharmaceuticals

**Source: World Bank reports 2013 (Aguilera et al.; Chakraborty et al.; Liang et al. ; Pigazzini et al. ; Smith et al.)**

The option to avoid escalating health care costs via prevention is particularly relevant for India. Despite the launch of the National Rural Health Mission in 2005, India, like many other low and middle-income countries, is characterized by poor service availability and quality at the primary health care system. Hsiao (2001) in such a context challengingly questions: “does a nation have the capacity to transform [public resources] into effective services for rural and poor population?” Investments in WSS that can reduce the primary health care burden are therefore particularly relevant. In addition, further comparison with other countries reveals to what extent the WSS is an important burden in India.

Table. 3: Safe drinking water and sanitation in selected countries

Country	Population with access to improved	
	Drinking water source	Sanitation facilities
China	89	61
Indonesia	81	52
Philippines	92	72
Mexico	94	83
Columbia	92	77
Ghana	82	13
Georgia	98	95
India	90	32
<i>Source: World Bank development indicators, 2008</i>		

Comparing WSS infrastructure in table 3 shows that India lags behind. Although with 90% of safe drinking water, India reports levels similar to China or the Philippines, the sanitation coverage is strikingly low at 32% in 2008, compared to 61% in China for the same year, or 72% in the Philippines. Looking at the level of infectious diseases and the level of under-five child mortality- which is strongly correlated to the levels of diarrhea mortality for this age group, India stands out by its exceptionally high levels. While in China, only 7,2% of all deaths are attributable to communicable diseases, maternal, prenatal and nutrition it causes 37,2% of all deaths in India in 2008.



## 6 Conclusion

India has launched an ambitious health insurance program for its poor, to enable a better access to health care, without facing the risks of health-related impoverishment. First evaluations of the scheme have shown encouraging results in terms of utilization but mitigated results in terms of financial protection. As emphasized in this paper, India's insurance program is rolled out in high environmental risks, with below average WSS coverage, resulting in a high burden of water-related diseases. Evidence shows that these diseases linked to the access of WSS facilities and the knowledge of hygiene practices, which are highly correlated with poverty. This implies that the targeted population of RSBY carries a heavy burden of water related diseases, which could be avoided by promoting investment in WSS together with RSBY, as a potentially highly effective accompanying measure.

The interest to analyse the synergies and trade-offs of investing in WSS and health insurance can be placed at two levels. Firstly, it is necessary to find strategies that can, beyond protecting the poor from catastrophic health expenditures, reduce their health burden, improve the financial protection of these households and increase their productivity, to contribute to real welfare gains. Secondly, it is necessary to find innovative approaches to ensure the sustainability of health safety nets which are currently being implemented in India by coordinating health insurance with preventive policies.

While the potential for synergies from coordinating a preventive and service supply investment- WSS- with a protective and responsive investment one – health insurance- seems promising; more research is needed to understand how private behavior is influenced when such investments are done in terms of attitudes towards health risks and their health seeking behavior.

A first step to further investigate this question would be to evaluate the effects of poor WSS and improved WSS on insured and uninsured households in their utilization of health care services; the frequency of water-related diseases, their health expenditures and their capacity to work and their income. This would enable to identify synergies or trade-offs of such investments. A second step would need to focus on the evolution of health seeking behavior and hygienic behavior of households when health insurance and WSS interventions are implemented, to deepen the understanding of how private behavior is influenced by external incentives.

## References:

- Abbring, J., Chiappori, P.-A., Zavadil, T., 2008. Better Safe than Sorry? Ex Ante and Ex Post Moral Hazard in Dynamic Insurance Data (No. 08-075/3). Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper.
- Acharya, A., Vellakkal, S., Taylor, F., Masset, E., Satija, A., Burke, M., Ebrahim, S., 2013. The impact of health insurance schemes for the informal sector in low- and middle-income countries. A systematic review (Policy Research Working Paper No. 6324), Policy Research Working Paper Series of the World Bank. The World Bank.
- Aguilera, N., Bonilla-Chacín, M.E., 2013. The Mexican social protection system in health (No. 75008). The World Bank
- Anderson, B. A., Romani, J.R, Wentzel, M., Phillips. H.E., 2010. "Awareness of Water Pollution as a Problem and the Decision to Treat Drinking Water Among Rural African Households with Unclean Drinking Water: South Africa 2005." PSC Research Report No. 10-701. April 2010.
- Arnold, B., Arana, B., Mäusezahl, D., Hubbard, A., Colford, J.M., 2009. Evaluation of a pre-existing, 3-year household water treatment and handwashing intervention in rural Guatemala. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* 38, 1651–1661.
- Banda, K., Sarkar, R., Gopal, S., Govindarajan, J., Harijan, B.B., Jeyakumar, M.B., Mitta, P., Sadanala, M.E., Selwyn, T., Suresh, C.R., Thomas, V.A., Devadason, P., Kumar, R., Selvapandian, D., Kang, G., Balraj, V., 2007. Water handling, sanitation and defecation practices in rural southern India: a knowledge, attitudes and practices study. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 101, 1124–1130.
- Bassani, D.G., Kumar, R., Awasthi, S., Morris, S.K., Paul, V.K., Shet, A., Ram, U., Gaffey, M.F., Black, R.E., Jha, P., 2010. Causes of neonatal and child mortality in India: a nationally representative mortality survey. *Lancet* 376, 1853–1860.
- Bates, L.J., Mukherjee, K., Santerre, R.E., 2010. Medical Insurance Coverage and Health Production Efficiency. *Journal of Risk and Insurance* 77, 211–229.
- Bauhoff, S., Hotchkiss, D.R., Smith, O., 2011. The impact of medical insurance for the poor in Georgia: a regression discontinuity approach. *Health Economics* 20, 1362–1378.
- Bennett, D., 2008. Clean water makes your dirty: water supply and sanitation behaviour in the Philippines.
- Bhandari, L., Berman, P., Ahuja, R., 2010. The Impoverishing Effect of Healthcare Payments in India: New Methodology and Findings. *Economic and Political Weekly*.
- Bonu, S., Kim, H., 2009. Sanitation in India. Progress, Differentials, correlates and challenges. Asia Development Bank, South Asia. Occasional Paper Series 2.
- Chakraborty, S., 2013. Philippines government sponsored health coverage program for poor households (No. 75010). The World Bank.
- Courbage, C., de Coulon, A., 2004. Prevention and Private Health Insurance in the U.K. *The Geneva Papers* 29, 719–727.
- Curtis, V., Cairncross, S., Yonli, R., 2000. Review: Domestic hygiene and diarrhoea – pinpointing the problem. *Tropical Medicine & International Health* 5, 22–32.
- Cutler, D.M., Zeckhauser, R., 2000. The Anatomy of health insurance, in: *Handbook of Health Economics*.
- Das, J., Leino, J., 2011. Evaluating the RSBY: lessons from an experimental information campaign. *Economic and Political Weekly* 156, 85–94.
- Desai, S., 2009. Keeping the “health” in health insurance. *EPW* 18–22.

- Devadasan, N., Manoharan, S., Menon, N., Menon, S., Thekaekara, M., Thekaekara, S., Team, A., 2004. Community Health Insurance: Increasing Access to Hospital Care. *Economic and Political Weekly* 39, 3189–3194.
- Dilip, T.R., 2012. On publicly-financed health insurance schemes. Is the analysis premature? *Economic and Political Weekly* 153, 79–80.
- Dizioli, A., Pinheiro, R.B., 2012. Health insurance as a productive factor.
- Dror, D., Vellakkal, S., 2012. Is RSBY India's platform to implementing universal hospital insurance? *The Indian Journal of Medical Research* 135, 56.
- Ehrlich, I., Becker, G.S., 1972. Market Insurance, Self-Insurance, and Self-Protection. *Journal of Political Economy* 80, 623–648.
- Eisenberg, J.N.S., Scott, J.C., Porco, T., 2007. Integrating Disease Control Strategies: Balancing Water Sanitation and Hygiene Interventions to Reduce Diarrheal Disease Burden. *Am J Public Health* 97, 846–852.
- Ekman, B., 2007. Catastrophic health payments and health insurance: Some counterintuitive evidence from one low-income country. *Health Policy* 83, 304–313.
- Enger, K.S., Nelson, K.L., Rose, J.B., Eisenberg, J.N.S., 2013. The joint effects of efficacy and compliance: A study of household water treatment effectiveness against childhood diarrhea. *Water Research* 47, 1181–1190.
- Esrey, S.A., Potash, J.B., Roberts, L., Shiff, C., 1991. Effects of improved water supply and sanitation on ascariasis, diarrhoea, dracunculiasis, hookworm infection, schistosomiasis, and trachoma. *Bull World Health Organ* 69, 609–621.
- Fewtrell, L., Kaufmann, R.B., Kay, D., Enanoria, W., Haller, L., Colford Jr, J.M., 2005. Water, sanitation, and hygiene interventions to reduce diarrhoea in less developed countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 5, 42–52.
- Fischer Walker, C.L., Lamberti, L., Adair, L., Guerrant, R.L., Lescano, A.G., Martorell, R., Pinkerton, R.C., Black, R.E., 2012. Does Childhood Diarrhea Influence Cognition Beyond the Diarrhea-Stunting Pathway? *PLoS One* 7.
- Forsberg, B., Gwatkin, D., Tomson, G., Allebeck, P., Petzold, M., 2009. Socioeconomic Inequalities in the Prevalence and Management of Childhood Diarrhoea: potential health gains to be achieved. *The Open Infectious Diseases Journal* 3, 44–49.
- Haller, L., Hutton, G., Bartram, J., 2007. Estimating the costs and health benefits of water and sanitation improvements at global level. *Journal of Water and Health* 05, 467–481.
- Hassan, R., Andres, Jimenez, J.C., Montoya, R.C., 2010. The Impact of Subsidized Health Insurance on the Poor in Colombia: Evaluating the Case of Medellín through Endogenous Switching Models and Propensity Score Matching for Medical Care Utilization (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 2193826). Social Science Research Network, Rochester, NY.
- Hsiao, W., 2001. Unmet health needs of two billion- Is community financing a solution? HNP Discussion paper.
- Hughes, G., Lvovsky, K., Delauey, M., 2001. Environmental health in India. Priorities in Andhra Pradesh. World Bank Publications.
- Hunter, P.R., 2009. Household Water Treatment in Developing Countries: Comparing Different Intervention Types Using Meta-Regression. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 43, 8991–8997.
- Hutton, G., Haller, L., Bartram, J., 2007. Global cost-benefit analysis of water supply and sanitation interventions. *Journal of Water and Health* 05, 481–509.
- ILO, 2012. Statistical update on employment in the informal economy.
- ILO, Baeza, C., 2002. Extending social protection in health through community based health organisations. Discussion paper.

- Institute of Health Metrics and Evaluation, 2010. Global burden of diseases, injuries and risk factors study 2010- India.
- International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS), 2007. NHFS-3 Full report- Volume 1.
- James, A. j., Verhagen, J., Van Wijk, C., Nanavaty, R., Parikh, M., Bhatt, M., 2002. Transforming time into money using water: A participatory study of economics and gender in rural India. *Natural Resources Forum* 26, 205–217.
- Jha, N., 2010. Access of the poor to water supply and sanitation in India: salient concepts, issues and cases. *International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth, Working Paper* 62, 1–40.
- Jowett, M., Deolalikar, A., Martinsson, P., 2004. Health insurance and treatment seeking behaviour: evidence from a low-income country. *Health Economics* 13, 845–857.
- Jütting, J.P., 2001. The impact of health insurance on the access to health care and financial protection in rural developing countries. The example of Senegal. *HNP Discussion paper*.
- Jütting, J.P., 2004. Do Community-based Health Insurance Schemes Improve Poor People's Access to Health Care? Evidence From Rural Senegal. *World Development* 32, 273–288.
- Klick, J., Stratmann, T., 2007. Diabetes Treatments and Moral Hazard. *Journal of Law and Economics* 50, 519–538.
- Kraft, A.D., Quimbo, S.A., Solon, O., Shimkhada, R., Florentino, J., Peabody, J.W., 2009. The Health and Cost Impact of Care Delay and the Experimental Impact of Insurance on Delays: Evidence from a Developing Country. *J Pediatr* 155, 281–5.
- Lei, X., Lin, W., 2009. The New Cooperative Medical Scheme in rural China: does more coverage mean more service and better health? *Health Economics* 18, S25–S46.
- Liang, L., Langenbrunner, J.C., 2013. The long march to universal coverage : lessons from China (No. 74960). *The World Bank*
- Liu, D., Tsegai, D., 2011. The New Cooperative Medical Scheme (NCMS) and its implications for access to health care and medical expenditure: evidence from rural China. (Discussion papers No. 155), ZEF- DP on development policies.
- Luby, S.P., Agboatwalla, M., Painter, J., Altaf, A., Billhimer, W., Keswick, B., Hoekstra, R.M., 2006. Combining drinking water treatment and hand washing for diarrhoea prevention, a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Tropical Medicine & International Health* 11, 479–489.
- Mahal, A., Debroy, B., Bhandari, L., 2011. *India Health Report 2010*.
- Marmot, M., 2005. Social determinants of health inequalities. *The Lancet* 365, 1099–1104.
- Mensah, J., Oppong, J.R., Schmidt, C.M., 2010. Ghana's national health insurance scheme in the context of the health MDGs: an empirical evaluation using propensity score matching. *Health Economics* 19, 95–106.
- Ministry of Finance, Gol, 2012. Key features of budget 2012-2013.
- Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, G., 2000. *National Family and Health Survey-2 (1998-99)*. IIPS.
- Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, G., 2007. *National Family Health Survey-3 (2005-2006)*. IIPS.
- National Commission on Macroeconomics and Health, Gol, 2005. *Financing and delivery of health care services in India*.
- Newhouse, J.P., Group, R.C.I.E., 1993. *Free for all?: lessons from the Rand Health Insurance Experiment*. Harvard University Press.
- Niehaus, M.D., Moore, S.R., Patrick, P.D., Derr, L.L., Lorntz, B., Lima, A.A., Guerrant, R.L., 2002. Early childhood diarrhea is associated with diminished cognitive function 4 to 7 years later in children in a northeast Brazilian shantytown. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.* 66, 590–593.
- Obermann, K., Jowett, M.R., Alcantara, M.O.O., Banzon, E.P., Bodart, C., 2006. Social health insurance in a developing country: The case of the Philippines. *Social Science & Medicine* 62, 3177–3185.
- Office of Registrar General, Gol, 2004. *Summary Report on causes of deaths: 2001-2003 in India*.

- Office of the registrar General and Census Commissioner, G., 2012. 2011 Census Data.
- Office of the registrar general, Gol, 2012. Report on medical certification of cause of death 2008.
- Overbey, L., 2008. The health benefits of water supply and sanitation projects: a review of World Bank lending portfolio (Working Paper No. 2008/1), IEG Working Paper.
- Patel, V., Kumar, A.K.S., Paul, V.K., Rao, K.D., Reddy, K.S., 2011. Universal health care in India: the time is right. *The Lancet* 377, 448–449.
- Pattanayak, S., Poulos, C., Wendland, K., Patil, S., Yang, J.-C., Kwok, R., McLaughlin, C.G., 2007. Informing the water and sanitation sector policy: case study of an impact evaluation study of water supply, sanitation and hygiene interventions in rural Maharashtra, India (Working Paper RTI No. 06).
- Pattanayak, S.K., Poulos, C., Yang, J.-C., Patil, S., 2010. How valuable are environmental health interventions? Evaluation of water and sanitation programmes in India. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 88, 535–542.
- Pigazzini, A., Harimurti, P., Pambudi, E., Tandon, A., 2013. The nuts and bolts of Jamkesmas - Indonesia's government-financed health coverage program for the poor and near-poor (No. 74996). The World Bank.
- Planning Commission, Gol, 2011. Faster, sustainable and more inclusive growth: an approach to the twelfth five year plan.
- Platteau, J.-P., Ugarte Ontiveros, D., 2013. Understanding and information failures: lessons from a health microinsurance program in India (Working Paper No. WP 1301), Department of Economics Working Paper Series. University of Namur.
- Prüss, A., Kay, D., Fewtrell, L., Bartram, J., 2002. Estimating the Burden of Disease from Water, Sanitation and Hygiene at a Global level. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 110, 537–543.
- Prüss-Üstün, A., Bos, R., Gore, F., Batram, J., 2008. Safer water, better health. Costs, benefits and sustainability of interventions to protect and promote health. WHO, Geneva.
- Public Health Foundation of India (PHFI), 2011. A critical assessment of the existing health insurance models in India.
- Rheingans, R., Kukla, M., Adegbola, R.A., Saha, D., Omore, R., Breiman, R.F., Sow, S.O., Onwuchekwa, U., Nasrin, D., Farag, T.H., Kotloff, K.L., Levine, M.M., 2012a. Exploring Household Economic Impacts of Childhood Diarrheal Illnesses in 3 African Settings. *Clin Infect Dis* 55, S317–S326.
- Rheingans, R., Kukla, M., Faruque, A.S.G., Sur, D., Zaidi, A.K.M., Nasrin, D., Farag, T.H., Levine, M.M., Kotloff, K.L., 2012b. Determinants of Household Costs Associated With Childhood Diarrhea in 3 South Asian Settings. *Clin Infect Dis* 55, S327–S335.
- Robyn, P.J., Hill, A., Liu, Y., Souares, A., Savadogo, G., Sie, A., Sauerborn, R., 2012. Econometric analysis to evaluate the effect of community-based health insurance on reducing informal self-care in Burkina Faso. *Health Policy Plan* 27, 156–165.
- RSBY <http://www.rsby.gov.in/>
- Ruger, J.P., Kim, H.-J., 2006. Global health inequalities: an international comparison. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 60, 928–936.
- Selvaraj, S., Karan, A., 2012. Why publicly -financed health insurance schemes are ineffective in providing financial risk protection. *Economic and Political Weekly* 152, 60–69.
- Sepehri, A., Sarma, S., Simpson, W., 2006. Does non-profit health insurance reduce financial burden? Evidence from the Vietnam living standards survey panel. *Health Economics* 15, 603–616.
- Sijbesma, C., 2008. Sanitation and hygiene in South Asia: Progress and challenges. *Waterlines* 27, 184–204.
- Smith, O., 2013. Georgia's medical insurance program for the poor (No. 74998). The World Bank.

- Subramanian, S.V., Ackerson, L., Subramanyam, M., Sivaramakrishnan, K., 2008. Health inequalities in India: the axes of stratification. *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 14, 127–139.
- Sugden, M.W.J. and S., 2006. Rethinking Sanitation: Lessons and Innovation for Sustainability and Success in the New Millennium (Human Development Occasional Papers (1992-2007) No. HDOCPA-2006-27). Human Development Report Office (HDRO), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).
- Trujillo, A.J., Ortiz, A.I.V., Gómez, F.R., Steinhardt, L.C., 2010. Health Insurance Doesn't Seem To Discourage Prevention Among Diabetes Patients In Colombia. *Health Aff* 29, 2180–2188.
- Trujillo, A.J., Portillo, J.E., Vernon, J.A., 2005. The Impact of Subsidized Health Insurance for the Poor: Evaluating the Colombian Experience Using Propensity Score Matching. *Int J Health Care Finance Econ* 5, 211–239.
- UNICEF, WHO, 2012. Progress on drinking water and sanitation 2012 update.
- Wagstaff, A., 2007 Social Health Insurance Reexamined (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 956491). (Policy Research Working Paper Series No. 4134). The World Bank.
- Wagstaff, A., Lindelow, M., 2008. Can insurance increase financial risk?: The curious case of health insurance in China. *Journal of Health Economics* 27, 990–1005.
- Wagstaff, A., Lindelow, M., Jun, G., Ling, X., Juncheng, Q., 2009. Extending health insurance to the rural population: An impact evaluation of China's new cooperative medical scheme. *Journal of Health Economics* 28, 1–19.
- Whitehead, M., Dahlgren, G., Evans, T., 2001. Equity and health sector reforms: can low-income countries escape the medical poverty trap? *Lancet* 358, 833–836.
- Whittington, D., Davis, J., Prokopy, L., Komives, K., Thorsten, R., Lukacs, H., Bakalian, A., Wakeman, W., 2009. How well is the demand-driven, community management model for rural water supply systems doing? Evidence from Bolivia, Peru and Ghana. *Water Policy* 11, 696
- WHO, 2008a. Guidelines for drinking-water quality. Third edition.
- WHO, 2008b. World Health Statistics.
- WHO Commission on Social Determinants of Health - final report WHO (2008)
- WSP, ADB, AusAID, UKAID, 2008. The economic impacts of inadequate sanitation in India.
- Yilma, Z., van Kempen, L., de Hoop, T., 2012. A perverse “net” effect? Health insurance and ex-ante moral hazard in Ghana. *Social Science & Medicine* 75, 138–147.

## Annex

**Table 1. RSBY coverage rates of BPL population per state in 2012:**

State or UT	Year of implementation start (for at least 3 districts)	% of districts covered	% of BPL population covered
Andhra Pradesh*	2007	100%	28,5%
Arunachal Pradesh	2011	63%	43,9%
Assam	2010	19%	41,3%
Bihar	2011	100%	49,6%
Chandigarh (UT)	2011	100%	50,8%
Chhattisgarh	2009	100%	67,6%
Delhi	2008 <sup>10</sup>	11%	9,7%
Goa	N.A.	0%	0,0%
Gujarat	2009	100%	49,7%
Haryana	2009	100%	42,5%
Himachal Pradesh	2010	100%	79,5%
Jammu and Kashmir	2011	13%	53,8%
Jharkhand	2010	100%	52,9%
Karnataka	2010	100%	45,8%
Kerala	2009	100%	67,0%
Madhya Pradesh	N.A.	0%	0,0%
Maharashtra	2009	91%	46,5%
Manipur	2011	44%	60,4%
Meghalaya	2010	71%	44,3%
Mizoram	2010	100%	62,4%
Nagaland	2009	100%	77,1%
Orissa	2010	100%	62,9%
Puducherry (UT)	2012	25%	62,6%
Punjab	2009	100%	45,8%
Rajasthan	2011	21%	53,7%
Sikkim	N.A.	0%	0,0%
Tamil Nadu *	2010	100%	67,2%
Tripura	2010	100%	71,3%
Uttar Pradesh	2009	100%	31,4%
Uttarakhand	2010	100%	55,3%
West Bengal	2009	100%	64,9%
<b>Total</b>		<b>77%</b>	<b>50,2%</b>

Source: Own compilation based on data from RSBY website<sup>11</sup>, Aarogyasri website for Andhra Pradesh (last consulted on 15.10.2012) and Tamil Nadu Kalaigarn Insurance Scheme. \* Both states are not covered by RSBY but their respective state health insurance.

<sup>10</sup> The scheme has not been extended or renewed since then.

<sup>11</sup> RSBY: <http://www.rsby.gov.in/overview.aspx> last consulted on 15.10.2012 ,  
[https://www.aarogyasri.org/ASRI/FrontServlet?requestType=CommonRH&actionVal=RightFrame&page=%3CB%3EDR\\_RWP%3C/B%3E&pageName=DR\\_RWP&mainMenu=Documents-and-Reports&subMenu=Reports-and-Working-Papers#](https://www.aarogyasri.org/ASRI/FrontServlet?requestType=CommonRH&actionVal=RightFrame&page=%3CB%3EDR_RWP%3C/B%3E&pageName=DR_RWP&mainMenu=Documents-and-Reports&subMenu=Reports-and-Working-Papers#) last consulted on 15.10 2012

1. Evers, Hans-Dieter and Solvay Gerke (2005). Closing the Digital Divide: Southeast Asia's Path Towards a Knowledge Society.
2. Bhuiyan, Shajahan and Hans-Dieter Evers (2005). Social Capital and Sustainable Development: Theories and Concepts.
3. Schetter, Conrad (2005). Ethnicity and the Political Reconstruction of Afghanistan.
4. Kassahun, Samson (2005). Social Capital and Community Efficacy. In Poor Localities of Addis Ababa Ethiopia.
5. Fuest, Veronika (2005). Policies, Practices and Outcomes of Demand-oriented Community Water Supply in Ghana: The National Community Water and Sanitation Programme 1994 – 2004.
6. Menkhoff, Thomas and Hans-Dieter Evers (2005). Strategic Groups in a Knowledge Society: Knowledge Elites as Drivers of Biotechnology Development in Singapore.
7. Mollinga, Peter P. (2005). The Water Resources Policy Process in India: Centralisation, Polarisation and New Demands on Governance.
8. Evers, Hans-Dieter (2005). Wissen ist Macht: Experten als Strategische Gruppe.
- 8.a Evers, Hans-Dieter and Solvay Gerke (2005). Knowledge is Power: Experts as Strategic Group.
9. Fuest, Veronika (2005). Partnerschaft, Patronage oder Paternalismus? Eine empirische Analyse der Praxis universitärer Forschungskooperation mit Entwicklungsländern.
10. Laube, Wolfram (2005). Promise and Perils of Water Reform: Perspectives from Northern Ghana.
11. Mollinga, Peter P. (2004). Sleeping with the Enemy: Dichotomies and Polarisation in Indian Policy Debates on the Environmental and Social Effects of Irrigation.
12. Wall, Caleb (2006). Knowledge for Development: Local and External Knowledge in Development Research.
13. Laube, Wolfram and Eva Youkhana (2006). Cultural, Socio-Economic and Political Con-straints for Virtual Water Trade: Perspectives from the Volta Basin, West Africa.
14. Hornidge, Anna-Katharina (2006). Singapore: The Knowledge-Hub in the Straits of Malacca.
15. Evers, Hans-Dieter and Caleb Wall (2006). Knowledge Loss: Managing Local Knowledge in Rural Uzbekistan.
16. Youkhana, Eva; Lautze, J. and B. Barry (2006). Changing Interfaces in Volta Basin Water Management: Customary, National and Transboundary.
17. Evers, Hans-Dieter and Solvay Gerke (2006). The Strategic Importance of the Straits of Malacca for World Trade and Regional Development.
18. Hornidge, Anna-Katharina (2006). Defining Knowledge in Germany and Singapore: Do the Country-Specific Definitions of Knowledge Converge?
19. Mollinga, Peter M. (2007). Water Policy – Water Politics: Social Engineering and Strategic Action in Water Sector Reform.
20. Evers, Hans-Dieter and Anna-Katharina Hornidge (2007). Knowledge Hubs Along the Straits of Malacca.
21. Sultana, Nayeem (2007). Trans-National Identities, Modes of Networking and Integration in a Multi-Cultural Society. A Study of Migrant Bangladeshis in Peninsular Malaysia.
22. Yalcin, Resul and Peter M. Mollinga (2007). Institutional Transformation in Uzbekistan's Agricultural and Water Resources Administration: The Creation of a New Bureaucracy.
23. Menkhoff, T.; Loh, P. H. M.; Chua, S. B.; Evers, H.-D. and Chay Yue Wah (2007). Riau Vegetables for Singapore Consumers: A Collaborative Knowledge-Transfer Project Across the Straits of Malacca.
24. Evers, Hans-Dieter and Solvay Gerke (2007). Social and Cultural Dimensions of Market Expansion.



25. Obeng, G. Y.; Evers, H.-D.; Akuffo, F. O., Braimah, I. and A. Brew-Hammond (2007). Solar PV Rural Electrification and Energy-Poverty Assessment in Ghana: A Principal Component Analysis.
26. Eguavoen, Irit; E. Youkhana (2008). Small Towns Face Big Challenge. The Management of Piped Systems after the Water Sector Reform in Ghana.
27. Evers, Hans-Dieter (2008). Knowledge Hubs and Knowledge Clusters: Designing a Knowledge Architecture for Development
28. Ampomah, Ben Y.; Adjei, B. and E. Youkhana (2008). The Transboundary Water Resources Management Regime of the Volta Basin.
29. Saravanan.V.S.; McDonald, Geoffrey T. and Peter P. Mollinga (2008). Critical Review of Integrated Water Resources Management: Moving Beyond Polarised Discourse.
30. Laube, Wolfram; Awo, Martha and Benjamin Schraven (2008). Erratic Rains and Erratic Markets: Environmental change, economic globalisation and the expansion of shallow groundwater irrigation in West Africa.
31. Mollinga, Peter P. (2008). For a Political Sociology of Water Resources Management.
32. Hauck, Jennifer; Youkhana, Eva (2008). Histories of water and fisheries management in Northern Ghana.
33. Mollinga, Peter P. (2008). The Rational Organisation of Dissent. Boundary concepts, boundary objects and boundary settings in the interdisciplinary study of natural resources management.
34. Evers, Hans-Dieter; Gerke, Solvay (2009). Strategic Group Analysis.
35. Evers, Hans-Dieter; Benedikter, Simon (2009). Strategic Group Formation in the Mekong Delta - The Development of a Modern Hydraulic Society.
36. Obeng, George Yaw; Evers, Hans-Dieter (2009). Solar PV Rural Electrification and Energy-Poverty: A Review and Conceptual Framework With Reference to Ghana.
37. Scholtes, Fabian (2009). Analysing and explaining power in a capability perspective.
38. Eguavoen, Irit (2009). The Acquisition of Water Storage Facilities in the Abay River Basin, Ethiopia.
39. Hornidge, Anna-Katharina; Mehmood Ul Hassan; Mollinga, Peter P. (2009). 'Follow the Innovation' – A joint experimentation and learning approach to transdisciplinary innovation research.
40. Scholtes, Fabian (2009). How does moral knowledge matter in development practice, and how can it be researched?
41. Laube, Wolfram (2009). Creative Bureaucracy: Balancing power in irrigation administration in northern Ghana.
42. Laube, Wolfram (2009). Changing the Course of History? Implementing water reforms in Ghana and South Africa.
43. Scholtes, Fabian (2009). Status quo and prospects of smallholders in the Brazilian sugarcane and ethanol sector: Lessons for development and poverty reduction.
44. Evers, Hans-Dieter; Genschick, Sven; Schraven, Benjamin (2009). Constructing Epistemic Landscapes: Methods of GIS-Based Mapping.
45. Saravanan V.S. (2009). Integration of Policies in Framing Water Management Problem: Analysing Policy Processes using a Bayesian Network.
46. Saravanan V.S. (2009). Dancing to the Tune of Democracy: Agents Negotiating Power to Decentralise Water Management.
47. Huu, Pham Cong; Rhlers, Eckart; Saravanan, V. Subramanian (2009). Dyke System Planing: Theory and Practice in Can Tho City, Vietnam.
48. Evers, Hans-Dieter; Bauer, Tatjana (2009). Emerging Epistemic Landscapes: Knowledge Clusters in Ho Chi Minh City and the Mekong Delta.
49. Reis, Nadine; Mollinga, Peter P. (2009). Microcredit for Rural Water Supply and Sanitation in the Mekong Delta. Policy implementation between the needs for clean water and 'beautiful latrines'.

50. Gerke, Solvay; Ehlert, Judith (2009). Local Knowledge as Strategic Resource: Fishery in the Seasonal Floodplains of the Mekong Delta, Vietnam
51. Schraven, Benjamin; Eguavoen, Irit; Manske, Günther (2009). Doctoral degrees for capacity development: Results from a survey among African BiGS-DR alumni.
52. Nguyen, Loan (2010). Legal Framework of the Water Sector in Vietnam.
53. Nguyen, Loan (2010). Problems of Law Enforcement in Vietnam. The Case of Wastewater Management in Can Tho City.
54. Oberkircher, Lisa et al. (2010). Rethinking Water Management in Khorezm, Uzbekistan. Concepts and Recommendations.
55. Waibel, Gabi (2010). State Management in Transition: Understanding Water Resources Management in Vietnam.
56. Saravanan V.S.; Mollinga, Peter P. (2010). Water Pollution and Human Health. Transdisciplinary Research on Risk Governance in a Complex Society.
57. Vormoor, Klaus (2010). Water Engineering, Agricultural Development and Socio-Economic Trends in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam.
58. Hornidge, Anna-Katharina; Kurfürst, Sandra (2010). Envisioning the Future, Conceptualising Public Space. Hanoi and Singapore Negotiating Spaces for Negotiation.
59. Mollinga, Peter P. (2010). Transdisciplinary Method for Water Pollution and Human Health Research.
60. Youkhana, Eva (2010). Gender and the development of handicraft production in rural Yucatán/Mexico.
61. Naz, Farhat; Saravanan V. Subramanian (2010). Water Management across Space and Time in India.
62. Evers, Hans-Dieter; Nordin, Ramli, Nienkemoer, Pamela (2010). Knowledge Cluster Formation in Peninsular Malaysia: The Emergence of an Epistemic Landscape.
63. Mehmood Ul Hassan; Hornidge, Anna-Katharina (2010). 'Follow the Innovation' – The second year of a joint experimentation and learning approach to transdisciplinary research in Uzbekistan.
64. Mollinga, Peter P. (2010). Boundary concepts for interdisciplinary analysis of irrigation water management in South Asia.
65. Noelle-Karimi, Christine (2006). Village Institutions in the Perception of National and International Actors in Afghanistan. **(Amu Darya Project Working Paper No. 1)**
66. Kuzmits, Bernd (2006). Cross-bordering Water Management in Central Asia. **(Amu Darya Project Working Paper No. 2)**
67. Schetter, Conrad; Glassner, Rainer; Karokhail, Masood (2006). Understanding Local Violence. Security Arrangements in Kandahar, Kunduz and Paktia. **(Amu Darya Project Working Paper No. 3)**
68. Shah, Usman (2007). Livelihoods in the Asqalan and Sufi-Qarayateem Canal Irrigation Systems in the Kunduz River Basin. **(Amu Darya Project Working Paper No. 4)**
69. ter Steege, Bernie (2007). Infrastructure and Water Distribution in the Asqalan and Sufi-Qarayateem Canal Irrigation Systems in the Kunduz River Basin. **(Amu Darya Project Working Paper No. 5)**
70. Mielke, Katja (2007). On The Concept of 'Village' in Northeastern Afghanistan. Explorations from Kunduz Province. **(Amu Darya Project Working Paper No. 6)**
71. Mielke, Katja; Glassner, Rainer; Schetter, Conrad; Yarash, Nasratullah (2007). Local Governance in Warsaj and Farkhar Districts. **(Amu Darya Project Working Paper No. 7)**
72. Meininghaus, Esther (2007). Legal Pluralism in Afghanistan. **(Amu Darya Project Working Paper No. 8)**
73. Yarash, Nasratullah; Smith, Paul; Mielke, Katja (2010). The fuel economy of mountain villages in Ishkamish and Burka (Northeast Afghanistan). Rural subsistence and urban marketing patterns. **(Amu Darya Project Working Paper No. 9)**
74. Oberkircher, Lisa (2011). 'Stay – We Will Serve You Plov!'. Puzzles and pitfalls of water research in rural Uzbekistan.

75. Shtaltovna, Anastasiya; Hornidge, Anna-Katharina; Mollinga, Peter P. (2011). The Reinvention of Agricultural Service Organisations in Uzbekistan – a Machine-Tractor Park in the Khorezm Region.
76. Stellmacher, Till; Grote, Ulrike (2011). Forest Coffee Certification in Ethiopia: Economic Boon or Ecological Bane?
77. Gatzweiler, Franz W.; Baumüller, Heike; Ladenburger, Christine; von Braun, Joachim (2011). Marginality. Addressing the roots causes of extreme poverty.
78. Mielke, Katja; Schetter, Conrad; Wilde, Andreas (2011). Dimensions of Social Order: Empirical Fact, Analytical Framework and Boundary Concept.
79. Yarash, Nasratullah; Mielke, Katja (2011). The Social Order of the Bazaar: Socio-economic embedding of Retail and Trade in Kunduz and Imam Sahib
80. Baumüller, Heike; Ladenburger, Christine; von Braun, Joachim (2011). Innovative business approaches for the reduction of extreme poverty and marginality?
81. Ziai, Aram (2011). Some reflections on the concept of 'development'.
82. Saravanan V.S., Mollinga, Peter P. (2011). The Environment and Human Health - An Agenda for Research.
83. Eguavoen, Irit; Tesfai, Weyni (2011). Rebuilding livelihoods after dam-induced relocation in Koga, Blue Nile basin, Ethiopia.
84. Eguavoen, I., Sisay Demeku Derib et al. (2011). Digging, damming or diverting? Small-scale irrigation in the Blue Nile basin, Ethiopia.
85. Genschick, Sven (2011). Pangasius at risk - Governance in farming and processing, and the role of different capital.
86. Quy-Hanh Nguyen, Hans-Dieter Evers (2011). Farmers as knowledge brokers: Analysing three cases from Vietnam's Mekong Delta.
87. Poos, Wolf Henrik (2011). The local governance of social security in rural Surkhondarya, Uzbekistan. Post-Soviet community, state and social order.
88. Graw, Valerie; Ladenburger, Christine (2012). Mapping Marginality Hotspots. Geographical Targeting for Poverty Reduction.
89. Gerke, Solvay; Evers, Hans-Dieter (2012). Looking East, looking West: Penang as a Knowledge Hub.
90. Turaeva, Rano (2012). Innovation policies in Uzbekistan: Path taken by ZEFa project on innovations in the sphere of agriculture.
91. Gleisberg-Gerber, Katrin (2012). Livelihoods and land management in the Ioba Province in south-western Burkina Faso.
92. Hiemenz, Ulrich (2012). The Politics of the Fight Against Food Price Volatility – Where do we stand and where are we heading?
93. Baumüller, Heike (2012). Facilitating agricultural technology adoption among the poor: The role of service delivery through mobile phones.
94. Akpabio, Emmanuel M.; Saravanan V.S. (2012). Water Supply and Sanitation Practices in Nigeria: Applying Local Ecological Knowledge to Understand Complexity.
95. Evers, Hans-Dieter; Nordin, Ramli (2012). The Symbolic Universe of Cyberjaya, Malaysia.
96. Akpabio, Emmanuel M. (2012). Water Supply and Sanitation Services Sector in Nigeria: The Policy Trend and Practice Constraints.
97. Boboyorov, Hafiz (2012). Masters and Networks of Knowledge Production and Transfer in the Cotton Sector of Southern Tajikistan.
98. Van Assche, Kristof; Hornidge, Anna-Katharina (2012). Knowledge in rural transitions - formal and informal underpinnings of land governance in Khorezm.
99. Eguavoen, Irit (2012). Blessing and destruction. Climate change and trajectories of blame in Northern Ghana.

100. Callo-Concha, Daniel; Gaiser, Thomas and Ewert, Frank (2012). Farming and cropping systems in the West African Sudanian Savanna. WASCAL research area: Northern Ghana, Southwest Burkina Faso and Northern Benin.
101. Sow, Papa (2012). Uncertainties and conflicting environmental adaptation strategies in the region of the Pink Lake, Senegal.
102. Tan, Siwei (2012). Reconsidering the Vietnamese development vision of “industrialisation and modernisation by 2020”.
103. Ziai, Aram (2012). Postcolonial perspectives on ‘development’.
104. Kelboro, Girma; Stellmacher, Till (2012). Contesting the National Park theorem? Governance and land use in Nech Sar National Park, Ethiopia.
105. Kotsila, Panagiota (2012). “Health is gold”: Institutional structures and the realities of health access in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam.
106. Mandler, Andreas (2013). Knowledge and Governance Arrangements in Agricultural Production: Negotiating Access to Arable Land in Zarafshan Valley, Tajikistan.
107. Tsegai, Daniel; McBain, Florence; Tischbein, Bernhard (2013). Water, sanitation and hygiene: the missing link with agriculture.
108. Pangaribowo, Evita Hanie; Gerber, Nicolas; Torero, Maximo (2013). Food and Nutrition Security Indicators: A Review.
109. von Braun, Joachim; Gerber, Nicolas; Mirzabaev, Alisher; Nkonya Ephraim (2013). The Economics of Land Degradation.
110. Stellmacher, Till (2013). Local forest governance in Ethiopia: Between legal pluralism and livelihood realities.
111. Evers, Hans-Dieter; Purwaningrum, Farah (2013). Japanese Automobile Conglomerates in Indonesia: Knowledge Transfer within an Industrial Cluster in the Jakarta Metropolitan Area.
112. Waibel, Gabi; Benedikter, Simon (2013). The formation water user groups in a nexus of central directives and local administration in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam.
113. Ayaribilla Akudugu, Jonas; Laube, Wolfram (2013). Implementing Local Economic Development in Ghana: Multiple Actors and Rationalities.
114. Malek, Mohammad Abdul; Hossain, Md. Amzad; Saha, Ratnajit; Gatzweiler, Franz W. (2013). Mapping marginality hotspots and agricultural potentials in Bangladesh.
115. Siriwardane, Rapti; Winands, Sarah (2013). Between hope and hype: Traditional knowledge(s) held by marginal communities.
116. Nguyen, Thi Phuong Loan (2013). The Legal Framework of Vietnam’s Water Sector: Update 2013.
117. Shtaltovna, Anastasiya (2013). Knowledge gaps and rural development in Tajikistan. Agricultural advisory services as a panacea?
118. Van Assche, Kristof; Hornidge, Anna-Katharina; Shtaltovna, Anastasiya; Boboyorov, Hafiz (2013). Epistemic cultures, knowledge cultures and the transition of agricultural expertise. Rural development in Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and Georgia.
119. Schädler, Manuel; Gatzweiler, Franz W. (2013). Institutional Environments for Enabling Agricultural Technology Innovations: The role of Land Rights in Ethiopia, Ghana, India and Bangladesh.
120. Eguavoen, Irit; Schulz, Karsten; de Wit, Sara; Weisser, Florian; Müller-Mahn, Detlef (2013). Political dimensions of climate change adaptation. Conceptual reflections and African examples.
121. Feuer, Hart Nadav; Hornidge, Anna-Katharina; Schetter, Conrad (2013). Rebuilding Knowledge. Opportunities and risks for higher education in post-conflict regions.
122. Dörendahl, Esther I. (2013). Boundary work and water resources. Towards improved management and research practice?
123. Baumüller, Heike (2013). Mobile Technology Trends and their Potential for Agricultural Development

- 124.** Saravanan, V.S. (2013). "Blame it on the community, immunize the state and the international agencies." An assessment of water supply and sanitation programs in India.
- 125.** Ariff, Syamimi; Evers, Hans-Dieter; Ndah, Anthony Banyouko; Purwaningrum, Farah (2014). Governing Knowledge for Development: Knowledge Clusters in Brunei Darussalam and Malaysia.
- 126.** Bao, Chao; Jia, Lili (2014). Residential fresh water demand in China. A panel data analysis.
- 127.** Siriwardane, Rapti (2014). War, Migration and Modernity: The Micro-politics of the Hijab in Northeastern Sri Lanka.
- 128.** Kirui, Oliver Kiptoo; Mirzabaev, Alisher (2014). Economics of Land Degradation in Eastern Africa.
- 129.** Evers, Hans-Dieter (2014). Governing Maritime Space: The South China Sea as a Mediterranean Cultural Area.
- 130.** Saravanan, V. S.; Mavalankar, D.; Kulkarni, S.; Nussbaum, S.; Weigelt, M. (2014). Metabolized-water breeding diseases in urban India: Socio-spatiality of water problems and health burden in Ahmedabad.
- 131.** Zulfiqar, Ali; Mujeri, Mustafa K.; Badrun Nessa, Ahmed (2014). Extreme Poverty and Marginality in Bangladesh: Review of Extreme Poverty Focused Innovative Programmes.
- 132.** Schwachula, Anna; Vila Seoane, Maximiliano; Hornidge, Anna-Katharina (2014). Science, technology and innovation in the context of development. An overview of concepts and corresponding policies recommended by international organizations.
- 133.** Callo-Concha, Daniel (2014). Approaches to managing disturbance and change: Resilience, vulnerability and adaptability.
- 134.** Mc Bain, Florence (2014). Health insurance and health environment: India's subsidized health insurance in a context of limited water and sanitation services.

<http://www.zef.de/workingpapers.html>

## ZEF Development Studies

edited by  
Solvay Gerke and Hans-Dieter Evers

Center for Development Research (ZEF),  
University of Bonn

Shahjahan H. Bhuiyan  
*Benefits of Social Capital. Urban Solid Waste Management in Bangladesh*  
Vol. 1, 2005, 288 p., 19.90 EUR, br. ISBN 3-8258-8382-5

Veronika Fuest  
*Demand-oriented Community Water Supply in Ghana. Policies, Practices and Outcomes*  
Vol. 2, 2006, 160 p., 19.90 EUR, br. ISBN 3-8258-9669-2

Anna-Katharina Hornidge  
*Knowledge Society. Vision and Social Construction of Reality in Germany and Singapore*  
Vol. 3, 2007, 200 p., 19.90 EUR, br. ISBN 978-3-8258-0701-6

Wolfram Laube  
*Changing Natural Resource Regimes in Northern Ghana. Actors, Structures and Institutions*  
Vol. 4, 2007, 392 p., 34.90 EUR, br. ISBN 978-3-8258-0641-5

Lirong Liu  
*Wirtschaftliche Freiheit und Wachstum. Eine international vergleichende Studie*  
Vol. 5, 2007, 200 p., 19.90 EUR, br. ISBN 978-3-8258-0701-6

Phuc Xuan To  
*Forest Property in the Vietnamese Uplands. An Ethnography of Forest Relations in Three Dao Villages*  
Vol. 6, 2007, 296 p., 29.90 EUR, br. ISBN 978-3-8258-0773-3

Caleb R.L. Wall, Peter P. Mollinga (Eds.)  
*Fieldwork in Difficult Environments. Methodology as Boundary Work in Development Research*  
Vol. 7, 2008, 192 p., 19.90 EUR, br. ISBN 978-3-8258-1383-3

Solvay Gerke, Hans-Dieter Evers, Anna-K. Hornidge (Eds.)  
*The Straits of Malacca. Knowledge and Diversity*  
Vol. 8, 2008, 240 p., 29.90 EUR, br. ISBN 978-3-8258-1383-3

Caleb Wall  
*Argorods of Western Uzbekistan. Knowledge Control and Agriculture in Khorezm*  
Vol. 9, 2008, 384 p., 29.90 EUR, br. ISBN 978-3-8258-1426-7

Irit Eguavoen  
*The Political Ecology of Household Water in Northern Ghana*  
Vol. 10, 2008, 328 p., 34.90 EUR, br. ISBN 978-3-8258-1613-1

Charlotte van der Schaaf  
*Institutional Change and Irrigation Management in Burkina Faso. Flowing Structures and Concrete Struggles*  
Vol. 11, 2009, 344 p., 34.90 EUR, br. ISBN 978-3-8258-1624-7

Nayeem Sultana  
*The Bangladeshi Diaspora in Peninsular Malaysia. Organizational Structure, Survival Strategies and Networks*  
Vol. 12, 2009, 368 p., 34.90 EUR, br. ISBN 978-3-8258-1629-2

Peter P. Mollinga, Anjali Bhat, Saravanan V.S. (Eds.)  
*When Policy Meets Reality. Political Dynamics and the Practice of Integration in Water Resources Management Reform*  
Vol. 13, 2010, 216 p., 29.90 EUR, br., ISBN 978-3-643-10672-8

Irit Eguavoen, Wolfram Laube (Eds.)  
*Negotiating Local Governance. Natural Resources Management at the Interface of Communities and the State*  
Vol. 14, 2010, 248 p., 29.90 EUR, br., ISBN 978-3-643-10673-5

William Tsuma  
*Gold Mining in Ghana. Actors, Alliances and Power*  
Vol. 15, 2010, 256 p., 29.90 EUR, br., ISBN 978-3-643-10811-1

Thim Ly  
*Planning the Lower Mekong Basin: Social Intervention in the Se San River*  
Vol. 16, 2010, 240 p., 29.90 EUR, br., ISBN 978-3-643-10834-0

Tatjana Bauer  
*The Challenge of Knowledge Sharing - Practices of the Vietnamese Science Community in Ho Chi Minh City and the Mekong Delta*  
Vol. 17, 2011, 304 p., 29.90 EUR, br., ISBN 978-3-643-90121-7

Pham Cong Huu  
*Floods and Farmers - Politics, Economics and Environmental Impacts of Dyke Construction in the Mekong Delta / Vietnam*  
Vol. 18, 2012, 200 p., 29.90 EUR, br., ISBN 978-3-643-90167-5

Judith Ehlert  
*Beautiful Floods - Environmental Knowledge and Agrarian Change in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam*  
Vol. 19, 2012, 256 S., 29,90 EUR, br., ISBN 978-3-643-90195-8

Nadine Reis  
*Tracing and Making the State - Policy practices and domestic water supply in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam*  
Vol. 20, 2012, 272 S., 29.90 EUR, br., ISBN 978-3-643-90196-5

Martha A. Awo  
*Marketing and Market Queens - A study of tomato farmers in the Upper East region of Ghana*  
Vol. 21, 2012, 192 S., 29.90 EUR, br., ISBN 978-3-643-90234-4

Asghar Tahmasebi  
*Pastoral Vulnerability to Socio-political and Climate Stresses - The Shahsevan of North Iran*  
Vol. 22, 2013, 192 S., 29.90 EUR, br., ISBN 978-3-643-90357-0

Anastasiya Shtaltovna  
*Servicing Transformation - Agricultural Service Organisations and Agrarian Change in Post-Soviet Uzbekistan*  
Vol. 23, 2013, 216 S., 29.90 EUR, br., ISBN 978-3-643-90358-7

Hafiz Boboyorov  
*Collective Identities and Patronage Networks in Southern Tajikistan*  
Vol. 24, 2013, 304 S., 34.90 EUR, br., ISBN 978-3-643-90382-2

Simon Benedikter  
*The Vietnamese Hydrocracy and the Mekong Delta. Water Resources Development from State Socialism to Bureaucratic Capitalism*  
Vol. 25, 2014, 330 S., 39.90 EUR, br., ISBN 978-3-643-90437-9

Sven Genschick  
*Aqua-`culture`. Socio-cultural peculiarities, practical senses, and missing sustainability in Pangasius aquaculture in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam.*  
Vol. 26, 2014, 262 S., 29.90 EUR, br., ISBN 978-3-643-90485-0

Farah Purwaningrum  
*Knowledge Governance in an Industrial Cluster. The Collaboration between Academia-Industry-Government in Indonesia.*  
Vol. 27, 2014, 296 S., 39.90 EUR, br., ISBN 978-3-643-90508-6



Zentrum für Entwicklungsforschung  
Center for Development Research  
University of Bonn

# Working Paper Series

Author: Florence Mc Bain  
Contact: [fmc bain@uni-bonn.de](mailto:fmc bain@uni-bonn.de)  
Photo: Florence Mc Bain

Published by:  
Zentrum für Entwicklungsforschung (ZEF)  
Center for Development Research  
Walter-Flex-Straße 3  
D – 53113 Bonn  
Germany  
Phone: +49-228-73-1861  
Fax: +49-228-73-1869  
E-Mail: [zef@uni-bonn.de](mailto:zef@uni-bonn.de)  
[www.zef.de](http://www.zef.de)