

DETERMINANTS OF THE HOUSEHOLDS' CHOICE OF DRINKING WATER SOURCE IN CAMEROON

Luc Armand Totouom Fotue

PhD candidate in Environmental Economics, University of Yaoundé II

Fondo Sikod

Lecturer at the faculty of Economics and Management, University of Yaoundé II

ABSTRACT

An important requirement in order to succeed in performing an effective and sustainable water management system is having a sufficient knowledge about households water demand. This study aims at identifying the determinants of the Cameroonian households' choice of drinking water source. The multinomial logistic regression model is used for discrete analysis of source choice. Data needs for empirical analysis are secondary data from a survey conducted in 2007 by the National Institute of Statistics. A cross-section of 11391 households was interviewed. Our findings show that distance to the water source (proxy of time cost) affect households' choice. Thus, the longer the distance to a particular source of drinking water, the lower will be the demand for same. Our study also confirms the fact that households' characteristics such as the household size and the household expenditure (proxy of household welfare) have a strong impact on the choice of drinking water source.

Key words: determinants, choice, water, source, Cameroon

INTRODUCTION

Water is a basic need for human life. It is used daily for many purposes: industry, agriculture and domestic use. According to the World Bank (World Resources, 1996), 69% of the 3240 Km³ of fresh water drawn every year are used by farmers, 23% by industrial sector and 8% for domestic use. Today, the right to water is increasingly recognized universally as a fundamental and inalienable right of the human person. Though essential for human life, access to drinking water (note 1) represents a day to day struggle for hundred's and thousand's citizens who live mainly in developing countries (Herischen, Ruwaida, & Blackburn, 2002 ; Chapitiaux, Houssier, Gross, Bouvier, & Brissaud, 2002 ; UN-Water/WWAP, 2006). In this regard and according to the World Health Organization (WHO), nearly 1.1 billion of individuals (17% of the population world-wide) do not have access to drinking water. Until today, waterborne diseases represent a real public health problem in many countries: 1.8 millions of people (90% are less than 5 years old) die every year due to waterborne diseases like cholera, mainly in the developing countries (WHO, 2005). Furthermore, 21% of infant mortality in the developing countries (DC) is caused by diarrhetic diseases (UN-Water/WWAP, 2006). This will inevitably decline the attainment of sustainable development since health is regarded as the pillar for sustainable development.

The population's access to safe water supply is a real problem in Cameroon. Less than 30% and 40% of the population have access to potable water in urban and rural area respectively (Missions Economiques, 2005). As it is the case in most of the DC, only a small fraction of the population is connected to the pipe network. Besides, connected households face day to day consequences of a deficit in the water supply: water is not supplied round the clock and pressure is insufficient to pump. For many years now, the government has considered population access to safe water supply as a top priority. It is sets to 75% the objective of access to potable water supply in 2020. This is consistent with the Millennium Development Goals which aims at reducing the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water by 50% by 2015. In order to attend such objectives, the government intends to rehabilitate in the upcoming years existing infrastructures made the overwhelming majority over 20 years, to make extensions of existing networks that have not kept pace with urban expansion and demographic, and to promote the implementation of programs of connections large-scale. These actions could not be successful if they are not coupled with a good management of the demand side. Unsuccessful results observed through the world after the first International potable Water and Sanitation decade show the importance of a household water demand analysis. In fact, in spite of the important public investments dedicated to water infrastructures in developing countries during the 1980 decade, it was obvious to observe that people's access to reliable water did not noticeably improve. This is because everybody was focusing on a quantitative objective of increasing households' connection to the public water network, rather than laying the emphasis on the households' water behavior and this situation gives rise to over budgeted infrastructures, far from being appropriate to the needs of the population and inefficiently managed (Breuil, 2004). This reveals the limits of the classical supply driven-approach which is based essentially on the supply side and neglects the demand side. Today, World Bank experts contend, governments need to adopt a "demand-driven approach" in which utilities "deliver services that people want and for which they are willing to pay" (World Bank Water Demand Research Team, 1993). Thus, to ensure that both water systems are sustainable, so that access to safe water is sustained for all, it is necessary to investigate the structure of the demand of users.

The identification of the household's choice of water source is a precondition necessary for the implementation of any effective and sustainable policy aiming at increasing households' access to safe water (Briand, Nauges, & Travers, 2009). It is relevant to stakeholders when making water management decisions. This study therefore investigates the behavior of household water demand in Cameroon. The study identifies specially the determinants of households' choice of drinking water source. To our knowledge, there is no empirical analysis of such household choice for Cameroon. It would be awkward to transpose results obtained in others countries here. The study thus contributes to the existing literature by providing an empirical analysis of household choice of drinking water source in Cameroon. Data needs for empirical analysis are secondary data from the households sample survey conducted in 2007 by National Institute of Statistics. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 1 provides a brief overview of empirically related work. Section 2 presents the background of the study area. Section 3 presents the main methodological issues. Section 4 presents the empirical results. Section 5 concludes.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Access to clean drinking water is one of the most important precondition for sustainable development. The meta-analyses of Esrey et al. (1991) and Fewtrell et al. (2005) suggest that safe drinking water supplies do reduce the incidence of diarrhea. Thus, it is important to understand the factors that affect household choice of water source. Sustainable

management of drinking water requires knowledge of the factors which affect the households' water demand. Economic literature suggests that the choice of water source is commonly influenced by households' socioeconomic and demographic characteristics and by the price of the water. Some empirical studies have been conducted in DC on the choice of water supply. Based on a review of the existing literature in DC on the topic of household water demand, Nauges and Whittington (2010) indicate that existing papers have studied household choice of water source, either as a primary focus (Mu, Whittington, & Briscoe, 1990; Madanat & Humplick, 1993; Hindman, 2002; Briand et al., 2009) or in combination with estimations of conditional water-demand models (Larson, Minten, & Razafindralambo, 2006; Nauges & Strand, 2007; Basani, Isham, & Reilly, 2008; Cheesman, Bennett, & Son, 2008; Nauges & Van Den Berg, 2009). In this second group of studies, a separate estimation of the selection (i.e., source of water) and levels (i.e., water volume) equations is made. It allows for a control of the relationship between households' characteristics and type of access to water sources. The two-step procedure corrects for selectivity bias through inserting a proxy variable (a correction term known as the inverse Mills ratio) to capture the selection effect as proposed by Heckman (1979). Next, we will focus on the first group of studies since they only focus on household choice of water source like the present study.

Mu et al. (1990) use in their model, data collected by in-depth personal interviews with 69 households in Ukunda (Kenya). The estimation of the multinomial logit model suggests that household's decisions are influenced by the time it takes to collect water from different sources, the price of water and the number of women in a household. Household income, however, did not have a statistically significant effect. Madanat and Humplick (1993) extended the work of Mu et al. (1990) in two ways. On the one hand, their study is usage-specific whereas Mu et al. analyzed the choice of water source apart from its use. On the other hand, they jointly analyses households' choice of water sources and connection decisions. Thus, they use two types of models: a binary logit model for household piped water connection decision and several multinomial logit models for the choice of water supply source. The above models are estimated with data coming from a survey made on 588 households' sample of Faisalabad in Pakistan. Next to Pakistan, Asthana (1997) uses a conditional logit model to examine household choice of water supply for households in rural India and finds negative impacts of distance on source choice.

Hindman (2002) conducted a study on household water choice in Philipines. He analyzes the effects of water prices, taste (it is use as a proxy for income) and household size on the probability to choose a specific water supply source. A survey was conducted close to 769 households of Cebu to estimate the discrete-choice model used. The results indicate that the time taken to collect water from different sources (proxy of water price) has a statistically significant effect. Household size only affects demand for connection while taste has ambiguous effects on household choice.

Using data on 301 households of Dakar (Senegal), Briand et al. (2009) estimate a bivariate Probit model to explain household's decision to rely on a private water connection at home or/and to get water from the public standpipe. The bivariate probit model takes in consideration the fact that there is interdependence between household's decision to rely on a private water connection at home or/and to get water from the public standpipe. The findings show that the household head status (being a widow) as well as the quality of the supply service have a significant impact on households' choices. Findings also indicate that the household welfare, the education of household head, time cost,

access to alternatives sources, are strong determinants of household decision to rely on private connection and/or standpipe.

Nketiah-Amponsah, Woedem, & Senadza, (2009) use multinomial logit model to identify socioeconomic determinants of household source of drinking water in Ghana. The study uses data from a survey conducted in three Districts (Lawra, Dangme West and Ejisu-Juaben) in Ghana (A cross-section of 531 households was interviewed using stratified random sampling technique). The results confirm the influence of factors such as income, residence (rural or urban), education level of the head and the distance between the residence and water source on household choices.

Briand and Laré (2010) explain the choice of household connection to the water network of informal small scale operators in peripheral districts of Maputo (Mozambique). They hypothesize that household access to different sources is exogenous since alternative sources are chosen when the small scale operators do not offer any network, in neighborhoods that are neglected in any way by the official operator. Moreover, households are found most often dissatisfied with the supply alternative sources. The estimation of the probit model suggest that the following variables have a significant and positive effect on the demand for small scale operators' networks: education of the household head, household wealth index, proportion of the households in the district who are dissatisfied with the water price, as well as the dummy variables representing the districts of Cumbeza, Albazine, Magoanine B, and Khongolote. Variables having a significant and negative sign are: proportion of the households in the district who are dissatisfied with the water cuts, dummy variables representing the districts of Guava, Nkobe, 1^{er} de Maio, Zimpeto, MatolaGare_Km15_Matèque. The occupation of the household head (farmer=1) and the household occupation status (tenant=1) also have negative and significant signs.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY AREA

Cameroon has more than 100 drinking water urban stations and more than 3000 stations and rural water points (Missions Economiques, 2005). Urban stations are managed by "La Camerounaise des Eaux", while stations and rural water points are managed by users (village communities) under the supervision of the authorities. Out of the above formal actors, thousands of small scale operators are present in the informal water market. Due to the low public network coverage, activities of these informal operators are growing and they play an important role in the provision of households with potable water. The third households sample survey in Cameroon (ECAM3) results put in evidence the diversity of drinking water supply source used by households as illustrated in table 1.

In fact, public utilities serve only a fraction of the urban population; with the vast majority relying on alternate sources (poorest households are especially concerned). Table 1 indicates that among the survey households, only 14.8% use CDE piped water as main drinking water. We observe from the table that many households buy water from the connected neighbors (22.4%). In fact, several studies indicate that in DC, poor households are almost never directly connected to the public utility, rely on vending systems, buy water at very high unit prices, and hence consume very little water. They often pay vendors several times the unit price paid by connected non-poor households to the utility (20 to 30 time more in Jakarta and Lima; 5 to 6 time more in Ouagadougou and Port-au-Prince).

Table 1: Main drinking water supply sources

	Number of households	Percentage of households
Private tap (CDE)	869	7.6
Other private tap	163	1.4
Collective tap (CDE)	818	7.2
Resellers of piped water	2555	22.4
Public water fountain	652	5.7
other collective tap	659	5.8
borehole	954	8.4
Improved dug well	1969	17.3
Unimproved sources (stream, lake, backwater ...)	2663	23.4
Rain water	16	0.1
Mineral water	20	0.2
Others	53	0.5
Total	11391	100

Source : ECAM 3

Connected households in Cameroon generally resell water at a high price (Fcfa 1 per liter) while purchasing it at a very low price to the CDE (Fcfa 293 per cubic meter or Fcfa 364 per cubic meter) (note 2). Up to 23.4% of households use water of unimproved sources (stream, lake, backwater, unprotected dug well...). Consumption of rain and mineral waters is still marginal among the survey households (0.1% and 0.2 % respectively). We also observe from the above table that only a low proportion of survey households rely on public water fountain (5.7 %). Although the construction of free public water fountains was encouraged by international institutions (World Bank for example) in the past in order to cope with the low network coverage, we observed nowadays that they have been progressively deserted, due to a poor maintenance of infrastructures by users. Moreover, they were viewed by authorities as a source of waste of water and that is why those existing today have been leased to private operators.

METHODOLOGY

We use multinomial logit (MNL) model to investigate the decision made by the households for different water sources. This model is applicable because the dependent variable, sources of drinking water has more than two categories with no natural ordering, representing the different options households have in terms of access to drinking water.

The MNL model has proved useful for describing household choice of drinking water and has been used in several studies (Nauges & Strand, 2007; Mu, et al., 1990). The most frequent specifications for source choice models are the probit model and the multinomial logit model (Nauges & Whittington, 2010). The probit model has been used when the household choice being modeled is whether to acquire a private connection or not. Multinomial logit model has been use for describing either the primary source of water chosen by households or the water source that is chosen for a specific use such as drinking, bathing, or cooking. Household choice can be formalized as follows: Suppose the unobserved variable Y^*_{ij} is the i^{th} household's utility if the household i choose source j . If we suppose that each household choose the optimal water source which brings the highest utility level, the observed choice of the household i for source j can be expressed as follows:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} Y_{ij} = 1 \text{ if } Y^*_{ij} > Y^*_{ik}, j \neq k \\ Y_{ij} = 0 \text{ if not} \end{array} \right. \quad (1)$$

$$Y^*_{ij} = Y(X_i\beta_j) + \varepsilon_{ij} \text{ is a linear function} \quad (2)$$

$i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ is household indicator while $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ correspond to supply sources. $J=1$ corresponds to private tap, $j=2$ corresponds to collective tap, $j=3$ corresponds to resellers of piped water, $j=4$ corresponds to public water fountain point and borehole, $j=5$ corresponds to improved dug well, $j=6$ corresponds to unimproved sources (lake, unprotected well, stream ...). For further purposes of the study, we removed from the sample the households relying on the following sources: mineral water, rain water, and other. They only represent 0.8% of the survey households. β is a vector of parameters, ε_{ij} is the error term.

X is the vector of following explanatory variables:

Hsize It is the household size and equal to the number of family members.

Edu This variable is the education level of the household head. It is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the household head is literate and 0 otherwise. The *a priori* expectation is that educated households are more sensitive to the quality of water issues and that is why they are expected to have a high propensity to rely on improved sources. Nauges and Van Den Berg (2009) confirm this *a priori* expectation.

Sex It represents the household head gender. This dummy variable is equal to 1 if household head is female and equal to 0 otherwise. Briand et al. (2009) find that the gender of the household head is a strong determinant of household choice of water source.

Resid represents household residence area. It is also a dummy variable equal to 1 if household lives in urban or semi-urban area and 0 otherwise.

Lexp It is the log of the household per capita average expenditure. This variable is used as a proxy for household welfare. Household expenditure is generally viewed as a better welfare proxy than income in DC (Basani et al., 2008). Expenditure is more stable than income and is a better proxy for *permanent income*.

Dist is the distance existing between the water supply point and the residence. It is used here as a proxy for time cost. It is expected to negatively influence household decisions (Sandiford, Gorter, Orozco, & Pauw, 1990). Data about distance to water source are not available for many households in our database. For this group of households, we consider the average distance of the enumeration group they belong to.

Price is not taken in this study as explanatory variable because households in Cameroon generally have the same price schedule.

Under the assumption that error terms ε_{ij} are independent and identically distributed, the above probability function can be written as follows:

$$P r o b (Y_i = j) = F_{ij} (X_i \beta_j) = \frac{e^{(X_i \beta_j)}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^m e^{(X_i \beta_k)}} \quad (3)$$

Where F_{ij} is the logistic distribution function. By implication, we suppose that the Independence of irrelevant alternatives hypothesis is respected. The above function is estimated by maximizing the following Log Likelihood function:

$$\log L (Y, \beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m s_{ij} \log [P r o b (Y_i = j)] \quad (4)$$

$$s_{ij} = 1 \text{ if } s_i = j \text{ and } 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

Under certain conditions, the Maximum Likelihood method provides consistent and efficient estimates of the parameters β (See Grenne, 2003 and Amemiya, 1985).

EMPIRICAL RESULTS

Descriptive statistic of explanatory variables

Data needs for empirical analysis are secondary data from the third households survey (ECAM3) conducted in 2007 by the National Institute of Statistics. A cross-section of 11391 households was interviewed. Descriptive statistics on household demographics and socioeconomics, and distance to water source are summarized in table2.

66.2% of the households live in urban or semi urban area while 33.8% of the survey households live in rural area. On the total, 26.7% households head are female. We observe from our database that the number of family members varies from 1 to 43. Households with one family member are the most important group of the sample (16.6%). A typical household of Cameroon has 4.55 family members. Concerning the education level of household head, data reveals that majority of the households head (76.5%) are literate while 23.5% (2680 households head) are illiterate. Of the literate households head, 32% has primary school level, 1.2% has post primary school level, 35% has secondary school level and only 8% has high school level. About per capita annual expenses (use as proxy for households welfare in our study), we note that

it varies from Fcfa 72053 for the poorest households to Fcfa 11300000 for the richest households. Finally, the distance from household residence to the water supply point varies from 0 to 92Km. After some adjustments done for households with incomplete data as mentioned in the sub-section above, it comes out that the average distance to drinking water supply point is 2.77 Km.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics

Variable	mean	Std. Dev	Min	Max
Resid	0,6618	0,4731	0	1
Sex	0,2673	0,4425	0	1
Hsize	4,5571	3,1052	1	43
Edu	0,7627	0,4254	0	1
Lexp	4726664	487563	72053	11300000
Dist	2,7706	8,2699	0	92

Source: Authors' computation based on ECAM3

RESULTS OF THE ECONOMETRIC MODEL

Table3 presents the estimation results. In general, the estimated parameters are significant and have the expected signs. The model is statistically valid with a likelihood ratio equal to 7671 (the chi-squared statistic is significant at 1%). Then, at least one explanatory variable has explanatory power on the outcome variable. The pseudo-R² is equal to 0,195.

As expected, “distance” variable is statistically significant and inversely related to the source of drinking water (except for resellers where the effect is positive but not statistically significant). Thus, the longer the distance to a particular source of drinking water, the lower will be the demand for same. Nketiah-Amponsah et al. (2009) as well as Briand et al. (2009) highlight the effects of the distance on the choice of water source. Our finding is also consistent with Hindman (2002) who found that time cost is an important determinant of household choice of drinking water source.

Estimation results also show that female household heads tend to choose nearest solutions (private tap or collective tap). They are rather less likely to choose public drinking fountain/borehole and unimproved sources as compared to improved dug well. This outcome can be justified by the fact that water fetching is the primary responsibility of women and that is why they are more sensitive to time cost than their husband counterpart. Time saved by adopting piped water for drinking purpose can therefore be reallocated to others domestic activities such as cooking. A meaningful water supply strategy in the rural and urban areas must therefore involve more women than men.

In this model, we also explore the effects of changes in household welfare. Our study shows that the per capita expenditure used as proxy for household welfare has a significant and negative impact on the probability to choose

unimproved (marginal effect is equal to -0,10). Inversely, these two factors increase access to public water network (via these three options: private tap, collective tap or connected neighbor) and public drinking fountain/borehole, albeit association between residence and public drinking fountain/borehole is not significant. As urban households become better-off, they are much more likely to choose improved quality water. Welfare effect is highlight by Asante (2003); Nauges and Van Den Berg (2009); Nauges and Strand (2007).

Table3: Marginal effects of multinomial logit regression for choice of water source

Variables	Private tap	Collective tap	Resellers of piped water	Public drinking fountain/borehole	Unimproved sources
Sex (female=1)	0,027 (0,005)*	0,026 (0,007)*	0,000 (0,008)	-0,014 (0,007)**	-0,026 (0,011)**
Dist	-0,002 (0,001)***	-0,031 (0,001)*	0,003 (0,002)	-0,040 (0,001)*	-0,036 (0,002)*
Hsize	0,013 (0,001)*	-0,004 (0,001)**	-0,005 (0,001)**	0,001 (0,001)	-0,005 (0,002)*
Edu (literate=1)	0,026 (0,005)*	0,050 (0,007)*	0,013 (0,009)	-0,006 (0,008)	-0,107 (0,013)*
Lexp	0,090 (0,006)*	0,053 (0,006)*	0,022 (0,007)*	0,026 (0,006)*	-0,100 (0,009)*
Resid(urban or sémi-urban=1)	0,057 (0,005)*	0,021 (0,005)*	0,404 (0,009)*	-0,011 (0,006)***	-0,419 (0,011)*
Pseudo R-Square					
<i>McFadden 0,195</i>					
Likelihood Ratio Tests					
<i>LR Chi-square(30)=7671*</i>					
<i>Prob > chi-square = 0.0000</i>					

Note: Standard errors reported in parentheses. *significant at 1%, ** at 5% and *** at 10%

Residence area is a strong determinant of household choice of water source. Urban households are 5.7; 2.1 and 40.4 percentage points more likely to have access to piped water in residence, collective tap and resellers respectively as compared to well. The study shows that living in semi or urban area reduces the probability to choose public drinking fountain/borehole and unimproved sources.

We also find that some estimated marginal impacts for the education level of household head dummies are statistically significant. It is in line with previous findings which show that Education level of household affect household decision. As expected, households are less likely to choose unimproved sources as compared to well if household head is literate (marginal effect is equal to -0,107). In fact, the higher the level of education household is, the more he is sensitive to health implications of water consumed. Household education is a significant predictor for private and collective tap indicating a strong association between these variables.

Household size has an impact on household decision (we observe that this impact is not very important). There is a statistically significant association between household size and private tap. Household size has a negative impact on the demand for collective tap and resellers services. The impact of household size on private tap demand has already been highlighted by Briand et al. (2009). Contrary to *a priori* expectation, Hindman (2002) finds that household size has a significant negative effect on household choice of piped or pumped water. Our findings may be explained by the fact that the more people are in a household, the higher are the family needs in water and the easier these needs can be satisfied by in-house tap compared to other outlying sources.

CONCLUSION

Water is identified as one of the most important natural resources because it is viewed as a key to prosperity and wealth (Arbués et al., 2003). Access to and use of safe drinking water can make an immense contribution to health, productivity, and social development. This study helps us to have a better understanding of the factors which influence the household choice of drinking water source. The study contributes to the still short literature on households' water choice in Africa by modeling Cameroonian household choice of drinking water source using revealed preference approach. The multinomial logistic regression model has been used for discrete analysis of source choice. Data needs for empirical analysis are secondary data from a survey conducted in 2007 by the National Institute of Statistics. A cross-section of 11391 households was interviewed. In general, the estimated parameters are significant and have the expected signs. As expected, *distance* is statistically significant and inversely related to the source of drinking water (except for resellers where the effect is positive but not statistically significant). Thus, the longer the distance to a particular source of drinking water, the lower will be the demand for same. We believe that these results give policy-makers useful guidance in their attempt to provide sustainable water supply to the population. Consideration must be given to households time allocation patterns since they seems to be more concerned with the distance to the source than the type of water source (Hindman, 2002). People should be equipped with improved water sources as close as possible; otherwise, they will rely on nearest unimproved sources. Our study also suggests that female-headed households are more likely to adopt private tap or collective tap as main water source, compared with male-headed households. Moreover, household's size has a significant positive effect on household's choice of private tap and negative impact on household's choice of coping sources. Given that there is high demand for tap from households with high number of family members, Government should react by facilitating their access to private tap water. This may be done for instance, by giving priorities to this group of households, when implementing campaigns of State subsidies for connection to public network. The study also suggests that households' characteristics such as residence area and education have an impact on the choice of drinking water source. Especially, it has emerged from the study that the household expenditure (proxy of household welfare) is the fundamental factor which compels households to rely on unimproved sources. Thus, authorities should grant special attention to poorer households when implementing strategies for population access to safe and reliable water.

REFERENCES

- Amemiya, T. (1985) *Advanced Econometrics*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Arbués, F., Garcia-Valiñas, M.Á., & Martinez-Espiñeira, R. (2003). Estimation of residential water demand: a state-of-the-art review, *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 32, 81-102.
- Asante, F. A. (2003). Economic Analysis of Decentralization in Rural Ghana. *Economics and Policy* 32, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.
- Asthana, A. N., (1997). Where the water is free but the buckets are empty: demand analysis of drinking water in rural India. *Open Economies Review*, 8(2), 139-149.
- Basani, M., Isham J., & Reilly B (2008). The Determinants of Water Connection and Water Consumption: Empirical Evidence from a Cambodian Household Survey. *World Development*, 36(5), 953–68.
- Breuil, L. (2004) Renouveler le partenariat public-privé pour les services d'eau dans les pays en développement, comment conjuguer les dimensions contractuelles, institutionnelles et participatives de la gouvernance ?. Thèse de Doctorat, Ecole Nationale du Génie, des Eaux et Forêts, Centre de Paris.
- Briand, A., Nauges, C., & Travers, M. (2009.) Choix d'approvisionnement en eau des ménages de Dakar: Une étude économétrique à partir de données d'enquête. *Revue d'Economie du Développement*, (3), 83-108.
- Briand, A. and Laré, L. A. (2010). Choix d'approvisionnement en eau des ménages auprès des Petits Opérateurs Privés dans les quartiers périphériques de Maputo : une étude économétrique à partir de données d'enquête. Paper presented at the Conference on Environmental Economics and Natural Resources Management in Developing and Transition Economies Clermont-Ferrand, France, on November, 18 – 19, 2010.
- Chapitoux, J. P., Houssier, S., Gross, P., Bouvier, C., & Brissaud, F. (2002). Etude de la pollution de l'eau souterraine de la ville de Niamey, Niger. *Bulletin de la société de pathologie exotique*, 95 (2), 119-123.
- Cheesman, J., Bennett, J., & Son, T. V. H. (2008). Estimating Household Water Demand Using Revealed And Contingent Behaviors: Evidence from VietNam. *Water Resources Research*, 44, W11428, doi:10.1029/2007WR006265.
- Greene, W. H. (2003). *Econometric Analysis*. Prentice Hall, 5th Edition.
- Heckman, J. (1979). Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error. *Econometrica*. 47(1), 153-61.
- Herischen, D., Ruwaida, M. S., & Blackburn, R. (2002). Répondre au défi urbain. Population Reports, Série M, Numéro 16. Info Project. Maryland, USA. 23 pages.
- Hidman, P. T. (2007). Household choice of drinking-water source in Philippines. *Asian Economic Journal*, 16(4), 303-316.
- Jaglin, S. (2001). L'eau potable dans les villes en développement : les modèles marchands face à la pauvreté. *Revue du Tiers Monde*, 42 (166): 275-303
- Larson, B., Minten, B., & Razafindralambo, R. (2006). Unravelling the Linkages between the Millennium Development Goals for Poverty, Education, Access to Water and Household Water Use in Developing Countries: Evidence from Madagascar. *Journal of Development Studies*, 42(1), 22-40.
- Madanat, S., Humplick, F. (1993). A model of household choice of water supply systems in developing countries. *Water Resources Research*, 29, 1353–58.
- Missions Economiques (2005). Le secteur de l'eau et de l'assainissement au Cameroun. Fiche de synthèse, Ambassade de France au Cameroun.

- Mu, X., Whittington, D., & Briscoe, J. (1990). Modelling village water demand behavior: a discrete choice-choice approach. *Water Resources Research*, 26, 521-529.
- Nauges, C., & Strand, J., (2007). Estimation of Non-Tap Water Demand in Central American cities. *Resource and Energy Economics*, 29, 165-182.
- Nauges, C., & Van Den Berg (2009). Demand for Piped and Non-piped Water Supply Services: Evidence from Southwest Sri Lanka. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 42(4), 535-49.
- Nauges, C., & Whittington (2010) Estimation of Water Demand in Developing Countries: An Overview”, *World Bank Research Observer* 25(2): 263-294.
- Nketiah-Amponsah, N., Woedem, A. P., & Senadza, B. (2009). Socio-economic Determinants of Sources of Drinking Water: Some Insight from Ghana. Paper presented at the Conference on International Research on Food Security, Natural Resource Management and Rural Development, University of Hamburg.
- Sandiford, P., Gorter, A. C., Orozco, J. G., & Pauw, J. P. (1990). Determinants of domestic water use in rural Nicaragua. *J Trop Med Hyg* 93(6), 383-389.
- UN-Water / WWAP (2006). L'eau : une responsabilité partagée ». Résumé du 2^{ème} rapport mondial des Nations Unies sur la mise en valeur des ressources en eau. 52P.
- Verdeil, V., (1995). Le commerce de l'eau dans les bidonvilles de Port-au-Prince. Analyse de l'approvisionnement en eau des ménages et des réseaux de distribution. Paris, GRET, p. 34 (Rapport de mission).
- WHO (2005) Célébration de la Décennie Internationale d'Action « L'Eau source » de vie 2005-2015. Guide de sensibilisation.
- WHO, Unicef (2000). Global Water Supply and Sanitation Assessment 2000 Report. 79 p.
- World Bank (1996) Water Resources Management. A Policy Paper, Washington, DC.
- World Bank Water Demand Research Team (1993). The Demand for Water in Rural Areas: Determinants and Policy Implications. *World Bank Research Observer* 8 (1), 47-70.

Note 1: The first international definition of *access to drinking water* concept was established during the first international potable Water and Sanitation decade launched by the United Nations. Access to drinking water was defined either by network connection or by collective service via public drinking fountain and other improved water points available at a reasonable distance from the house (less than 200 meters). Since 2000, the WHO and UNICEF in their report *Global water supply and sanitation assessment 2000* propose a new definition. Access to drinking water is defined according to the availability of an improved water source next to the house (less than 1000m) where people can draw at least 20liters/individual/day.

Note 2: CDE sell water under an increasing block-pricing tariff structures. Marginal price varies from Fcfa 293 per cubic meter in the first block (for any unit below 10 cubic meters per month) to and Fcfa 364 per cubic meter for any unit above 10 cubic meters per month.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Mr. Luc Armand TOTOUOM FOTUE: PhD candidate in Environmental and Resource economics, University of Yaoundé II, Cameroon.

Pr. Fondo SIKOD: Senior lecturer at the faculty of Economics and Management, University of Yaoundé II, Cameroon.