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### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AusAID</td>
<td>Australian Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDT</td>
<td>Bangladeshi Taka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoP</td>
<td>Base of the Pyramid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWST</td>
<td>Centre for Affordable Water and Sanitation Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLTS</td>
<td>Community Led Total Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPHE</td>
<td>Department of Public Health and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFT</td>
<td>Family Friend Toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOB</td>
<td>Government of Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWU</td>
<td>George Washington University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGD</td>
<td>Local Government Division of Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFIs</td>
<td>Micro-Finance Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODF</td>
<td>Open Defecation-Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Private Public Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMSS</td>
<td>Thengamara Mohila Sabuj Sangha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSSM</td>
<td>Total Sanitation and Sanitation Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>The United Nation’s Children Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERC</td>
<td>Village Education Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGF</td>
<td>Vulnerable Group Feeding Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>Water and Sanitation Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

iDE is an international NGO with over 25 years of experience designing and delivering market based anti-poverty programs in 13 countries. iDE Bangladesh was established in 1984 as the first country program with a focus on creating income and livelihood opportunities for poor rural households. In 2012, iDE Bangladesh began its ongoing SanMark Pilot: Private Sector-Led Sanitation Project in three upazilas in Rajshahi district with funding from the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and the World Bank’s Water and Sanitation Program (WSP). This project uses sanitation marketing, which applies social and commercial marketing approaches to scale up the supply and demand for improved sanitation facilities.

The SanMark pilot project introduced the SaTo pan, a new latrine technology, developed using a human centered design process in partnership with RFL Plastics Conglomerate and WSP. Additionally the project included branding and promotion of a line of five hygienic latrines called the Family Friend Toilet (FFT). Third, the project aimed to improve the skills of latrine producers and transform their role in the community beyond simply suppliers and manufacturers of concrete latrine products to selling consumers a bundled service of high quality latrines, transportation, installation, and future upgrades to more extensive latrine models. Lastly, the project aimed to improve decision-making and market responsiveness through public-private partnerships at the local level. Union Parishad Chairman and Department of Public Health and Engineering (DPHE) engineers were drivers of local government interaction and product adoption. Lastly, iDE staff and volunteers served as catalysts in the pilot communities through training, market facilitation, and relationship building among stakeholders and beneficiaries.

The study sets out to evaluate project outcomes through in-depth interviews with key stakeholders and beneficiaries, including: representatives of RFL Plastics Conglomerate, Union Parishad chairmen and DPHE engineers, iDE SanMark volunteers, latrine producers and their sales representatives, and households/consumers. The evaluation took place in three pilot upazilas: Baghmara, Durgapur, and Mohanpur in the Rajshahi district of Bangladesh. A total of 52 semi-structured, open-ended qualitative in-depth interviews were conducted during the period of March 4 to March 18, 2014.

The evaluation found a number of key themes and concepts that guided the development of fourteen recommendations for iDE Bangladesh:

1. Partner with RFL to develop a business case that provides clear incentives for latrine producers to strengthen their relationship with RFL.
2. Provide RFL with strategic blueprint for engaging and motivating latrine producers to purchase the SaTo pan.
3. Together with RFL headquarters and national management, develop a goal structure that rewards not only quantity of SaTo pan sold but also quality of technical training.
4. Partner with RFL headquarters and national management to develop a sequential standard training plan for latrine producers that can be easily franchised to sales representatives in the field.
5. Facilitate relationship building between RFL sales representatives/latrine producers and the Union Parishad Chairman and help establish a sales approach strategy for the national rollout.
6. Facilitate relationship building between RFL sales representatives and the DPHE regional officials to display the benefits of the SaTo pan as compared to other "approved" latrines.
7. Clearly define the concept of a sanitation dealer for latrine producers and demonstrate that market-based incentives exist for adopting a bundled approach to providing sanitation products and services.
8. Overcome information asymmetries between latrine producers and consumers to prevent market failure through above-the-line marketing to both parties.
9. Provide technical assistance to RFL to develop pricing and marketing strategy for full plastic solution.
10. Develop stronger brand positioning, personality, and execution and use commercial marketing techniques to increase brand recognition and awareness.
11. Highlight the ease of cleaning the SaTo pan and the shiny plastic finish in advertisements for the SaTo pan.
12. Improve the latrine producer’s consumer facing sales and marketing skills.
13. Include options for affordable superstructures in the new line of latrine products.
14. Develop value propositions for the key segments: joint family households, households with income generating women, and households with adolescent daughters near or of marrying age

These recommendations not only apply to the national scale up of the SanMark program in Bangladesh, but can also provide insight for the development and improvement of sanitation marketing programs around the world with a similar program components and approach. Additionally, a social marketing plan was developed based on key findings to improve targeted marketing for key segments, which focuses on improving brand identity and recognition to facilitate sustained product uptake and upgrading behaviors.

BACKGROUND

Sanitation Marketing: An Overview

Sanitation marketing, as defined by the Water and Sanitation Program of the World Bank, is the application of the best social and commercial marketing practices to change behaviour and to scale up the demand and supply for improved sanitation, particularly among the poor (Water and Sanitation Program 2012). There are many individual components that can be incorporated into a sanitation marketing program but these activities support two main functions. First, strengthening supply by building capacity of the local private sector and second, “selling sanitation” by using commercial marketing techniques to motivate households to build latrines.

Currently, there is little peer-reviewed literature evaluating either the impact of sanitation marketing or which particular activities work best in supporting the desired outcomes. A systematic review covering the last twenty-two years of social marketing, focused on water and sanitation, found two peer-reviewed studies that concentrated on latrines (Pattanayak et al. 2014). These two studies found that sanitation marketing interventions decreased the rates of diarrhoea in children under five (Nanan et al. 2003) and were successful in increasing the number of latrines constructed in treatment villages (Pattanayak et al. 2009). The studies did not conduct a process evaluation of the interventions but Pattanayak et al. found demand creation activities had a stronger effect on latrine construction when paired with an intervention that lowers the cost of obtaining a latrine (Pattanayak et al. 2009).

A review of programmatic literature and impact evaluations revealed findings consistent with the aforementioned studies in terms of the health impacts of sanitation marketing programs. The existing sanitation marketing programs reviewed for this evaluation found a majority of programs included the following components:
Supply side strengthening – Each sanitation marketing program reviewed had a component of supply side strengthening. This typically involved technical training for the local suppliers that already existed in the market. The interventions reviewed typically did not introduce a new technology but built upon latrines that already existed in the local market. A small percentage of the projects reviewed did not endorse a specific product; however, the majority either “packaged” latrines (i.e. suppliers were encouraged to sell a full latrine rather than inputs) or rebranded existing latrines to create a new product line. For example, a Water for the People project in Malawi focused on training the local masons to construct improved latrines using technology that already existed in the market. The technical training focused on building different models of hygienic latrines to offer to consumers (Water for the People 2011).

Demand creation – Each sanitation marketing program reviewed included an intervention designed to create demand among consumers for latrines and other sanitation products and services. In most cases, the projects employed Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) to create demand for sanitation products. The projects that did not use CLTS typically created a “health promoter” role in the community and recruited volunteers to spur household demand through education and promotional activities. The review did not find any interventions that attempted to cultivate a producer-employed team of sales representatives to encourage demand for sanitation products. For example, an Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) funded project in rural Fiji created demand by including rural women in an agenda-setting exercise for community priorities (Live and Learn 2013).

Enabling Environment – The sanitation marketing program reviewed for this evaluation typically included an intervention focused on fostering an “enabling environment”. Broadly, this fell into one of two categories. The first category was the promotion of financial products for consumers. This involved partnering with micro-finance institutions (MFI) to create a new financial product or promoting an existing product. In rare cases, a subsidy scheme was introduced to facilitate the purchase of sanitation products. The second category was working with local, regional, or national governments to implement policies, regulations, or codes that created favourable conditions in the sanitation market. For example, the Total Sanitation and Sanitation Marketing (TSSM) project in the Eastern Java region of Indonesia employed a traveling “road show” in each district. The “road show” was held for one day in each district and brought together relevant stakeholders to secure buy-in and clear any potential bureaucratic roadblocks (Water and Sanitation Program 2011).

Description of Sanitation Marketing in Bangladesh

Bangladesh is known as the birthplace of the CLTS approach, which the Government of Bangladesh (GOB) adopted during a massive effort from 2003 to 2006 to increase sanitary latrine coverage, with the goal of achieving national open defecation-free (ODF) status by 2010. The countrywide efforts involved all levels of government as well as NGOs and other actors, and resulted in nearly 90% latrine coverage by 2010 (WSP 2011).

Despite these successes, hygienic latrine coverage in Bangladesh remained at only 53% (WSP 2011). While Bangladesh’s national sanitation movement rightly focused on the confinement of feces, it did not adequately address the need to stop the oral-fecal transmission of disease through increased adoption of hygienic latrine use. As a result, Bangladesh continues to struggle with poor health and has the world’s seventh-highest number of diarrheal-related deaths, despite a marked drop in open defecation (UNICEF 2009).
Successfully expanding hygienic latrine coverage in Bangladesh requires many challenges to be overcome, including the need for an improved hardware solution, creating demand for hygienic latrines among households, and improving the marketing of hygienic latrines by the private sector to add to (and eventually phase out) efforts by the public sector and NGOs to distribute subsidized latrines.

To solve these problems, the World Bank launched a sanitation-marketing program in 2008, with assistance from WSP. The program was designed to teach entrepreneurial latrine producers how to construct and market hygienic latrines using social and commercial approaches that stimulate demand (World Bank 2014).

**iDE Sanitation Marketing: Pilot Project Approach**

iDE Bangladesh has delivered sanitation marketing solutions since 2011 through an innovative approach that sought to create a viable market system for private-sector led quality latrine provision at scale. Building upon the success of a 2011 pilot project funded by HYSAWA and supported by the Local Government Division of Bangladesh (LGD) and a 2011 UNICEF-funded sanitation market study in Brahmanbaria district, iDE Bangladesh began its ongoing *SanMark Pilot: Private Sector-Led Sanitation Project* (funded by SDC and WSP) in three upazilas in Rajshahi district in 2012.

The SanMark Pilot project seeks to address the key problems of design, affordability, low hygiene awareness, coordination, and consumer orientation in service provision which persist in the current sanitation service market in Rajshahi by reaching 20 latrine producers, 2,000 households and 10,000 individuals. The project is based upon an approach which understands market systems as the most efficient, effective and sustainable means to disseminate products and services to base of the pyramid (BoP) consumers. This approach views BoP consumers as rational and active participants in an underserved market segment rather than passive beneficiaries of “aid” or development who are beyond the reach of the market. The project is comprised of five interventions:

1. **Introduction of an appropriate design using a Human Centered Design Process**
2. **Introduction of a financial product for latrine production and purchasing**
3. **Branding and promotion of hygienic latrines**
4. **Skills development of latrine producers**
5. **Private Public Partnership (PPP) Platform at local level for improved decision-making and market responsiveness**

The SanMark Pilot project focuses on behavior change and the supply of sanitation hardware. SanMark steps away from subsidy models, making products so desirable that consumer purchase them instead of relying on handouts. SanMark leverages CLTS behavior change and focuses on the adoption of sanitary latrines that separate excreta from human contact. By focusing on supply and demand, SanMark creates markets for sanitation products that sustainably serve the poor.

**METHODOLOGY**

**Evaluation Design**
This evaluation was conducted in three pilot upazilas of Baghmara, Durgapur, and Mohanpur in the Rajshahi district of Bangladesh. Study participants included latrine producers and their sales representatives, Union Parishad chairmen, DPHE engineers, RFL Plastics representatives, iDE SanMark volunteers, and households/consumers in the three pilot areas. Semi-structured, open-ended qualitative in-depth interviews were conducted during the period of March 4 to March 18, 2014. Participants were recruited through purposive sampling with the aid of iDE project staff and SanMark volunteers. Inclusion criteria for participation in the study was residing or working in the pilot areas of Baghmara, Durgapur, and Mohanpur. Informed consent was obtained verbally prior to all interviews. No compensation was provided for participation in the study.

Data Collection and Analysis

Interviews with consumers were conducted within the household; interviews with latrine producers were conducted at their business site or at a location nearby to facilitate privacy; and interviews with government officials, sales representatives, and RFL Plastics representatives were conducted in their offices or other convenient locations. A researcher from the George Washington University (GWU) consulting team led the discussion, with a note-taker and interpreter present. Qualitative in-depth interviews included a number of human centered design and participatory research activities. This included the Sanitation Ladder Activity by the Center for Affordable Water and Sanitation Technology (CAWST) that was adapted to the local context to gauge consumer preferences and the use of concept mapping during latrine producer interviews to understand which stakeholders were important for the success of latrine producers’ businesses.

The GWU team conducted transcription and coding of transcripts to identify key themes and concepts from the interviews.

Limitations

Due to time and logistical limitations, including insecurity resulting from district elections, interviews were not conducted outside of project areas and a control group was not established for any of the stakeholder or beneficiary groups. Additionally, disparity between information gained from latrine producers and consumers may indicate sampling bias due to purposive sampling. The evaluation team was connected to many households through iDE volunteers working in the pilot areas.

---

1 Activities by the Center for Affordable Water and Sanitation Technology are available through their Resource Center: http://resources.cawst.org/package-type/activity-package
EVALUATION RESULTS

The evaluation focused on project stakeholders and beneficiaries of the as depicted in Figure 1. The results are categorized according to the key stakeholders that were interviewed as a part of the evaluation. The results are presented with a brief background of each stakeholder’s role in the project, the specific findings of the evaluation relevant to that stakeholder, and finally a set of recommendations for iDE Bangladesh relevant to each section.

Evaluation Results: RFL Plastics Conglomerate

Background

The life of every SaTo pan, and thus every FFT, starts with RFL. RFL Plastics is a sister company of PRAN-RFL group that employs over 10,000 people in Bangladesh (PRAN-RFL 2014). RFL produces and distributes the SaTo pan directly to latrine producers throughout Bangladesh via a dedicated team of sales representatives. While the evaluation primarily focused on latrine producers and households, it also explored the relationship between RFL and latrine producers from the perspective of both the latrine producers and RFL. The evaluation conducted two interviews with RFL employees to explore their role in the distribution of SaTo pans, demand creation, and motivation of latrine producers.

Interviews were conducted with a RFL zonal manager and a RFL sales representative. The zonal manager oversees 69 unique RFL dealers and seven sales representatives. The sales representative interviewed was one of seven sales representatives in the Rajshahi district. Sales representatives are the central point of contact between RFL and the latrine producers. As such, this evaluation sought to explore the relationship between RFL’s head office and the sales representatives, in addition to the relationship between the sales representatives and the latrine producers to answer the following questions:

- How does RFL interact with the local governments, NGOs, and latrine producers?
- How does RFL Dhaka (headquarters) message the SaTo pan project/endeavor down to their local staff (dealers and sales representatives)?
- What does RFL need to do to turn latrine producers into a more integrated network of rural retailers?
- What should the training model for latrine producers look like when RFL assumes full management?

The diagram below depicts a simplified version of the RFL supply chain for SaTo pans. The RFL factory produces the pans, which are then provided to RFL dealers. Based on the interviews conducted in Rajshahi, both RFL dealers and RFL sales representatives sell the SaTo pan directly to customers, including latrine producers, shopkeepers, and NGOs. RFL distributors focus on orders of 100 SaTo pans or more while sales representatives concentrate on securing smaller orders for dealers. According to the data gathered during the evaluation, an estimated 80% of SaTo pan sales in Rajshahi are placed via a sales representative while an estimated 20% are placed directly through the dealer.
The evaluation found that there are two main customer segments being actively targeted by the RFL sales team and a third group that is being developed.

Findings

**RFL Customer Group #1: Latrine Producers and Shopkeepers**

The first group, which represents the largest portion of the sales representatives’ business, consists of local latrine producers and shopkeepers. Latrine producers account for a majority of this business (an estimated 90% according to the sales representatives interviewed) and are the primary target customers. RFL sales representatives visit these small businessmen on a regular basis, in order to collect information on how well RFL products are selling, take orders from latrine producers, and attempt to sell them new items from the RFL catalog. Sales representative sell a variety of products from the RFL catalog and the employees interviewed estimated that SaTo pan sales currently account for an estimated 15% of total currently. This is up from an estimated 0.05% of total sales one year ago. The RFL employees interviewed both reported that SaTo pan is the only low cost, high quality pan on the market and does not have a direct competitor outside of locally produced plastic pans.

iDE facilitates the majority of introductions between RFL sales representatives and latrine producers who want to purchase the SaTo pan.

Based on the interviews conducted, it was found that RFL sales representatives receive a list of latrine producer’s addresses and phone numbers from iDE volunteers and use this list to generate SaTo pan sales. The sales representative interviewed had recently transferred from an area where no iDE volunteers operated to an area where iDE had a volunteer interacting with the local latrine producers. As such, he reported selling 300 SaTo pans in his previous area in about eleven months while he reported selling over 200 in just fifteen days in the new district. The sales representatives also target “out of list” latrine producers who are identified by driving around target areas with SaTo pan samples and “cold” selling to them. The zonal manager reported that sales representatives outside of the project areas were given a goal of selling 100 SaTo pans monthly and have been able to meet that goal without any problems. However, this conflicted with the information provided by the sales representative as he reported selling less than 100 SaTo pans per month in his previous post.

**RFL Customer Group #2: Local and International NGOs**

The second group of customers that RFL currently targets includes NGOs operating in the sanitation sector. The sales representative interviewed had not successfully converted a sale to an NGO but reported that he was in the final stages with Caritas Bangladesh prior to being transferred. The zonal manager interviewed listed “visiting NGO offices to push SaTo pan sales” as a key responsibility of his role and indicated he had converted several sales using this method. The RFL employees interviewed estimated that 50% of NGO leads come by the NGO contacting RFL and 50% come from a sales representative, dealer, or zonal manager proactively selling to the NGO.

**RFL prioritizes NGO orders internally and provides a bulk purchase discount.**

The RFL zonal manager has been given direct orders to fulfill NGO orders first, even if it creates delays for internal RFL dealers and latrine producers to receive the SaTo pan. Additionally, RFL offers NGOs a 5% discount on the price of SaTo pans. The zonal manager further explained that the NGOs are important customers and the ability to fulfill their orders first reflects the view that they will be consistent sources of demand. This finding is neither negative nor positive but partially reveals the view from the private sector
that NGOs will continue to be a strong source of demand for sanitation. This indicates that latrine producers will continue to compete with subsidized latrines for BoP consumers.

**RFL Customer Group #3: Government**

The third customer group that is currently being developed is local and national government. Based on interviews conducted for the evaluation, RFL has not yet directly executed a contract with a Union Parishad or the DPHE to supply SaTo pans. However, the evaluation found that at a macro level RFL management was waiting on the decision from the DPHE review of SaTo pan to pursue further sales activities. An encouraging anecdote from the local level was that the RFL sales representative helped a latrine producer facilitate a deal whereby RFL provided 500 SaTo pans to the latrine producer in order to fulfill an order from the Union Parishad chairman. Outside of the business operations of RFL there were several other key findings.

**There is a gap between the latrine producer’s need for demand creation and technical training and RFL’s ability to provide it.**

The zonal manager and sales representative interviewed for this evaluation were very cognizant of the need for RFL to provide training to latrine producers on how to stimulate demand in the absence of RFL. The zonal manager provided a more macro-level view of RFL’s approach and identified a solid foundation for this effort: collecting and compiling the names and addresses of latrine producers and targeting new entrants to the market to educate them about SaTo pan. However, when pressed for details he identified a gap in knowledge of how to operationalize these activities and roll them out to the sales representatives.

The current training capability of RFL staff, as reported by the zonal manager and sales representative, primarily involves training latrine producers how to cast the SaTo pan into the concrete slab. The sales representative interviewed reported he provides information on how to case the SaTo pan into concrete after he sells the pan to the latrine producer and if more detailed technical training is needed he contacts an iDE volunteer or iDE staff member to conduct additional training. The zonal manager provided very basic details on how he intends to train the latrine producers on marketing and demand creation activities and as identified above, the sales representative was not sure that he could replicate the training iDE currently provides to latrine producers regarding demand creation after the project end date.

**The motivation to take the concept of the integrated rural retailer latrine producer to reality is present; however, RFL lacks the operational framework to execute this vision.**

The project, as described by iDE project staff, seeks to closely link RFL and latrine producers together and intensify their relationship, to include activities such as market coordination and product diversification. This concept would allow RFL to sell a centrally produced product(s) with quality control to a broader consumer base through latrine producers. This would allow latrine producers to effectively act as a network of integrated retailers who would have access to the technical and commercial expertise of RFL and serve as an entry point into the market for new products and innovations.
The evaluation found that RFL is slowly starting to move in a direction that aligns their business goals with this concept; however, RFL lacks the operational framework to turn this concept into a reality. The sales representative and the RFL zonal manager interviewed both described the role of the sales representative as essential to: create demand for sanitation, explain how to use the RFL products to customers, and demonstrate how these products will help improve public health in Bangladesh. The evaluation found that a structure to incentivize sales representatives to provide quality technical and commercial training to the latrine producers does not currently exist.

However, the evaluation found the current relationship between sales representative and latrine producers is largely transactional. The gap was highlighted by the sales representative interviewed, who explained that his responsibilities focus on the importance of sanitation for health and the training of customers [latrine producers] on how to use the product. However, this detailed description of his day-to-day activities consisted only of taking orders, delivering products, collecting money, and strategizing as to how to meet his sales goals.

Further, the goals set by RFL headquarters encourage a sales-centric approach to dealing with latrine producers. This sales-centric approach encourages a transactional relationship and does not currently emphasize or reward technical and commercial training. The zonal manager and sales representative interviewed both identified hard sales goals they are pushed to hit by upper management each month. The zonal manager reported there will be “some punishment” if he does not meet the SaTo pan sales targets in his area. While the evaluation sample size was extremely limited, this approach causes managers and sales representatives in the field to focus on the quantity of inputs (SaTo pans) sold rather than building the capacity of latrine producers to become an integrated rural network of retailers for RFL.

Recommendations for iDE Bangladesh

1. **Partner with RFL to develop a business case that provides clear incentives for latrine producers to strengthen their relationship with RFL.**

   - The evaluation team recommends that iDE Bangladesh assists RFL in creating a business case for why latrine producers should strengthen their ties with RFL in order to move closer to the “concept” of a rural integrated network of retailers. Additionally, the team recommends that iDE Bangladesh help RFL establish an internal strategy to guide the integration of latrine producers into a larger network of sanitation dealers. This will need to identify the responsibilities of sales representatives and managers in the field and set clear performance expectations in order for the current concept to become a reality. The plan developed by RFL should clearly communicate to the latrine producers the benefits they will receive from partnering more closely with RFL and conversely what costs (if any) they will have to incur.

2. **Provide RFL with strategic blueprint for engaging and motivating latrine producers to purchase the SaTo pan input.**

   - The evaluation team recommends that iDE Bangladesh provides RFL with the best practices used to engage and motivate latrine producers in the pilot project area to purchase the SaTo
pan input. This will likely be the first step in the process detailed in recommendation number one and, to date, iDE Bangladesh’s team of volunteers has been very successful in motivating latrine producers to purchase SaTo pans. The evaluation found that the sales representative from RFL was concerned with being able to replicate this activity when iDE staff left the project area. The interviews also showed that the demand for the SaTo pan was higher in project areas than non-project areas (where only RFL sales representatives are operating) and that the engagement and motivation of the latrine producers was an essential piece of it. The evaluation did not find that RFL sales representatives lacked the skills to conduct this but that copying the success of iDE volunteers will strengthen demand across Bangladesh.

3. **Partner with RFL headquarters and national management to develop a goal structure that rewards not only the quantity of SaTo pans sold but also the quality of technical training.**

   - The evaluation team recommends that iDE works with RFL to help develop a set of internal goals related to the FFT product (rather than just the input) to promote greater focus on the technical training provided to the latrine producers. The evaluation found that a strong culture of goals currently exists at RFL. Each level of employee has a specific goal that must be hit and interviews showed that there are often inter-team competitions at the company. The goals for the SaTo pan are exclusively sales oriented and thus the field managers and sales representatives focus on achieving these metrics. There is a large opportunity to leverage this culture of goals and direct the efforts of field staff to also provide comprehensive technical training.

4. **Partner with RFL headquarters and national management to develop a sequential standard training plan for latrine producers that can be easily franchised to sales representatives in the field.**

   - The evaluation team recommends that iDE assists RFL in developing a sequential standard training plan that covers technical aspects of FFT construction and basic commercial marketing skills for the latrine producers. A centrally produced plan will ensure that all latrine producers receive the skills necessary to be transformed into a network of retailers and reduce the burden of development training on individual sales representatives. The evaluation found that sales representatives currently visit latrine producers in their area on a recurring basis. We recommend that the training plan contain easy-to-execute “modules” designed to build the technical and commercial skills of latrine producers one step at a time.

**Evaluation Results: Union Parishad Chairmen**

**Background:**

Interviews were conducted with three Union Parishad chairmen and two DPHE supervisors to answer the following questions:

- What role does the public sector play in the sanitation market in the project area?
- Are government subsidies distorting the market for latrines and creating an unpredictable environment

**Figure 2: Union Parishad Subsidy Process**

*From Concept to Reality: An Evaluation of iDE Bangladesh’s SanMark Pilot Project*
Figure 2 above depicts the cycle of the typical Union Parishad latrine subsidy program, based on the interviews conducted in Rajshahi. The first step is that the Union Parishad chairman and counselors meet with each ward to determine the list of needs that the community has and prioritize them. These lists are compiled and refined to guide the overall strategic goals of the Union Parishad. The second step involves the disbursement of funds from the central government via the local government development program (note: the acronym LGDP was used by the interview subjects and translators although additional research shows the name as “local government development fund” and “local government development project”). Based on the interviews conducted, this fund is provided annually in January but is often subject to considerable delay. The Union Parishad raises a small portion of funds through taxes and other certification fees but relies primarily on this cash infusion to fund activities each year.

The next step is for the Union Parishad to determine the allocation of resources specifically for sanitation. The three UP Chairmen interviewed estimated that sanitation typically consumed 20% of the overall monies provided. The Union Parishad then identifies the households that will receive the subsidized latrines. Each UP had a different way of identifying the households that would receive a subsidized latrine ranging from a subset of those in the Vulnerable Group Feeding (VGF) program to poor households identified by NGO activities.

All of the Union Parishads contracted the actual production out to local latrine producers. The subsidy covers about 200 to 400 latrines on average and is based on the amount of money available. In all three Union Parishads included in the evaluation, the subsidy was for the Primary FFT latrine model, which provides three rings, a slab with the SàTo pan, and transportation. The beneficiary is expected to pay 200
to 300 Taka for the installation of the latrine. The evaluation found that the Union Parishad typically pays the same amount or slightly more to the latrine producer as a single household would for an equivalent latrine.

Findings

**Union Parishad chairmen view SaTo pan as an affordable, high quality product that improves hygienic latrine coverage.**

All three Union Parishad chairmen interviewed for the evaluation reported greater satisfaction among subsidy beneficiaries with SaTo pan and the subsidized FFT latrine over their previous latrine. Commonly cited attributes of SaTo pan included: hygienic, high quality, efficient water usage [requires only one bodna of water]. Anecdotal evidence suggests that subsidized latrines have generated further demand for FFT latrines among neighbors and relatives. However, this could not be confirmed during the course of the evaluation. Nevertheless, this is an important finding from a viability and product perspective.

**Continual growth forecasted for Union Parishad budget allocation towards subsidized latrines.**

All three Union Parishad chairmen interviewed reported the steady growth of the Union Parishad budget for sanitation (as a percentage of the total money provided by the central government) over the past few years and believe it will continue to increase as Bangladesh aims to increase hygienic latrine coverage to 100% by 2015. Additionally, the longest tenured Union Parishad chairman interviewed reported the budget for subsidized latrines has grown exponential 300% over the past 14 years and predicts continued growth as the push to provide full hygienic latrine coverage continues.

**Identification of specific latrine for subsidization is heavily influenced by each Union Parishad chairman’s personal preference.**

Our interviews identified the Union Parishad chairman as the ultimate decision maker regarding the identification of a specific latrine for subsidization. The Union Parishad chairmen interviewed reported being influenced by DPHE, NGO education sessions, trusted advisors, and latrine producers in their area. This finding indicates a risk and an opportunity for latrine producers and RFL sales representatives. SaTo pan currently enjoys a high reputation in the market. However, all union chairmen interviewed noted that SaTo pan would only be subsidized until the introduction of a “better” technology to the market.

**Recommendations for iDE Bangladesh**

1. **Facilitate relationship building between RFL sales representatives/latrine producers and Union Parishad chairmen and help establish a sales approach strategy for the national rollout**

   • Union Parishad chairmen are ideal customers: they will be placing consistent orders every year, these orders are likely to grow in volume, and they pay latrine producers market value or higher for subsidized latrines. Facilitation of this relationship in existing project areas will
lay the groundwork for RFL to replicate success across Bangladesh. iDE Bangladesh can also assist in helping RFL develop a targeted sales pitch that addresses the attributes identified by the chairmen as critical for the subsidization of a latrine. These attributes include durability, efficient water usage, hygienic, and affordability.

**Evaluation Results: DPHE Engineers**

**Background**

The evaluation team interviewed two DPHE officials; however, only one was able to provide detailed information about the sanitation program. The relevant information is summarized below in two findings. The evaluation team acknowledges that iDE Bangladesh is likely already aware of this information.

**Findings**

The official DPHE approval process is almost finished for the SaTo pan and, if final approval is given, the SaTo pan will be included on the official list of latrines eligible for subsidization.

The approval process, according to DPHE officials interviewed, was initiated by iDE Bangladesh and RFL. Technical assessment of any new technology requires a minimum of one year. This assessment includes a door-to-door evaluation of the technology being used by consumers as well as an official review and report to be completed by the head DPHE office in Dhaka. The approval, if given, will allow SaTo pan to be included on a list of latrines that can be used in subsidy programs by the government. Regional DPHE offices do not have to use the SaTo pan but can choose to do so without any additional approval once the technical assessment is completed.

**DPHE runs a subsidy scheme at the upazilla level; this scheme differs in execution from the subsidy provided by the Union Parishad.**

The latrine subsidy program run by the DPHE takes place once a year, typically from March to June. The DPHE directly employees two latrine producers and two masons in at each regional office that are paid a monthly salary that is not related to the number of latrines they produce. The DPHE engineer procure the necessary inputs and the latrine producers and masons produce the latrines. The latrines are then sold out of a nearby DPHE building at a subsidised price. There are no limitations as to who can buy the latrines, however the consumers must cover the transportation and installation.

**Recommendations for iDE Bangladesh**

1. **Facilitate relationship building between RFL sales representatives and DPHE regional officials to demonstrate the benefits of the SaTo pan as compared to other “approved” latrines.**

   - Similar to the UP Chairman, DPHE orders represent a potentially consistent source of demand for RFL to grow their business. The evaluation team recommends that RFL pursues an agreement with the DPHE to supply SaTo pans for the subsidy program on a national scale.

**Evaluation Results: Latrine producers**

**Background**
Interviews were conducted with 17 latrine producers. Latrine producers are responsible for the production and sale of concrete latrine inputs. As such, they are on the front lines of sanitation marketing and are the key actors in the SanMark pilot project. Latrine producers market and sell latrine products to household consumers as well as NGOs and local governments for inclusion in latrine subsidy programs.

iDE Bangladesh defines a “sanitation dealer” as a latrine producer that has graduated beyond a the production and sale of concrete inputs to the production and sale of bundled services including the production and sale of entire latrine systems, latrine transportation and installation, as well as upgrading services. To explore the impact of the SanMark pilot program on latrine producers’ business and the viability and success of latrine producers becoming sanitation dealers, the evaluation asked the following questions:

- What impact has the SanMark pilot project had on the business model of latrines producers?
- Is the concept of latrine producers become sanitation dealers viable and realistic?
- What is the extent of upgrading marketing behavior among the latrine producers?
- What is the current relationship between the latrine producers and representatives of RFL?
- How do latrine producers finance their business and would the latrine producers benefit from a new financial product?
- What does iDE need to do to help RFL market a mass-produced plastic latrine?
- What type of marketing and price points would be most effective at increasing uptake of the full plastic latrine?

**Findings**

**Latrine producer business and business confidence has improved.**

Overall, the SanMark pilot improved the business and business confidence of the Latrine producers that participated in the project. Of the latrine producers questioned, seven (63%) stated that their business had improved since they began selling the SaTo pan and six reported that they will no longer sell the locally-produced plastic pan. One latrine producer reported that the trainings by iDE Bangladesh helped him to expand his sanitation business by 50% and another said his standing in the community has improved by improving the environment.

Additionally, seven latrine producers expressed confidence in the future success of their business due to the SanMark pilot. One latrine producer described the importance of iDE Bangladesh’s business and marketing training, attributing his new competencies to the recent expansion of his business. Others expect the sanitation portion of their business to expand in the coming months due to their newfound business competencies and increased sales volume.

Latrine Producers listed several reasons for business improvement and increased business confidence, including:

- Feeling better trained in latrine production and business management
- Increased rate of sales for latrine inputs
- Increased confidence in higher quality product compared to competition’s product

![Figure 3: Business Confidence of Latrine Producers](image-url)
- Improved reputation within the community.

The actual profit earned from SaTo pan latrines reported by latrine producers varies widely; six latrine producers reported higher profits (as much as 100 BDT) and three reported profit losses (as much as 50 BDT) compared to profits earned from selling latrines with locally-produced plastic pans. However, profit loss was deemed acceptable to latrine producers interviewed for a variety of reasons: 1) latrine producers are selling latrines at a higher sales volume, compensating for the loss in per-unit profit; 2) latrine producers see long term potential of FFT product to help scale up their business and achieve greater success in the long run; 3) latrine producers feel civicly compelled to contribute to health and environmental improvements within their community; and 4) latrine producers are willing to invest in new technologies because they believe it will attract consumers and eventually become profitable.

**Latrine producers have not significantly altered their business model.**

While the SanMark pilot has generally improved latrine producers’ business and business confidence, it has not had an effect on their business model or the fundamental way in which they do business. Interview data suggests that latrine producers continue to view themselves as producers of concrete inputs for latrines rather than full FFT latrine producers or providers of bundled latrine services. Most of the latrine producers interviewed were pleased to see their sales volume expand and felt proud for contributing to the improvement of the environment. However, latrine producers made no advancements toward sanitation dealers and do not understand the fundamental nature of the FFT brand.

**Latrine producers do not frequently engage consumers in upgrading behavior.**

The evaluation found that most latrine producers are not engaged in upgrading behavior. When selling latrines, latrine producers tend to offer latrine models that they believe the consumer can afford based on perceived income-level status rather than pushing consumers to purchase a higher grade. While most latrine producers recognized that they can earn more profit by selling a higher model, they have either not yet internalized the fact that selling higher FFT latrine models can help them grow their business by earning more profit or have not been motivated to make a greater effort to up sell consumers.

However, there are several notable exceptions of early-adopters of upgrading behavior among the latrine producers interviewed. For example, one latrine producer interviewed indicated that he explains the price...
advantage of the Masters FFT model to consumers. An additional latrine producer noted he follows up with each household after the sale of an FFT model to offer a second pit.

Latrine producers interviewed generally said that these activities are often not successful because consumers do not understand the benefits of upgrading their latrine. It should be noted that pits purchased at the beginning of the SanMark pilot are not yet full and may be the reason for limited uptake of upgrading behavior among latrine producers and consumers. We expect to see an increase in upgrading behaviors over the next year as pits begin to fill.

**The transition from latrine producer to sanitation dealer is more concept than reality.**

Almost half of the latrine producers interviewed for the evaluation only produce and sell only the Primary FFT model as opposed to the full product line composed of five FFT models ranging in quality and price. Several latrine producers interviewed explained that they only produce the Primary model because it is the most affordable option for poor consumers. This lack of investment in the production of higher FFT latrine models is attributed to a lack of consumer demand and a lack of knowledge among latrine producers concerning the production of more complex latrine systems. Some latrine producers also lack the flush funnel mold required to produce offset systems due to its high cost. This severely limits their ability to expand their FFT latrine offerings.

Latrine producers are not yet providing essential elements of bundled latrine services. Only half of the latrine producers interviewed supply plastic pipes for offset latrines. Moreover, no latrine producer interviewed routinely offers latrine installation services. A few latrine producers indicated that they occasionally aid consumers with latrine installation if the consumers are unable to install the latrine themselves. This finding was triangulated with consumer interviews.

On average, latrine producers interviewed channel more than 30% of their business toward the production of other concrete inputs outside of latrines, such as pipes, cow feeders, and cook stoves. Additionally, many of the latrine producers interviewed has other businesses as well. Four latrine producers interviewed indicated that they have seen or expect to see the sanitation portion of their business expand in the next six months. This finding indicates that latrine producers may be beginning to see value in specializing in sanitation as their latrine input sales volume increases.

The evaluation found that latrine producers lack a clear vision of what a sanitation dealer is and why it is beneficial to change their established course of business to fulfill the concept of a sanitation dealer. Small subsets of latrine producers in Rajshahi district are currently offering bundled sanitation products and services. However, this is being done in coordination with BRAC’s subsidized latrine program rather than being influenced by the SanMark pilot.

**Latrine producers insufficiently communicate with consumers.**

The evaluation team found that the latrine producer is one of the most important influencers in determining the type of latrine purchased by consumers. Most consumers looking to purchase a latrine come into the latrine producer’s shop uninformed about the various types of latrines offered and are only interested in purchasing the cheapest option available. 100% of latrine producers interviewed indicated that they attempt to convince consumers to purchase a SaTo pan rather than the locally produced plastic pan because of it hygienic qualities. Although the SaTo pan is more expensive than the locally produced
plastic pan, latrine producers are generally successful at convincing consumers to buy the SaTo pan. This finding signifies that latrine producers can be persuasive marketers. Moreover, consumers can be convinced to upgrade when a product is convincingly marketed.

Moreover, the evaluation team found that most latrine producers determine the specific FFT model to offer consumer based on the consumer’s perceived income-level. In this case, the sanitation market is prevented from operating efficiently. The evaluation team found that latrine producers may withhold product information or refuse to upsell a particular product for two main reasons: fear not being repaid if sold on credit and desire to protect consumers from incurring additional debt. As a result, latrine producers are missing out on potential profits from selling more costly FFT models. Also, consumers may be more able to pay or willing to take on debt than latrine producers assume in order to purchase the FFT latrine model they actually desire.

Latrine producers fail to engage in marketing activities.

Marketing activities for the FFT models by latrine producers is limited. The evaluation found that, on average, latrine producers did not see the value in engaging in marketing activities and lacked knowledge on the benefits of such activities. Roughly 30% of latrine producers interviewed indicated that they do not engage in any marketing activities. Signboard strategically placed outside of the production site or in the nearest village center was found to be the most common form of marketing among latrine producers. This promotion strategy was found to be inadequate since signage provided by iDE is text heavy and the majority of the population within in project is illiterate. Latrine producers do not know what is written on these FFT advertisements. This finding significantly contributes to the lack of brand awareness among latrine producers and consumers.

80% of latrine producers believe they have no competition from other latrine producers in their area and/or their competitors do not negatively affect their business since, unlike their neighbor, they are able to offer a high quality product. Additionally, latrine producers interviewed fail to engage in marketing behaviors since consumers already come to them for sanitation products.

Few exemplary latrine producers have emerged as positive deviants, successfully engaging in effective promotional activities. Of the positive deviants identified, the evaluation team found these latrine producers had well-established relationships with iDE project staff. Promotional activities include: the employment of a bicycle-powered megaphone announcer to market sanitation products, the initiation of monthly sales meetings where consumers can experience the product and ask questions (latrine producer offers snacks to incentivize attendance) and the use community-based sales representatives to market sanitation products door-to-door. Two latrine producers interviewed employed sales representatives, while two additional latrine producers expressed plans to employ sales representatives in the future.
The latrine producer-sales representative model is effective at increasing sales but the majority of latrine producers remain unconvinced of the model’s cost advantage.

The evaluation team interviewed two sales representatives employed by the same latrine producer. The sales representatives interviewed were both successful at securing additional business for their employer—one sales representative was so effective that the latrine producer offered to promote him from a commission-based to a full-time salaried position. The sales representatives interviewed visited several villages each week to convince families with unhygienic latrines to purchase a hygienic latrine from their employer. Both sales representatives interviewed reported using a household’s perceived income status as the basis to determine which FFT model to offer the family.

One sales representative mentioned that he could make even more sales and would market FFT models to community clubs, schools, and marketplaces if his employer could keep up with demand. This finding illustrates the advantage of employing sales representatives to strengthen the business/promotional marketing of latrine producers. Nevertheless, the majority of latrine producers are not aware of the logistics or benefits of hiring a community-based sales representative.

The government and NGO subsidy programs play a large role in the sanitation market.

The evaluation found that most latrine producers view contracts for government and NGO latrine subsidy programs a business opportunity. Of those questioned, ten latrine producers (77%) reported that they currently have an NGO or government contract to supply latrines or are seeking one. These contracts are more desirable among latrine producers because they provide large amounts of business, are profitable (the evaluation found occasionally through kickbacks), allow for the use of lower quality products, and come with advance payment. The evaluation did not find any evidence that subsidy programs are distorting local latrine markets; these programs do not appear to have a significant negative effect on the local business environment for latrines. The vast majority of latrine producers that participate in subsidy programs continue to sell latrines to households, and latrine producers did not report altering prices or production levels for household latrines due to their subsidy contracts. Additionally, none of the households interviewed mentioned the opportunity to receive a subsidized latrine, although this finding is constrained by the evaluation’s sample size.

Latrines produced for subsidy schemes are typically of lower quality than those produced for household consumers.

Latrine producers interviewed reported a difference in quality between latrines produced for households and those produced for government or NGO subsidy programs. Eight of the latrine producers interviewed specifically referenced the quality of their products as a point of pride, although this only applied to latrine inputs built for household consumers.
Two latrine producers (that were likely more honest than others) recounted how they do not use the same quality of inputs in their contract latrines and do not provide the same guarantees of durability that comes with their household latrines. The latrine producers did not explain why, but the difference is likely related to the absence of a relationship between latrine producers and households when latrines are distributed through subsidy programs. Additionally, lower quality latrines increase latrine producers’ profit margins, further incentivizing subsidy contracts. The limited data available suggests that latrine producers earn just as much or more per latrine produced for subsidy programs; in three cases, latrine producers earned 150 BDT to 300 BDT profit for each latrine produced for the local Union Parishad or BRAC.

**Latrine producers have access to a variety of financing options and there is a lack of demand for a new financial product.**

As Figure 4 illustrates, the latrine producers interviewed receive financing for their business from a variety of sources. The evaluation found that latrine producers see no shame in taking out a loan for their business, but there is also a sense of pride in not relying on loans to finance their business. The majority of latrine producers interviewed also offer credit to consumers who are not able to pay upfront, and one latrine producer reported that the proportion of consumers requiring credit has not changed since the FFT latrine was introduced. Additionally, the evaluation found that all latrine producers interviewed have adequate opportunity to access loans through local MFIs should they choose to do so.

The majority of latrine producers interviewed indicated that their business goals over the next six months include scaling up their business, and they identified capital constraints as a key roadblock to reaching that goal. However, the latrine producers did not express any interest in a new financial product to help overcome their financing challenges, indicating that a lack of available loans is not the problem. A few of the latrine producers expressed interest in securing loans at a lower interest rate, though an economic analysis of Rajshahi’s loan market would be necessary to evaluate whether their interest is realistic and feasible.

**Latrine producers are uncertain about the effects of a mass produced full plastic latrine on the sustainability of their business.**

The evaluation team was able to discuss the possibility of a full plastic solution with eleven latrine producers in the project area. The strongest concern was that a full plastic latrine would eat into their profits and result in a decrease in business. There are two reasons that were identified by the latrine producers as to why they held this view. First, the latrine producers make a large portion of their profit on a latrine from the slab. They were concerned that a full plastic solution would take away that profitable input. Second, the latrine producers believed that local shopkeepers and hardware store owners would stock the plastic components, enabling households to easily purchase and install the plastic inputs and thus not need the latrine producer.
The evaluation research found that a majority of the latrine producers had concerns about the quality of a mass-market full plastic latrine. It is likely that consumers hold the same belief as latrine producers: that concrete is of superior quality and durability when compared to plastic. Second, the interviews found that over half of the latrine producers expressed concern about the price of a full plastic latrine solution. The latrine producers view consumers as having low capacity to spend additional money on latrines and were concerned (without the evaluation team providing price points) that a full plastic solution would be more expensive than the current offerings.

**Recommendations for iDE Bangladesh**

1. **Clearly define the concept of a sanitation dealer for latrine producers and demonstrate that market-based incentives exist for adopting a bundled approach to providing sanitation products and services.**
   - In order for the concept of a sanitation dealer to become reality, latrine producers must better understand what the concept is and how it will benefit their business. The FFT brand must also be improved and promoted more widely by RFL and iDE Bangladesh.

2. **Overcome information asymmetries between latrine producers and consumers to prevent market failure through above the line marketing to both latrine producers and consumers.**
   - Latrine producers and consumers would benefit if full information were available and widely known. Latrine producers could potentially earn more profit by selling higher FFT latrine models and consumers can achieve greater utility by choosing the FFT latrine model that is best for their household.
   - Latrine producers are unlikely to be able to convince subsidizing agencies to use the SaTo pan as a hygienic and cost-effective alternative to the locally-produced plastic pans and ceramic pans, so RFL and iDE Bangladesh should ensure that governments and NGOs are convinced of the SaTo pan’s beneficial qualities.

3. **Provide technical assistance to RFL to develop pricing and marketing strategy for full plastic solution.**
   - The evaluation team recommends that iDE Bangladesh provides technical assistance to RFL to determine consumer willingness to pay for a full plastic latrine, in order to better understand the market for a full plastic solution.
   - The evaluation team recommends that iDE Bangladesh assist RFL in developing a marketing strategy for latrine producers that addresses the main concerns raised by the latrine producers. First, the marketing strategy needs to provide a compelling explanation of the cost advantage for latrine producers. This should include information regarding: price of full plastic latrine, estimated profit margins, and any potential for labor cost savings. The potential for labor cost savings was raised by one latrine producer who believed a full plastic solution would allow him to reduce the number of masons or day laborers employed. Secondly, the plan must address concerns regarding the quality and durability of a full plastic solution.
found that, among latrine producers, the RFL brand is synonymous with high quality products, which can be leveraged to roll out a full plastic solution.

**Evaluation Results: Consumers**

**Background**

Twenty-three interviews were conducted with households across the project area; six interviews were held with male heads of households and eighteen were held with a female member of the household. This evaluation defines the nuclear family as a husband, a wife and their children, but if the husband is the eldest son, the paternal grandparents are also included in the nuclear family. Additionally, the evaluation uses the term joint family households to refer to multiple family units, typically brothers and their parents, and their individual nuclear families living together in one compound with shared monetary resources and assets. In this case, the eldest son or his father is considered to be the head of household. Household interviews aimed to answer the following questions:

- Who was reached by SanMark program and how satisfied are households with the new latrine?
- Why or why not did consumers purchase a latrine, and what were the triggers/motivators and barriers of purchasing a latrine?
- What type of latrine do consumers prefer and what is the aspirational latrine product for consumers?
- How is the decision made to purchase a latrine or a specific system within the FFT line?
- Do households have access to finance and how do households pay for their latrines?
- Has the SanMark pilot impacted communities’ position on the sanitation ladder?
- What segments have emerged for the five latrine design types during the SanMark pilot in Rajshahi District?
- How can the current latrine offering be improved to better appeal to consumers?

**Findings**

**Motivations for latrine purchase include: replacing a broken latrine, installing a hygienic latrine, and impressing others.**

All households interviewed had previously owned a latrine, however, the majority of households previously owned an unhygienic latrine. Open defecation was not practiced by households due to the social shame associated with exposing one’s body in public and safety concerns for women and girls. The interviews revealed that the main motivator of latrine purchase was a broken latrine. Many households reported needing a new latrine since their previous one was “out of order,” or no longer functional.

Additionally, many households discussed purchasing a new latrine because they wanted a hygienic latrine to decrease odor, flies, and sickness. One woman interviewed commented that she purchased a new latrine since her child was repeatedly fell ill due to the previous unhygienic latrine. Everyone we spoke with was familiar with the term hygienic, gaining this knowledge from NGO community workers, latrine producers, or neighbors.

“**My daughter is 12 and will get married soon. Having a good latrine is important to find an eligible man to marry my daughter. I also want to plaster and paint the house since men will come here to see her.**”

- Female in the household
Lastly, households were motivated to purchase a new latrine in order to impress others. A recurrent theme in interviews with households that had daughters was the importance of a new latrine to help find an eligible man for their daughters to marry. In the communities interviewed, men and their families visit the homes of young girls in order to make a decision to marry. This finding highlights the importance of superstructures in the overall valuation of a latrine.

**Consumer decision-making includes multiple members of the family and is largely driven by the latrine producer’s offerings.**

The initial decision to purchase a latrine is often made as a family. Most commonly, women ask their husbands for a new latrine and a discussion follows regarding finances and latrine preferences. Ultimately, final decision-making rests with the male head of household. Women who are income generators in the family tended to have a larger role in household decision-making. Income generating women discussed saving money for the purchase of a latrine. Although women and girls are commonly involved in the decision making process, they are not typically present at time of purchase since it is uncommon for women to travel to market.

After the decision has been made to purchase a new latrine, the male head of household visits the latrine producer and asks for a hygienic latrine. As mentioned previously, households are typically unaware of latrine options prior to this interaction with the latrine producer, although some had seen their neighbor’s or a family member’s SaTo pan, referring to it as the “blue pan.” Latrine producers typically influence consumers’ decision to purchase the SaTo pan because it eliminates odors and insects, requires less water than other pans, and the stool is not visible. Many consumers noted that the SaTo pan was the only hygienic pan available at the latrine producers shop. Latrine producers also told consumers which other inputs to purchase, typically three to five rings and a slab from the latrine producer and pipes from the market for offset systems. Households were familiar with the benefits of a double pit system and knew the difference between direct versus offset pits, although it is unclear whether this information was acquired during the purchase interaction with the latrine producers.

**The SaTo pan and FFT brands were not recognized or known by consumers.**

Only one out of 23 households was familiar with the brand SaTo pan. Households primarily referred to SaTo pan as “blue pan”, although a few households labeled SaTo pan the “RFL pan.” Likewise, only one household was familiar with the FFT brand, referring to the product as the “Bondu toilet.”

Households do not consider the entire FFT latrine system as one product, but rather a number of latrine parts or inputs. The majority of households interviewed purchased the necessary latrine parts over a number of days from different sources rather than at one time from the latrine producers. Additionally, the majority of households were responsible for transportation and installation of their latrine, which is in contrast to iDE’s vision.

**Consumers interviewed were most likely to purchase the single pit offset system within the Family Friend Toilet line and were satisfied with their purchase.**

The majority of households interviewed either purchased a direct pit or an offset, single pit system due to limited financial resources. Offset was preferred for safety reasons, since many people knew of children...
and adults falling into direct pit systems, and for the ability to add a second pit in the future. This conflicts with information gained from latrine producers, indicating higher sales of Primary direct pit systems. This disparity could be a result of sampling bias due to purposive sampling. The evaluation team was connected to many households through iDE volunteers working in the pilot areas.

Besides adding another pit, upgrading to another system in the FFT line was not commonly discussed during the interviews. A few households interviewed had a Masters system, stating that they were persuaded to take out loans to purchase the Masters system without regard for household income level by a community worker from an organization referred to as PSCC.

100% of households interviewed were satisfied with their new latrine and stated that they prefer their new latrine to the their previous latrine for the following reasons: the attached cover which shields against odors, insects and visible stool, the “beautiful” color of the SaTo pan, and minimal amount of water required for flushing. The majority of families interviewed highlighted that they were early adopters of the SaTo pan in their communities and were proud to show neighbors and families their new latrine.

**Barriers purchasing upgrading behaviors within the FFT product line include: price, lack of knowledge about latrine options, and future plans for household improvement.**

The greatest constraint for households is cost. Most households interviewed paid for their latrine in one payment with savings, although some respondents utilized loans and installment payments. In contrast to what latrine producers reported, households reported that many latrine producers did not offer installment and/or credit options. However, consumers have access to financial loan products through a number of NGOs and microfinance institutions including: ASHA, Thengamara Mohila Sabuj Sangha (TMSS), Islamia, Grameen Shakti, Village Education Resource Center (VERC), Grameen Foundation, and PSCC. While consumers have access to financial products, interviews revealed that there are negative social perceptions associated with loan usage. Both women and men stated that loans were only for the ultra poor, and that they did not use loans because they are of a higher socioeconomic status. Additionally, one respondent discussed that people with loans suffer greatly as a result of high interest rates.

Lack of knowledge regarding latrine options is an additional barrier to purchasing and upgrading behaviors. As discussed previously, many households are uninformed about their options and therefore rely on the latrine producer to influence their decision. This could negatively impact upgrading behavior among consumers who do not know about the full line of FFT products and services.

Another deterrent to purchasing a better latrine in the FFT line or upgrading a current latrine is that almost household interviewed expressed goals to improve their homes by building a brick house with an attached latrine. Many women stated that their primary reason for purchasing the Primary, Secondary, or Higher Secondary FFT systems is due to plans to improve their home; many households considered the SaTo pan a temporary latrine.

**The aspirational latrine product is a double pit substructure with a ceramic pan and a brick or cement superstructure.**

The CAWST Sanitation Ladder Activity and questions about future goals revealed a number of key findings regarding consumer preferences. The latrines that were considered the best during the Sanitation Ladder activity are illustrated in Figure 5 below:
Latrine preference was highly determined by both the substructure and superstructure. The aspirational product for households is a double pit substructure with a brick or cement superstructure with door, walls, and roof. Only one of the women who stated a preference for a ceramic pan over a SaTo pan had ever used one. Two forces drove the preference for ceramic pans. First, that the ceramic pan is common in the homes of wealthier families, in office buildings, and in urban parts of Bangladesh. Second, women prefer the ceramic pan because of its shiny white appearance and the perception that it is easier to clean. Women mentioned seeing commercials for Harpic, a locally available and widely used cleaning product, showing a shiny, clean ceramic pan.

A double pit system is preferred among households interviewed since it increases the lifespan of the latrine. Use of compost for agriculture was not discussed as a reason for wanting a double pit system versus single pit system. There is also a popular belief that adding more rings will increase the time span before the latrine fills. This could have negative ramifications in areas where the water table is high, which is common in many regions of Bangladesh.

Lastly, households have strong preferences regarding the superstructure. The majority of households interviewed had fencing constructed out of reeds surrounding the latrine, with a hung piece of cloth material for the door. Consumers prefer tin and mud to reed fencing, and preferred brick and cement the most. A roof was an important aspect that many women discussed wanting to add in the near future, if there was not one already.

Recommendations for iDE Bangladesh

1. Develop stronger brand positioning, personality, and execution and use commercial marketing techniques to increase brand recognition and awareness.

   - The evaluation team recommends that iDE Bangladesh develop a stronger brand identity for the FFT models, focused on functional and emotional benefits of the latrine models with clearly recognizable logos and positioning statements. Additionally, we found very little to no marketing of the product so improving marketing techniques and methods mix would improve brand recognition and awareness. Lastly, the SaTo pan should only be produced in a
set range of colors due to the finding that households associated the better quality, hygienic product with the bright blue color.

2. **Highlight the ease of cleaning the SaTo pan and the shiny plastic finish in advertisements for SaTo pan.**

   - The evaluation team recommends that iDE Bangladesh focus on specific attributes of the SaTo pan that resonate with women, including ease of cleaning and shiny appearance. Advertisements should show a shiny, sparkling pan in an attached brick superstructure.

3. **Improve the latrine producer’s consumer facing sales and marketing skills.**

   - The evaluation team recommends that iDE Bangladesh develop standard marketing tools that can be used by latrine producers to advertise, promote, and sell the line of FFT. As many of the consumers and latrine producers are illiterate, the marketing tools should be pictorial and not text based, as many of the current materials are now. Additionally, training on sales interactions should be developed and led by iDE with an emphasis on upgrading since currently latrine producers are not informing consumers of the range of options available.

4. **Include options for affordable superstructures in the new line of latrine products.**

   - The evaluation team recommends that iDE Bangladesh include superstructures in their product offerings based on the finding that consumers’ valuation and willingness to pay is highly impacted by components that are visual to others. While brick and cement are aspirational, for target segments with limited resources, tin might be a better alternative to reed fencing due to durability. Lastly, durability of latrine component parts and time till the pit fills were important determinants in choosing between multiple latrine options. Focusing on the importance of double pit systems versus adding additional rings to a single pit system will be important in regions of Bangladesh with higher water tables.

5. **Develop value propositions for the following segments: households with adolescent daughters near or of marrying age, joint family households, and households with income generating women.**

   - The evaluation team recommends that iDE Bangladesh focus targeted marketing on the three segments above, tailoring communications based on behavioral and psychographic attributes. The social marketing plan in the following section provides audience profiles and value propositions for the identified segments.
SOCIAL MARKETING PLAN

Consumer Segmentation Objectives and Methodology

The GWU team undertook a qualitative study of households in Rajshahi to develop a strong understanding of their needs, desires and willingness to pay for quality (hygienic) latrine products and services.

Consumer segmentation was conducted utilizing the SaniFOAM behavior change framework to provide more nuanced insights into behaviors of different types of households to ensure effective targeting of SanMark activities and deliver greater impact. The SaniFOAM framework\(^2\) categorizes research finding into categories of behavioral determinants. The three main behavioral determinants include opportunity, ability and motivation and are defined as:

- **Opportunity**: Does the individual have the chance to perform the desired behavior?
- **Ability**: Is the individual capable of performing the desired behavior?
- **Motivation**: Does the individual want to perform the desired behavior?

Behavioral indicators and attitudes of households were analyzed to identify key drivers of latrine purchase and classify target audiences into homogenous segments that are meaningfully different from each other with regard to propensity for latrine purchase and upgrading behavior.

Three segments for targeted marketing were identified, which are as follows:

- Joint family households

\(^2\) www.wsp.org/node/86
- Households with income generating women
- Households with adolescent daughters near or of marrying age

**Consumer Segment Profiles**

**Farhan: Joint Family Household**

Farhan is 36 and lives in a shared family compound with his wife, three children, elderly mother, four brother and their wives and children in Baghmara Upazila—17 people in total. Farhan is illiterate and works as an agricultural day laborer. As the eldest brother, Farhan is responsible for household finances and all household decision making. Every week, he goes with his brothers to the market to purchase food and other goods for the household. Farhan is concerned about bringing home enough income to support his large family. Per established gender norms in his community, he is not involved in looking after the children.

Farhan purchased the first latrine for his household 12 years ago. The household currently has a hand dug, direct pit latrine located inside of the house. Farhan identifies this latrine as unhygienic because it produces “bad smells” and he can see the stool.

Farhan plans to move the household latrine outside of the compound because of the bad smells. Additionally, his wife, mother and sister-in-laws do not feel comfortable using the current latrine since its location inside of the household does not offer very much privacy. Farhan has seen latrines with ceramic pans on the television. He dreams of owning a ceramic pan because people living in Rajshahi City own ceramic pans in their homes. He has never heard of FFT or SaTo pan.

**Demographics**

- **Household Composition**—Extended family with many dependents. A joint family household is defined as multiple family units, typically brothers and their parents, and their individual nuclear families living together in one compound with shared monetary resources and assets.
- **House Type**—Mud
- **Income status**—Very low; several income streams, however females do not contribute to household income
- **Nature of income**—Agricultural; seasonal (highest in January-March and May)
- **Education**—Low literacy rates

**Psychographics and Determinants of Behavior**

- **Aspirations**—Farhan wants to build a brick house for his nuclear family and purchase a new double-pit latrine with a permanent brick superstructure, tin roof and a ceramic pan but does not currently have the money to do so. Each family in the compound would prefer to have their own latrine.
- **Willingness to access loans**—Households commonly access loans for home improvement purchases. Commonly used financial institutions include the Grameenbank, ASHA, and BRAC. Purchased refrigerator and chairs in installments because the household could not afford to pay in one installment.
- **Routine**—Farhan rises early each day to work in the fields and returns home in the late afternoon to shower, eat and relax with his family. As the head of household, Farhan is responsible for making weekly trips to the market to purchase food and other household items for household. The market is easily accessible.
• **Worries**—Farhan worries about providing for his large family. Upgrading his latrine is not an immediate priority. Priority expenditures include food, investing in business interests such as livestock and agriculture, and pursuing lifestyle improvements such as a television and refrigerator.

• **Values**—Family and religion. Wants to live a life of dignity and respect.

• **Decision-making**—Patriarch responsible for household decision making

**Media Habits**

• Television, neighbors, and family are the most trusted source of new information for rural households.

• Literacy is very low, so information is commonly transmitted through audio/visual means

**Adwaita: Households with income generating women**

Adwaita is 23 years old she is the mother of two sons ages 16 and 8, and lives with her husband and children in Durgapur. Her husband is an agricultural laborer. During the day, Adwaita is busy with household chores and works as a tailor late into the night in order to supplement her husband’s income to finance her sons’ education. Adwaita considers her life easy because she has a loving husband and she does not spend her days doing hard labor in the field. She worries about her children’s health and education and wants to provide a better life for them.

Adwaita’s youngest son learned about hygienic latrines in school and shared this knowledge with the family. The family decided together to purchase a new latrine. This new latrine has one “house” [direct pit] with eight rings and a blue pan. It is different from her old latrine because the blue pan has a cover that keeps flies and bad smells away. Her family is the first household in the neighborhood to purchase this latrine. Adwaita is very proud of her new latrine and likes to show it off to the other women her neighborhood. The superstructure on Adwaita’s new latrine is made of a tin roof and fence walls, which is all her family can afford. Some day she hopes to upgrade her latrine to include a brick superstructure with a door and a ceramic pan; she thinks ceramic pans looks beautiful and are “shiny” and “easy to clean.” An improved superstructure is especially important to Adwaita since the fencing on her current structure does not allow for much privacy and comfort. Adwaita currently owns an unhygienic latrine but is interested in purchasing a new hygienic latrine. However, she has never heard of FFT or SaTo pan.

**Demographics**

• *Household composition*—Nuclear family

• *House type*—Cement

• *Income status*—Moderately low; male is the primary income generator, however female supplements household income with tailoring and livestock activities

• *Nature of income*—agricultural laborer

• *Education*—Low literacy rates

**Psychographics and Determinants of Behavior**

• *Aspirations*—Adwaita desperately wants to build a better life for her children. She works hard to supplement her family’s income so that she can afford private tutoring for her sons. She wants to upgrade her latrine with permanent brick superstructure and ceramic pan since she is concerned about privacy and believes the ceramic pan is cleaner and more prestigious than her current blue pan [SaTo pan].
**Willingness to access loans**—Moderately low-income households typically do not access loans. Loans are perceived to be for the ultra-poor. Adwaita does not consider her family to be ultra poor and chooses to save for larger purchases instead of taking out a loan. She and her husband are able to save 40 Taka per week.

**Routine**—Adwaita rises early to begin her daily chores, which include cooking and cleaning for her family, feeding poultry, and praying. Once her family goes to bed, she stays up to work on her tailoring in order to supplement her husband’s income.

**Decision-making**—Family shares responsibility for household decision making, however ultimate decision rests with male head of household.

**Worries**—Adwaita worries about her children’s health and education. She also worries about her social status and how her neighbors perceive her.

**Values**—Adwaita values her privacy and is willing to pay more for privacy and convenience.

**Media Habits:**
- Television, neighbors, and family are the most trusted source of new information for rural households.
- Literacy is very low, so information is commonly transmitted through audio/visual means.

---

**Iftekhar: Households with adolescent daughters**

Iftekhar is 30 years old. He lives with his wife and children (two daughters and son) in Mohonpur and works as an agricultural laborer and van driver. Iftekhar’s eldest daughter is twelve years old and he is hoping to soon find a good match for her marriage. Iftekhar’s current latrine is a slab set over a direct, unlined pit. However, it filled up a month ago and is currently “out of order.”

Iftekhar is building a new brick home in order to attract a good match for his daughter’s marriage. Additionally, rather than emptying his existing pit, Iftekhar hopes to install a masters system including brick walls and a tin roof since he heard that bridegrooms’ families give importance to latrines. He learned of this new latrine system from his sister and brother-in-law, who purchased the masters system a few months ago.

Iftekhar took out loans to pay for the inputs and construction of his new brick home. However, he does not plan to take out additional loans to pay for the purchase of a new latrine. Instead he will pay for the latrine in installments. Iftekhar worries about his family’s perceived social status, financing his daughter’s marriage, and ensuring the modesty of his wife and daughters.

**Demographics**

- **Household** composition—Adolescent daughter(s) aged 11-18 years at home
- **House Type**—Brick house
- **Income status**—Very low/moderately low
- **Nature of income**—Agricultural laborer and van driver
- **Education**—High illiteracy rates

**Psychographics and Determinants of Behavior:**

- **Aspirations**—Iftekhar aspires to soon find a good match for his eldest daughter’s marriage.
- **Willingness to access loans**—Households commonly take out loans to finance dowry, home improvement purchases and other costs associated with a daughter’s marriage.
▪ **Routine**—Iftekar leaves for the fields early in the morning and works most of the day. In the evening, he prays, eats dinner, and watches cricket on the television.

▪ **Decision-making**—Patriarch responsible for household decision-making

▪ **Worries**—Iftekhar worries about the marriage of his eldest daughter. He is overwhelmed and worries about repaying the loans he has taken out to finance the construction of his family’s new brick house.

▪ **Values**—Values social prestige and will do anything to arrange for his daughter to marry a good and respectable man

**Media Habits:**

▪ Television, neighbors, and family are the most trusted source of new information for rural households.

▪ Illiteracy is very high, so information is commonly transmitted through audio/visual means

**Table 1: Perceived Benefits and Barriers of Desired Behavior Versus Competing Behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Benefits or Motivators</th>
<th>Desired Behavior: Purchase latrine model in FFT product line and initiate upgrading behavior</th>
<th>Competing Behavior: Purchase local latrine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• SaTo pan is hygienic, easy to clean and has no bad smell</td>
<td>• Familiarity with FFT product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Availability of FFT within the community</td>
<td>• Easy to clean ceramic pan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cost advantage of double pit latrine when purchased is staggered</td>
<td>• Prestige associated with ceramic pan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trust TV, neighbors and friends as sources of new information</td>
<td>• Heavy subsidy programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Privacy (emphasis on women)</td>
<td>• Quality of local plastic pan—unhygienic (smells bad, can see flies and stool)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shame/embarrassment associated with unhygienic latrine ownership</td>
<td>• Monetary costs associated with ceramic pan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prestige</td>
<td>• Availability of ceramic pan within the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multiple income streams to offset costs of product</td>
<td>• Requires more water than SaTo pan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Barriers or Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Monetary costs associated with purchase of all latrine inputs, transport and installation</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marketing Objectives

This social marketing campaign developed for iDE Bangladesh’s SanMark Pilot Project is intended to achieve the ultimate goal of contributing to improved sanitation-related health outcomes in Rajshahi district through improvements in private sector provision of hygienic latrines. This goal will be achieved through the following objectives:

- **Behavior Objective:** To purchase a FFT latrine and initiate upgrading behavior
- **Knowledge Objective:** To increase knowledge of FFT brand, including various latrine options available in the FFT product line and the cost advantage associated with purchase of FFT versus locally available latrines
- **Belief Objective:** *Iftekhar*—To increase belief around prestige of FFT and the effect it will have on daughter’s marriage.
- **Belief Objective:** *Adwaita*—To increase belief around prestige of FFT (its shine and ease of clean) and the effect it will have on family’s health, happiness, and status within the community.
- **Belief Objective:** *Farhan*—To increase belief around the affordability of and privacy offered by FFT.

Brand

The most important attribute of the SaTo Pan and FFT line to consumers are ease of cleanliness, prestige, affordability, and reduced odor. The brand should embody these product aspects, as well as clarifying that the FFT models are upgradeable systems and not simply collections of latrine inputs.

Brand Personality and Positioning Strategies

Based on our strategic segments, we developed the following tailored personality and positioning strategies:

**Farhan: Joint Family Household**

- **Personality:** Family-oriented, private, affordable
- **Positioning:** For Farhan, purchase of FFT latrine is affordable and the best way to achieve convenience, safety, and privacy for women in his household.

**Adwaita: Households with income generating women**

- **Personality:** Protective, hygienic, confident, clean, shiny
- **Positioning:** For Adwaita, purchase of FFT latrine is the best way to protect children from sickness, promote a clean home, and compete with neighbors, which makes her a proud mother.

**Iftekhar: Households with adolescent daughters**

- **Personality:** Clean, prestigious, dignified
- **Positioning:** For Iftekhar, purchase of a FFT latrine is the best way protect his family’s prestige in the community and impress future in-laws to ensure a good marriage match for his daughter.
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APPENDIX 1: EVALUATION STUDY DESIGN AND PROTOCOL

Background

The goal of this project is to evaluate iDE Bangladesh’s SanMark Pilot: Private Sector-Led Sanitation Project in three pilot upazilas in Rajshahi District, Bangladesh. Key findings will guide development of programmatic recommendations for iDE Bangladesh and a social marketing plan to improve targeted marketing for key segments, which focuses on improving brand recognition to facilitate sustained product uptake and upgrading behavior.

Evaluation Questions

The evaluation aims to answer the following questions:

- What segments have emerged for the five latrine design types during the SanMark pilot in Rajshahi District?
- How can the current latrine offering be improved to better appeal to consumers based on developed generalized personas and value propositions?
- What impact has the SanMark pilot had on the business model of latrine producers?
- Has the SanMark pilot impacted the community’s position on the sanitation ladder?
- Is the concept of latrine producers becoming sanitation dealers viable and realistic?
- What role do the Union Parishad governments play in the sanitation market?

Objectives

The evaluation focused on the main stakeholders and beneficiaries involved with or impacted by the project. The objectives of the evaluation are categorized below by stakeholders and beneficiaries.

Objectives for research with RFL are to understand:

- How does RFL interact with the local governments, NGOs, and latrine producers?
- How does RFL Dhaka (headquarters) message the SaTo pan project/endeavor down to their local staff (dealers and sales representatives)?
- What does RFL need to do to turn the latrine producers into a more integrated network of rural retailers?
- What should the training model for latrine producers look like when RFL assumes full management?

Objectives for research with local government (Union Parishad chairman and DPHE) are to understand:

- What role does the public sector play in the sanitation market in the project area?
- Are government subsidies distorting the market for latrines and creating an unpredictable environment?
Objectives for research with latrine producers are to understand:

- What impact has the SanMark pilot project had on the business model of latrines producers?
- Is the concept of latrine producers become sanitation dealers viable and realistic?
- What is the extent of upgrading marketing behavior among the latrine producers?
- What is the current relationship between the latrine producers and representatives of RFL?
- How do latrine producers finance their business and would the latrine producers benefit from a new financial product?
- What does iDE need to do to help RFL market a mass-produced plastic latrine?
- What type of marketing and price points would be most effective at increasing uptake of the full plastic latrine?

Objectives for research with consumers are to understand:

- Who was reached by SanMark program and how satisfied are households with the new latrine?
- Why or why not did consumers purchase a latrine, and what were the triggers/motivators and barriers of purchasing a latrine?
- What type of latrine do consumers prefer and what is the aspirational latrine product for consumers?
- How is the decision made to purchase a latrine or a specific system within the Family Friend Toilet line?
- Do households have access to finance and how do households pay for their latrines?
- Has the SanMark pilot impacted communities’ position on the sanitation ladder?
- What segments have emerged for the five latrine design types during the SanMark pilot in Rajshahi District?
- How can the current latrine offering be improved to better appeal to consumers?

Evaluation Design

This evaluation will take place in the three pilot upazilas of Baghmara, Durgapur, and Mohanpur in the Rajshahi district of Bangladesh. Study participants will include latrine producers and their sales representatives, Union Parishad chairmen and Department of Public Health and Engineering (DPHE) engineers, RFL Plastics representatives, iDE SanMark volunteers, and households/consumers in the three pilot areas. Semi-structured, open-ended qualitative in-depth interviews will be conducted during the time period of March 4 to March 18, 2014. Participants will be recruited through purposive sampling with aid of iDE project staff and SanMark volunteers. Inclusion criteria for participation in the study is residing or working in the pilot areas of Baghmara, Durgapur, and Mohanpur. Verbal consent will be obtained prior to all interviews. No compensation will be provided for participation in the study.

Data Collection and Analysis

Interviews with consumers will be conducted in the household; interviews with latrine producers will be conducted at their business site or at a location nearby to facilitate privacy; and interviews with government officials, sales representatives, and RFL Plastics representatives will be conducted in their offices or other convenient location. An interviewer from the George Washington University (GWU) consulting team will lead the discussion, with a note-taker and interpreter present. Qualitative in-depth
interviews will include a number of human centered design and participatory research activities. This includes the Sanitation Ladder Activity by the Center for Affordable Water and Sanitation Technology\(^3\) that was adapted to the local context to gauge consumer preferences and the use of concept mapping during latrine producer interviews to understand which stakeholders were important for the success of latrine producers’ businesses.

The GWU team will conduct transcription and coding of transcripts to identify key themes and concepts from the interviews.

**Interview Guides**

Interview guides were developed for each stakeholder and beneficiary group to provide a list of possible areas to explore, although interviewers are not limited to the questions below. The interviews will be semi-structured with open-ended questions so that the lead interview can probe and follow lines of inquiry to capture insight into project outcomes, stakeholder relationships, behaviors, and determinants of behaviors.

**Interview guide for RFL Plastic Ltd.**

1. How does RFL interact with the local governments, NGOs, and latrine producers?
2. How does RFL Dhaka (headquarters) message the SaTo pan project/endeavor down to their local staff (dealers and sales representatives)?
3. What does RFL need to do to turn the latrine producers into a more integrated network of rural retailers?
4. What should the training model for latrine producers look like when RFL assumes full management?

**Interview guide for local government (Union Parishad chairman and DPHE engineers)**

1. Does your Union provide a sanitation subsidy under the Vulnerable Group Feeding program?
   a. *If yes* How did you first learn about FFT? Can you tell me more about the sanitation subsidy? How does it work?
   b. Imagine your Union has enough money to subsidize ten latrines- can you draw out for me how the latrines are purchased, delivered, and installed? (*provide paper and pen*) Will you please walk me through this?
      i. *If not illustrated in the drawing, ask about*: Who is the subsidy for? What portion of the latrine is subsidized? How often is the subsidy given (annually and to individual households)? Where in the diagram do you monitor program activities
   c. *If no*- Why does your Union not provide a sanitation subsidy? Do you intend to provide one in the future?

---

\(^3\) Activities by the Center for Affordable Water and Sanitation Technology are available through their Resource Center: http://resources.cawst.org/package-type/activity-package
2. What characteristics do you look for when choosing a latrine for subsidy in the program? If you could only subsidize one type of latrine, which type would it be and why? Does the type of manufacturer or support services offered impact this decisions?

3. Are sanitation subsidies exclusively for the Family Friendly Toilet in your Union Parishad?
   a. [If yes] Why has your Union decided to only subsidize the Family Friendly Toilet? What other latrines did you consider for the subsidy program?
   b. What is different with the subsidy now with the FFT than before?
   c. [If no] Why has your Union decided to subsidize the Family Friendly Toilet? Why does your Union still subsidize other types of latrine?

4. Does the Union monitor whether the subsidized Family Friendly Toilets are actually used by the households that receive them?
   a. If yes- Do the households that receive the Family Friendly Toilet use them exclusively?
      i. [If yes] Is the Family Friendly Toilet improving sanitation coverage in your Union?
      ii. [If no] Why not? Is this problem specific to the Family Friendly Toilet, or to government subsidized latrines in general? Can you tell me about a family that was given a subsidized FFT but didn’t use it? What are the barriers for a family who has received the subsidy to install, maintain, and use a latrine in their home?
      iii. Overall, what do you believe are barriers to full hygienic latrine coverage in your Union?

Interview guide for latrine producers

Section 1: Background Questions

1. Tell me about your business…
   a. When did you open your business? Why?
   b. What products do you sell?
      i. What sanitation products and services do you offer?
   c. What is the farthest area where you regularly deliver and install your products? Can you mark it for me on this Union Parishad map?
   d. How many staff do you have?

2. [Looking specifically at sanitation] Did you have a chance to work with RFL plastics?
   a. If yes, did you choose to work with them or not?
      i. Why or why not?
      ii. If you do work with them, would you characterize your relationship with the local RFL representatives as positive or negative?
      iii. If you do work with them, did you receive training?
         1. Tell us about the training? Was it adequate?
         2. What would you do to improve the training?
      iv. If you do not work with them, do you know people who do?
      v. Draw a diagram that explains the “latrine supply chain” illustrating the process from inputs to sales of latrines?
         1. Explain the diagram
2. Point out where the following stakeholders are located in the diagram:
   a. You?
   b. RFL?
   c. Consumers?
   d. Sales agents?
   e. iDE?
   f. Union Parishads?

3. What are the responsibilities of all of these stakeholders?
   vi. What were the costs associated with partnering with the conglomerate?
       1. How did you cover those costs?
   vii. What were your goals in joining the partnership?
   viii. Did you achieve the goals you wanted to through the partnership?
        1. Why or why not?
   ix. What has been the overall impact of the partnership on your business?
       1. Would you classify it as positive or negative?
   x. What are the biggest challenges you face in constructing and selling latrines in your business?
   xi. Rank the most critical partners for you to sustain and grow your sanitation business.
       1. How would your business be impacted if any one of these partners were no longer in business? [We want to know if the Sanitation Dealers have the confidence to sustain their growth without iDE support and intervention].
       2. What three things do you anticipate needing once this project is finished to sustain and further develop your business model?

Section 2: Supply Side Questions

3. Supply side questions
   a. [For those would do partner with RFL]:
      i. [Looking at the drawing] Has the process/model of obtaining the necessary inputs to build latrines changed since the partnership began? Why/why not?
      ii. Describe your relationship with the local RFL representative.
          1. What are pros of working with them?
          2. What are the cons of working with them?
          3. How could the partnership be more successful?
          4. In terms of supplies and support, what do you need that you do not currently receive?
   b. [For those who do not work with RFL, looking at the drawing] what if any changes have you made to the process of acquiring the necessary inputs to build latrines in the last year and why?
      i. What are the challenges for you in terms of obtaining the inputs to build latrines?
      ii. Who are your suppliers for raw materials for latrines?
      iii. What is your biggest need in obtaining the inputs to build latrines?
Section 3: Demand Side Questions

4. [For both those who do partner with RFL]
   a. How do you project how many latrines you will sell? Have you ever run out of stock? Do you ever have an oversupply of latrine products?
      i. Has this process of projecting demand changed since the partnership began and why did it change?
      ii. What have been the challenges/successes?
   b. How do your customers find you?
   c. What latrines do the customers ask for?
      i. What qualities are they looking for in a latrine?
      ii. What has been the impact of the partnership on customer behavior/preferences?
      iii. Do people come asking for the FFT? Have you had any customers specifically ask for the FFT without prompting?
   d. How many FFT latrines have you sold?
      i. How many upgrades have you sold?
      ii. Do you see value in promoting the upgrading of latrines instead of constructing new toilets?
      iii. Do you have the necessary supplies to upgrade existing direct pit latrines?
      iv. Why do you think consumers do not upgrade? What are the barriers to upgrading for them?
   e. How do you sell latrines?
      i. Has this changed since the partnership?
   f. Do you advertise your latrines?
      i. Has being part of the partnership changed your advertising practices? Why or why not?
      ii. Do you think advertising your services is necessary?
      iii. Are you still promoting the new brand (FFT)?
      iv. Where do you tell your customers to go to purchase latrines in your advertisements?
      v. Do you advertise the upgrades that are available to your customers?
      vi. Do you sell and promote all five types of latrines? If not, why not?
      vii. How much do you charge for each of the five FFT latrines? Do you negotiate prices?
   g. Have you ever done a promotion?
      i. Has this changed since the partnership?

5. [For those who do not partner with RFL]
   a. How do you project how many latrines you will sell? Have you ever run out of stock? Do you ever have an oversupply of latrine products?
      i. Has this process of projecting demand changed since the partnership began and why did it change?
      ii. What have been the challenges/successes?
   b. How do your customers find you?
c. What latrines do the customers ask for?
   i. What qualities are they looking for in a latrine?
   ii. What has been the impact of the partnership on customer behavior/preferences?
   iii. Do people come asking for the FFT?

d. What is your best selling model?

e. How do you sell latrines?
   i. Has this changed since the partnership?

f. Do you advertise your latrines?
   i. Has being part of the partnership changed your advertising practices? Why or why not?
   ii. Do you think advertising your services are necessary?
   iii. Where do you tell your customers to go to purchase latrines in your advertisements?

g. Have you ever done a promotion?
   i. Has this changed since the partnership?

Section 4: Competition

6. Who are your main competitors?
7. Do they influence how you do business? What is their impact?
8. How do you differentiate yourself from them?
9. (If part of pilot) How has the partnership impacted the competitive landscape?
10. Do you know anyone who was not doing sanitation related work but has since re-entered the market due to the pilot/partnership?

Section 5: Financing

11. Do you have a business bank account?
   a. [If no] Do you have a personal bank account?
12. Did you seek access to external funding to invest in Family Friendly Toilets?
   a. [If yes] Were you able to secure external financing?
   b. [If yes] Please tell me more about your experience (What was the source of the funding and how much were you able to access?)
   c. [If no] Please tell me more about your experience. (What sources of financing and how much financing did you pursue?)
   d. [If no] why not? How did you gather enough capital to cover your costs?
13. How would you describe your cash flow?
14. Would you be able to make more money if you had better access to capital?
   a. [If yes] What would you do with the extra capital?
   b. [If no] What barriers would still stand in your way?
15. Do you think there is a need for a new financial product to cater to latrine dealer?
   a. [If yes] what would the ideal financial product look like?
   b. [If no] why not?
16. Do you offer financing options such as credit or payment installations to your customers?
Section 6: Business Performance and Goals

17. Performance
   a. What percent of your business was sanitation in the year prior to the partnership (or prior to the pilot start date if not a member of pilot)?
   b. What percent of your business is sanitation since joining the partnership (or since the pilot start date if not a member of pilot)?
   c. How many latrines did you sell in the 3 months prior to the partnership (or prior to the pilot start date if not a member of pilot)?
   d. How many latrines did you sell each month since the partnership (or since the pilot start date if not a member of pilot)?
   e. What was your per unit costs prior to the partnership (or prior to the pilot start date if not a member of pilot)?
   f. What are your per unit costs now?
   g. What was your per unit profit prior to the partnership (or prior to the pilot start date if not a member of pilot)?
   h. What is your per unit profit since joining the partnership (or since the pilot start date if not a member of pilot)?
   i. How many people do you have on staff? Has this changed since the partnership (or since the pilot start date if not a member of pilot)?
   j. If you had the choice, would you rather continue producing, selling, and installing the current FFT or sell and install fully plastic latrine? What if you sold the fully plastic latrine but still produced concrete rings for the latrine?

18. Goals
   a. What are your business goals for the year?
      i. [If a part of it] has the partnership changed those goals?
   b. What do you project will happen to the sanitation share of your business in the next year?
      i. Do you see the market or sales stagnating in few months or years? Or will there be a constant demand for new latrines? How is the demand and supply balancing out itself?
      ii. If you could, would you become a full time sanitation dealer?
   c. Where do you see your business in 5 years?
   d. Do you know anyone who is doing anything out of the ordinary to sell sanitation related products? If so, can you introduce us?

Interview guide for consumers

Section 1: Background Information

1. How many people are in your household? How many children under the age of five?
2. Who is the head of household in your home?
2. What is your weekly income?
3. How old were you on your last birthday?
4. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
5. How many years of schooling have you received?
6. What is your religion?
7. Do you or the women in your household observe purdah?
8. What ethnic group/tribe do you belong to?
9. What is your current marital status?
10. How are you currently earning money?
11. What is your average monthly income?
12. What is the main material of your floor, roof, and walls? [Record observation]
14. What is the next home improvement purchase you would like to make? Why?
   a. How do you plan to finance this improvement?
15. Do you currently own a latrine? [If respondent says yes move to section 2, if respondent says NO skip section 2 and move to section 3]

Section 2: Questions for participants who currently own a latrine (whether FFT or other)

Section 2.1 Consumer Preferences

1. What type of latrine do you own? Can you show it to us?
2. When did you purchase your current latrine?
   a. How long have you had this latrine?
   b. Is this your first latrine?
   c. [If no] Why did you stop using the first latrine? Can you walk us through the lifecycle of the latrine used prior to this one?
3. Do you share this latrine with other households? How many people use this latrine?
4. Who in HH made the decision? Who influenced the decision?
5. Where did you buy your latrine from?
   a. Why did you choose that person/store?
   b. How did you find out about that person/store?
6. Why did you decide to buy this latrine?
   a. When you were deciding to build a latrine, what latrine options did you consider? How did you learn about these options? How did you decide to build this type of latrine?
   b. Are you in the government Vulnerable Group Feeding (VGF)? [If yes]- did you receive a government subsidy for your latrine?
7. How often do you use your latrine?
   a. If not consistently, what are the barriers to use?
   b. Please draw a map of where you most often defecated in the past seven days? [Based on drawing, probe further (i.e. what are the places you drew: grass? latrines? etc?)]
8. What latrines are available in your area?
   a. Have you heard about the FFT or SaTo pan?
b. Are you aware of the partnership between your local sanitation dealer and RFL? Does the partnership change your opinion about the products or services your local sanitation dealer offers?
c. Do you own a FFT latrine? Why did you get a FFT latrine?
d. How does the FFT differ from other latrines available in your area?
e. From where did you learn about FFT and which was your source of information about it? Which source was most effective (if more than one)? Why so?
f. Have you seen the FFT ad campaign? Did this campaign influence your decision making?
g. Has somebody visited your home to talk to you about FFT or SaTopan? Who was this person?

9. *[If they own a FFT toilet]* Show pictures of FFT models without prices, and ask the following:
   a. If all models cost the same, rank these models from least preferred to most preferred.
      i. why did you rank them that way?
      ii. why did you rank this one the highest; this one the lowest
      iii. which one you never buy? Why?
      iv. which one would be the minimum that would be acceptable to you?
      v. is there a difference between FFT 1-3 and FFT 4-5?
   b. Now please rank them in order from cheapest to most expensive, in your opinion
   c. Now here are the actual prices, what is the highest level toilet you think you can get to?
   d. Which FFT model do you own? Why did you choose that model?
   e. Which FFT model do the majority of your neighbors own?

10. Would you prefer to empty your latrine pit once it is full and reuse it, or construct a new pit after the current one is full?

11. Do you have any plans to upgrade your latrine or have you upgraded your latrine?
    a. Would you upgrade the existing toilet system or construct a new high end version of toilet to replace the old one?
    b. What would you upgrade to?
    c. *[If they upgraded]* Did you upgrade your latrine using a different LP than the one from whom you bought your original latrine?

Section 2.2 Loans/Financial Services

1. Do you have any large purchases or home improvements planned in the next year?
   a. What do you plan to buy and from where?
   b. How do you plan to finance it?
   c. Do you have a bank account? Are you saving for it currently?
2. If a relative gave you a gift of 600 taka, what would you do?
3. What is the last expensive purchase or home improvement that you made? Did you have to save money to make this purchase or home improvement and for how long? Where did you go to buy this item or supplies and how did you transport?
4. What factors do you consider important when it comes to purchasing expensive products or services in your home?
5. How did you pay for your latrine? Savings? Credit? Payment installments?
a. Who is offering loans?
   b. Who is receiving the loans? How are they aware of the availability of loans?
   c. Is it working as intended? Are monies being used for latrines? How much default?

Section 3: Questions for study participants who do not currently own a latrine:

1. Are you in the government Vulnerable Feeding Group program? If yes, did you receive a government subsidy for your latrine? Why did you choose not to build a latrine?
2. Have you ever had a latrine in the past? What are your reasons for no longer having a latrine?
3. Please list the last three major household purchases you made
   a. Who made/influenced the decision to purchase these?
   b. Who made/influenced the decision on which product to purchase?
   c. Who in the HH makes/influences decisions about home improvements?
4. What is the next home improvement purchase you would like to make? Why?
   a. How do you plan to finance this improvement?
5. Have you ever considered building a latrine? Why/why not? What has prevented you from building a latrine?
6. What latrines are available in your area?
   a. Have you heard about the FFT or SaTopan?
   b. How does the FFT differ from other latrines available in your area?
   c. From where did you learn about FFT and which was your source of information about it?
      Which source was most effective (if more than one)? Why so?
   d. Have you seen the FFT ad campaign? Did this campaign influence your decision making?
   e. Has somebody visited your home to talk to you about FFT or SaTopan? Who was this person?
2. Show pictures of FFT models without prices, and ask the following:
   a. If all models cost the same, rank these models from least preferred to most preferred.
      i. why did you rank them that way?
      ii. why did you rank this one the highest; this one the lowest
      iii. which one you never buy? Why?
      iv. which one would be the minimum that would be acceptable to you?
      v. is there a difference between FFT 1-3 and FFT 4-5?
   b. Now please rank them in order from cheapest to most expensive, in your opinion
   c. Now here are the actual prices, what is the highest level toilet you think you can get to?
   d. Which FFT model do the majority of your neighbors own?