



Guidance Note 10

Sanitation Marketing and CATS: How do we link approaches?

Danielle Pedi and Mimi Jenkins

In this Guidance Note you will learn:

- How SanMark can work alongside CATS initiatives at programmatic and community level
- Key considerations and tips for linking approaches, including common assumptions and do's and don'ts for program implementation
- Ways UNICEF can test what will work best in different contexts

1. SanMark and CATS are mutually reinforcing

Sanitation Marketing and CATS are compatible and complementary approaches. In sanitation, catalyzing changes in social norms and developing local markets are the most promising approaches to trigger and sustain long-term safe latrine usage for all. It is not a question of 'behaviour or technology': good sanitation involves both a behaviour/practice and an enabling facility – not one or the other. Although it is clear that a facility does not need to be purchased to be hygienic, it is also true that the vast majority of households with durable, improved latrines have invested cash to purchase and build them.

UNICEF CATS and other sanitation initiatives have worked with governments to adjust policies away from latrine subsidies and supply-driven construction programmes, and have built political awareness and institutional capacity for demand-led sanitation approaches. CATS has shifted programmatic focus away from 'doing' and 'building' and towards facilitating and catalyzing changes in behaviours and community norms. SanMark builds on this progress and mindset shift. In this Guidance Note, we offer some practical guidance on how to link approaches, based on the limited evidence and experience thus far. We also discuss how UNICEF can develop a learning agenda to systematically test how SanMark and CATS can link in practice.

2. Sequencing Approaches: Program vs. community level considerations

SanMark is often presented conceptually as following CATS, the prevailing logic being that the first essential task is to change community norms and behaviours. In practice, differences in programmatic activities, resource requirements and start-up times (see GN 1) mean that the question of 'sequencing' is not so straight-forward.

CATS and SanMark 'sequencing' has two dimensions:

- **Programmatic Sequencing:** This refers to timing and execution of activities required to effectively implement SanMark and CATS on the ground. For SanMark, this includes the steps within the 7-Step Sanitation Marketing framework that are implemented across a large population base. For CATS, it includes programme planning, guidance and tool development, and capacity and systems development before activities can begin to be implemented in specific communities. Programmatic sequencing is not a critical

issue in geographic areas where CATS is already underway. However, due to the time needed to complete the initial SanMark steps (in particular market research, product design, and supply chain development), these should start as soon as possible in new areas, so that businesses are ready to provide products and services as community demand increases.

- **Community-level Sequencing:** This refers specifically to the timing of CATS triggering and SanMark product introduction within a particular community. That is, when do we ‘introduce’ a product promotional event, a new set of products, or a local small business – before, after, or perhaps even during a CATS triggering event? After a village is declared ODF? When should the introduction of information about technical options and locally available products happen? Here there is less systematic evidence about what works, but anecdotal experience points to a mix of workable models.

The issue of sequencing is critically linked to geography and scale: Since markets are broader than individual communities, it is simply impossible to confine SanMark activities to specific communities.

In practice SanMark may not always be suitable in all CATS program contexts. UNICEF and your partners will need to assess broad market conditions, consult with sector partners, and weigh up budget and timing constraints to determine whether and where to start. It is very possible that within a given country or region it may make operational sense to implement CATS alone, SanMark alone, and/or CATS+SanMark together – your market conditions will determine this.

Box 1: Sequencing SanMark and CATS Programmes: Experience from Bangladesh and Indonesia

The historical evolution of sanitation programming in Bangladesh indicate that activities such as product design, supply chain strengthening and business development had a strong impact on sanitation prior to the introduction of CLTS in the country. The government’s ‘Social Mobilization’ program from 1993 to 1996 resulted in substantial increases in sanitation coverage, new low-cost products, and over 4000 new rural businesses (Heirli and Frias 2007). Large-scale investment in SanMark activities meant that supply chains were in place and low-cost desirable product options were available when CLTS was introduced in 2003. A 2011 evaluation of 53 declared ODF communities found that the mature existing private sector played a critical role in sustaining latrine usage over time (WSP 2011b). These findings indicate that locally available supply of affordable, desirable products is a significant contributing factor in both achieving and sustaining ODF social norms, but alone is probably insufficient.

An evaluation of the Water and Sanitation Program’s Total Sanitation Sanitation Marketing (TSSM) project in Indonesia points to similar findings. Due to delays delivering the SanMark component of the program, CLTS triggering was underway for 2 years or more before local marketing and supply interventions began. Research in triggered villages found that lack of affordable pour-flush latrines was a contributing factor both to poor achievement and poor sustaining of ODF. The study concluded that in future it would be more productive to schedule CLTS triggering after provincial market research results are used to identify a pro-poor marketing strategy for provinces, including consumer-driven products and business models. It recommended that the program start to improve local supply capacity before demand creation begins, in order to achieve optimal conversion of the generated demand into sustainable sanitation improvement (WSP 2011a).

3. Resourcing Approaches: We will need different skills

Not only is there often a mismatch between favourable conditions, geographic scales, timing and start-up of activities, CATS and SanMark also require different skill sets to be implemented well. For example, program staff with no business experience or understanding of local markets will be ill-equipped to train and mentor businesses.

Likewise, business development specialists with little knowledge of community dynamics will probably make poor CATS facilitators.

SanMark will require new skills related to business and market development, market research, product design, commercial marketing and sales, and others. These skills are relatively new for the WASH sector, and may not be available within local CATS teams. To implement SanMark effectively, it will be necessary to consider what additional training, new staff, and/or short-term technical assistance is required within UNICEF and implementing partners. While UNICEF will often have a single WASH Officer supervising all sanitation activities, it may be useful to consider having separate teams at the level of implementation. This may include:

- **Programmatic separation:** To ensure approaches are distinct, but still highly coordinated, consider separate managers or teams for day-to-day management of CATS and SanMark within an implementing agency (IA) or partner, or contract separate IAs for these components if working with NGOs.
- **Community-level separation:** It is important to be clear about roles at community level, to ensure that CATS facilitation is seen as separate to efforts to develop and support the market (see GN6 and Assumption 2 below).

4. SanMark and CATS in practice: Challenging assumptions, learning what works

While generally accepted that CATS and SanMark can work together, there is very little systematic evidence about how to make linkages work on the ground. The following section sets out some common concerns and assumptions about SanMark and CATS, presents some emerging experience and learning questions, and offers some practical tips for implementation.

Assumption 1: SanMark is just a supply-side add-on to CATS work. CATS is about demand, and SanMark is about supply – and demand creation should come first.

What do we know?

- Stand-alone SanMark programs in Vietnam, Benin, Cambodia and elsewhere have shown substantial and measurable impact on sanitation uptake and sustained usage. However, SanMark on its own is very unlikely to achieve and sustain 100% Open Defecation Free communities without CATS or similar approaches to change defecation social norms.
- There is a clear dynamic between a household's level of satisfaction with their current latrine facility and rates of consistent latrine usage. CATS programs that overlook facility preferences can risk losing momentum if the types of facilities households built in response to triggering do not meet minimum acceptable levels of satisfaction. In Cambodia, for example, latrine usage was strongly linked to technology type and satisfaction in both CLTS and non-CLTS villages (Pedi et al. 2012).
- Demand creation without local businesses supplying the right products can be problematic, as in some cases this can lead to the possibility of households building poor quality or 'temporary' latrines that collapse, fill up quickly, soon become unpleasant to use, or are unhygienic.
- SanMark cannot simply be tacked on to a CATS program after triggering is done, as the potential geographic scale mismatch may mean that SanMark activities will be needed in places where CATS is not yet operational or where triggering conditions are unfavourable. Businesses may operate in a geographic area that includes both CATS and non-CATS triggered villages and some communications channels will reach a wide audience.

What do we need to know?

- **Comparative Advantages:** Where does it make sense for CATS and SanMark to work together? Where might it make more operational sense/ be more cost effective to have just CATS? Just SanMark?

- **Existing Technologies:** What types of products/services do people invest in after CATS triggering? What are the initial and life-cycle costs? How satisfied are people with them? Does technology impact on usage? What are differences between households in different wealth classifications?
- **Current role of supply in CATS:** What role do supply-side factors already play in achieving and sustaining ODF? How important are these factor relative to other known success factors such as effective triggering and follow-up?

Box 2: Do's and Don'ts for Programming

<p>DO track factors such as distance to markets/roads, cash incomes and availability of products and services to understand where supply-side interventions are needed (and not needed). Collect data on latrine technologies and costs in CATS villages, and who is already buying what (see GN9). This will help you understand where the actual product design and supply-side gaps are.</p> <p>DO test what works for you – set up some small action research trials of product promotions before/after/during triggering to see what might work best.</p> <p>DO consider ‘harmonizing’ approaches in a broad sense at national and sub-national scales. For maximum cost-effectiveness, it may not be necessary or ideal to try to geographically overlap completely.</p>	<p>DON'T treat SanMark as a supply-side add-on to CATS work. Businesses will fail to sustain and grow if they are limited to working only in CATS areas and only when a village is triggered or ODF.</p> <p>DON'T try to control the market. Making blanket policies like ‘no product promotions until a community is ODF’ will stifle businesses on the supply side. On the demand side, there is no evidence that consumer awareness of private sector product/service options is detrimental to ODF achievement, and there is some evidence that it may be crucial to long-term sustained ODF (see Box 1).</p>
---	---

Assumption 2. SanMark will weaken the social change process of CATS. Introducing products or businesses will be confusing and can make CATS facilitators lose credibility.

What do we know?

- There is a concern about using CATS facilitators or natural leaders as paid product sales promoters for local businesses. This concern relates to the risk that households may interpret the push for ODF as a benefit to the promoter, rather than for the sake of having an ODF community. Although some programmes have had success using paid promoters or sales agents, there is also evidence (for example in Benin and Vietnam) that community volunteers or un-commissioned government staff can play effective promotional and market facilitation roles. Linking approaches does not equal turning natural leaders into sales agents or ‘entrepreneurs’.
- A second concern— particularly where open defecation is an entrenched practice – is that some people may be reluctant to change their behaviour if products and businesses are ‘introduced’ too early. In such situations, poorer households may do nothing or delay until they can save up to purchase, rather than sharing with others or building a simple latrine that requires little or no cash. In Uganda, for example, Plan International reports that product introduction alongside CLTS seemed to delay achievement of ODF. This concern might need to be evaluated in the context of whether poorer households have clear facility preferences that could impact satisfaction and consistent usage.

What do we need to know?

- **Village-level Demand/Supply linkages:** What is the best way to physically link households to products/providers at community-level without undermining community commitment to ODF status?

- **Avoiding CATS Dilution and Social Stigma:** How do we maintain focus on community social norm change while still encouraging individual HH investment? Will promotion of 'improved' latrines stigmatize those in the community that cannot afford latrines or prevent ODF achievement?
- **Appropriate roles for local leaders:** How do we support government/leaders to inspire community action, while not 'meddling' too much in the market (e.g. 'picking winners, creating monopolies, engaging in activities that create conflict of interest)?

Box 3: Do's and Don'ts for Programming

DO monitor community dynamics closely, and adapt strategies as you go. Are your promotional strategies alienating/ stigmatizing those with poor quality latrines? Is it clear that a local leader is preventing some businesses from freely operating?

DO be clear about your goals. In SanMark private sector strengthening is a means to an end, not an end in itself. The goal in SanMark is to ensure that low-income households have access to affordable and appropriate sanitation products and services. Generating revenue and employment for the local community is an added bonus. We are looking for the strongest businesses, not trying to create community income generation schemes.

DON'T take a one-size fits all approach: While it might seem easier to just tack on product promotions to a community leader's role, this may not be ideal. Turning natural leaders into a sales force is not the goal of SanMark (although this may work some of the time) (see GN 6).

DON'T confuse Natural Leaders with 'entrepreneurs': Don't assume these leaders are the right people to be engaging in profitable production and sale. Do not give seed money to natural leaders to start sanitation businesses – this may be problematic on the demand side, and is also probably not a viable business strategy (see GN 4).

Assumption 3. Supply will spontaneously emerge to meet newly triggered CATS demand. The right products, information and abilities for households to build a durable latrine on their own already exist.

What do we know?

- In every case where we have conducted supply chain research, we find that sanitation businesses do not have the capacity or skills on their own to invest in product re-design to lower costs and improve availability (see GN5).
- Products that are installed in most rural areas tend to be brought in from urban markets and cater to the wealthiest segments. Without the right products at the right prices, local businesses will have nothing to offer to respond to new rural low-income demand.
- Businesses need good market intelligence and enough new demand to be willing to invest in expanding into a new area. This kind of information does not exist without us actively collecting and presenting it to businesses as a profitable business proposition (see GN 4).
- If households with ability to pay invest in their own latrines, the poorest can be better targeted. But without specific efforts to help markets reach the poor, those that benefit most will be among the better-off.

What do we need to know?

- **Supply Constraints:** Are businesses near CATS communities already increasing sales in response to new demand generated by CATS? Do they understand the opportunities (e.g. number of potential new customers and their preferences)? Are they already making new investments or adapting their product/service offering to expand to newly triggered communities? If not, why not?

- **Reaching the Poor:** How far can businesses go towards helping the poorest access a durable improved latrine? How can public funds be programmed to provide smart subsidies for the poorest (see GN8)? At what stage of the CATS process should this happen? How can the sanitation sector build on existing Social Policy safety nets?

Box 4: Do's and Don'ts for Programming

DO talk to existing sanitation businesses about CATS activities and provide market intelligence about the size and location of triggered villages (GN 6). Explore enabling and constraining factors that businesses face in expanding to serve CATS communities, from their perspective.

DO create opportunities for communities to take advantage of bulk purchase. One of the key supply-side barriers for poor communities is transport. Organized community bulk purchase may help households share costs. CATS action plan implementation may be the best time to capitalize on this opportunity.

DON'T assume existing products meet poor household needs or that businesses can easily serve new household demand. Invest in good consumer research and product re-design that focuses on the poorer (see GN5 and GN8). Design should include local innovation and input, but do not be afraid to introduce new ideas. Do not design just for the wealthier easier-to-reach members of the community. Instead, encourage product offerings that meet the needs of a range of consumer segments.

Assumption 4: If follow-up support is in place, households in ODF communities will rebuild their latrines when they collapse and replace poor quality latrines with improved designs.

What do we know?

- Evidence from CLTS/CATS indicates that progressive increases in improved latrine coverage can be achieved where local affordable supply exists. There is also evidence that people in ODF communities will rebuild when a latrine collapses or fills up in some contexts, and that households will upgrade basic facilities over time. For example, a systematic review of ODF communities in Bangladesh found that four years after ODF verification almost 90% of households were using a latrine. About 23% had rebuilt or replaced their latrine during that period, and another 20% had upgraded their facility (WSP 2011).
- CATS experience indicates that latrines built after triggering can and do meet hygienic criteria. In Zambia, for example, 88% of the 14,500 household toilet constructions in 402 ODF villages met the government's definition of 'adequate' sanitation (Harvey and Mukosha 2009).
- It is also clear that many households, once triggered, may opt to jump directly to an improved facility, especially if they are aware of locally available options. These households tend to be those with some financial resources

What do we need to know?

- **Upgrading Behaviour:** Are households 'upgrading' existing unimproved latrines built in response to triggering, or are they building entirely new ones? Are they waiting until poorer quality latrines are no longer functioning to take action?
- **Consumer Awareness:** Do households have the technical and market information and access they need to be able to build improved durable latrines on their own?

- **Equity:** In ODF and triggered villages, who benefits from improved levels of service? Do the poor and poorest have the means to move up the sanitation ladder over time? Is sustainability of usage linked to facility durability, and if so to what degree does this affect the poor?

Box 5: Do's and Don'ts for Programming

DO understand 'upgrading' in your context. If it is clear that households are building entirely new latrines when they 'upgrade' to an improved facility, then this might build the case for product introduction soon after triggering, rather than waiting until a community is declared ODF.

DO understand what technical information is needed among natural leaders and CATS facilitators, but don't try to turn them into technical experts – this may dilute their impact as mobilizers, and lead to misconceptions or incorrect information about technical designs.

DON'T assume SanMark is not equitable. In the long term, equity gains of a community-wide approach could be lost in some contexts, if the poorer and poorest households are more likely to slip back to OD or remain stuck on the bottom rung of the ladder. Achieving equity, full improved latrine access and sustained behaviour change will require a mix of policy and programmatic responses.

5. Towards a global learning agenda: Practical tips for UNICEF

As two of the most promising - and compatible - approaches to accelerating and sustaining sanitation uptake, there is great potential for innovation when it comes to leveraging the comparative strengths of CATS and SanMark. Here are some practical tips for UNICEF as you begin to explore this potential:

Tip 1: Be flexible and test what works. At this stage in our understanding, it is better to be pragmatic when it comes to the role markets play in achieving and maintaining ODF status. Test what works, set up small trials, and monitor the results. Take an iterative approach to programming, especially when it comes to 'who does what' (see GN6). Challenge assumptions and use ground evidence to shape your programming. Do not set strict rules about waiting for ODF declaration before introducing new products without first understanding what makes sense on the ground.

Tip 2: Develop a global learning agenda. UNICEF can play a global leadership role by developing a learning agenda to build robust evidence on systematic linking of approaches. SanMark is an area of emergent learning. CATS programming has now reached a level of maturity in many countries where it is becoming possible to more clearly understand long-term sustainability and equity impacts. To move beyond assumptions, we will need to share experiences of at-scale work in integrating approaches. Consider key learning questions like the ones laid out in this Guidance Note, and set aside budget and time for learning, sharing, research and evaluation to answer these questions and share results.

Tip 3: Keep the focus on sustainability, scale, and cost-effectiveness. The promise of both CATS and SanMark is that they can help deliver sustainable behavioural outcomes at scale, and in such a way that on-going external investment is not required. At the same time, by leveraging community, household, private and public investment, these approaches may be able to achieve results in a more cost-effective way than other approaches. In learning and evaluating programmatic approaches, we need to weigh up not only their impact on communities and households now, but also the programmatic costs, exit strategies and long-term viability of different models.

RESOURCE FOR FURTHER READING:

Reports

1. UNICEF (2010). Sanitation Marketing in a CATS Context: A Discussion Paper” prepared by Ann Thomas. http://www.unicef.org/wash/files/Sanitation_Marketing_in_a_CATS_Context.pdf
2. Heirli, U. and Frias, J. (2008). One Fly is Deadlier than 1000 Tigers: Total Sanitation as a Business and Community Action in Bangladesh and Elsewhere. www.unwater.org/.../One_fly_is_deadlier_than_100_tigers.pdf
3. WSP (2011a). Factors Associated with Achieving and Sustaining Open Defecation Free Communities: Learning from East Java. WSP-EAP Research Brief.
4. WSP (2011b). Long-Term Sustainability of Improved Sanitation in Rural Bangladesh. WSP Technical Paper prepared by S. Hanchett, L. Krieger, M.H. Kahn, C. Kullmann, and R Ahmed.
5. Harvey, P.A., and Mukosha, L. (2009). Community-led total sanitation: Triggering sustainable development in Zambia. Paper presented at the 34th WEDC International Conference, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2009.
6. WaterAid (2009). Sustainability and equity aspects of total sanitation programmes: A study of recent WaterAid-supported programmes in three countries: Global synthesis report prepared by B. Evans, J. Colin, H. Jones and A. Robinson.

About the UNICEF Sanitation Marketing Learning Series

This Guidance Note is part of the UNICEF Sanitation Marketing Learning Series, a learning initiative designed by the University of California Davis (UCD) to improve Sanitation Marketing knowledge and practice within UNICEF. The Learning Series is delivered by Mimi Jenkins (UCD and London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine), Danielle Pedi (Consultant, WASH Catalyst), Jeff Chapin (Consultant, IDEO), and Mike Rios (17 Triggers Behavior Change Lab).

The ten Guidance Notes in the Series are available for download here: <http://uni.cf/Xo2o2l>

1. *Situation Analysis – How do I know if SanMark will work in my country?*
2. *Consumer Behavior – How can we understand sanitation consumers in target markets?*
3. *Sanitation Supply Chains and Business Models – How can we improve market systems?*
4. *Private Sector development - How do we improve capacity of local sanitation businesses?*
5. *Getting the Product ‘Right’ – How do we design affordable, desirable latrines that businesses can profitably produce and sell?*
6. *Enabling Environment – What roles and functions are needed in the new market?*
7. *Demand Promotion and Marketing – How do we reach rural target markets in san mark?*
8. *Equity in Sanitation Marketing - How can we support the market to reach the poorest?*
9. *Monitoring and Evaluation – How do we measure sanitation marketing progress?*
10. *Sanitation Marketing and CATS – How do we link approaches?*