



Request for Proposals
Summative Evaluation of Lazos de Agua I

April 2022

Table of Contents

Acronyms	3
Background	4
About Lazos de Agua	4
About One Drop and the A·B·C for Sustainability model	4
Evaluation	5
Purpose	5
Specific objectives	6
Intended users and uses	6
Scope	6
Approach	7
Evaluation questions	8
Methodology	9
Roles and responsibilities	11
Timeline	11
Guidelines for bidders	13
Evaluation team qualifications	13
Proposals	13
Technical proposal	13
Financial proposal guidelines.....	14
Selection process	14
Question period.....	14
Proposal Submission.....	15
Appendix I	16

Acronyms

CEAG	Comisión Estatal del Agua de Guanajuato (México)
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EPs	Executing partners
FEMSA	Fomento Económico Mexicano
IDB	InterAmerican Development Bank
LDA	Lazos de Agua
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OD	One Drop
SABC	Social Arts for Behaviour Change
SENASA	Servicio Nacional de Saneamiento Ambiental (Paraguay)
SIP	Strategic Implementing Partner
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

Background

About Lazos de Agua

The Lazos de Agua Program (LDA) is a multi-stakeholder partnership of One Drop Foundation, the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), The Coca-Cola Foundation and Fundación FEMSA (referred as the program Conveners). With a financial commitment of USD\$ 25,000,000 of these organizations and complementary investments for a similar amount from national and local governments as well as from executing partners, LDA seeks to provide access to drinking water and improved sanitation and hygiene to around 200,000 people in Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua and Paraguay by 2022. In each of these five countries, One Drop, as the Strategic Implementing Partner (SIP), works with executing partners (EPs) and, in some instances, with national governments to implement the activities of the program.

Social Art and sustainability are at the core of this innovative Program, which adopts a systems-based approach to contribute to improving living conditions in Latin America. Lazos de Agua introduces the Social Art for Behaviour Change™ (SABC) approach in the Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) sector and develops its projects based on the One Drop's A·B·C for Sustainability™ model.

LDA has been implemented at a different pace in each country since July 2016 and is coming to an end in December 2022. One Drop, as the SIP, is facilitating the Program's Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) committee mandate to commission the summative evaluation of the program. This document outlines the general approach expected for the evaluation, which will be fine-tuned upon contracting with the selected evaluation team.

For more information about the Lazos de Agua program, visit <https://www.lazosdeagua.org/>. The program's logic model is included in Appendix I.

About One Drop and the A·B·C for Sustainability model

One Drop (OD) is an international foundation created by Cirque du Soleil founder Guy Laliberté in 2007. Its mission is to ensure sustainable access to safe water and sanitation for the most vulnerable communities through innovative partnerships, creativity and the power of art. The A·B·C for Sustainability model is a systems-based approach, which constitutes LDA's strategy, that was developed to achieve the abovementioned mission. It consists of:

A for Access

This component includes building new or rehabilitated drinking water and sanitation infrastructure and providing capacity building of community organizations and other institutions delivering the services to make them sustainable.

Component A is implemented in two ways within LDA:

Model 1: implemented by the EPs: in Colombia, Fundación PLAN; in Guatemala, Water For People; and in Nicaragua, WaterAid America. Model 1 projects involve governmental partners but do not involve large governmental programs as Model 2 projects do.

Model 2: implemented by the EPs: in Mexico, Living Water International and in Paraguay, Fundación Moisés Bertoni. In addition to the EPs working in each country, model 2 projects are also implemented by

the Government through a specialized public organization in charge of multimillion-dollar water and sanitation programs. In Paraguay, SENASA carries out a program of over 30 million dollars. In Mexico CEAG carries out a program from which more than 11 million dollars are earmarked to the Access component of the Lazos de Agua project in Guanajuato.

B for Behaviour Change

Through local artist sub-contracted by the EPs, the LDA designs and implements innovative interventions focused on SABC and based, among others, on the Integrated Behavioral Model for WASH. SABC interventions are designed to evoke different experiences for beneficiaries and are classified in three types of interventions based on their intended effect: Inspire, Activate and Sustain behaviour change. These interventions, carried out sequentially in the order presented before¹, foster mobilization and dialogue for, by and with the community to increase the practice of the following behaviours:

- Handwashing with soap and water at key moments
- Household water treatment and safe storage
- Payment of water service tariff
- Payment of sanitation service tariff

C for Capital

This component proposes market development strategies based on a WASH value chain model in which the main actors (links in the chain) offer technical-financial solutions adapted to the context and which favour the demand and construction of WASH solutions by families in the target communities.

Implementation

Over the years of implementation, the program has been characterized by continuous adaptation to reach its outcomes. The A·B·C for Sustainability Model provides an overarching framework that intentionally requires adaptation at project level and a coherent integration among components for their synergy to generate better outcomes. Thus, each of the five projects that constitute the program share the same components that are implemented in different ways in each country. These differences are reflected in each project's annual plans.

Results from the programs' monitoring system and the external mid-term evaluation also provided opportunities to reflect and adjust programming. Finally, the COVID-19 pandemic demanded that project activities adjust to the new reality, which contributed to new changes, such as the incorporation of new technologies and adjusting the program's timeline.

Evaluation

Purpose

The purpose of the summative evaluation is both learning and accountability.

LDA's systems-based approach to addressing WASH, particularly through social arts for behavior change, is novel. There are components of the program related to SABC that were coined at the onset of LDA and which progressively evolved throughout implementation. The evaluation, therefore, offers a learning

¹ or as relevant depending on the behaviour change stage at which the participants are identified to be at according to formative research based on the Transtheoretical Model developed by Prochaska and DiClemente (pre-contemplation, contemplation, action, maintenance, relapse)

opportunity for LDA stakeholders and the WASH sector in general, as few, if any, programs have adopted such a holistic, systems-based approach.

As part of the learning purpose, the evaluation process is expected to be an opportunity for stakeholders to reflect on the work they performed and derive new understandings and meaning by virtue of the methods employed in the evaluation process.

Finally, as the program comes to an end, the evaluation is also intended to generate evidence about the results achieved for the purpose of accountability.

Specific objectives

Specific evaluation objectives include:

1. To generate evidence about the outcomes achieved and how the program contributed to them.
2. To estimate the cost-effectiveness of this type of intervention.
3. To derive insights on how the A·B·C for Sustainability model and SABC model work and where there are opportunities to improve.
4. To contribute to WASH sector-wide learning about systems-based programming that integrates SABC.
5. To create an opportunity for reflection and learning among LDA stakeholders.

Intended users and uses

The primary users of the evaluation are staff members of One Drop (SIP) and the other conveners IADB, FEMSA, and Coca-Cola. EPs and other stakeholders that have partnered within LDA are also among the evaluation users.

Some of the uses identified include:

1. To improve future programming (i.e.: making improvements to the systems-based approach adopted within LDA I, particularly around the novel SABC approach)
2. To inform future funding and fundraising strategies.
3. To communicate findings among the WASH sector about systems-based and behavior-change approaches, their effectiveness, and challenges.
4. The evaluation process should be an opportunity for EPs to reflect on their work and celebrate achievements.

Scope

The summative evaluation is expected to consider the entire extent of the implementation period, from July 2016 up to the moment when data is generated for the evaluation. The evaluation is expected to be conducted parallel to the last semester of implementation, which creates an opportunity for the evaluation team to integrate their methodology into ongoing programming and monitoring efforts, where appropriate.

The evaluation focuses on three main components:

1. A description of the outcomes the program contributed to by looking into intended and unintended immediate, intermediate and ultimate outcomes
2. An assessment of LDA's strategy
3. An assessment of the cost-effectiveness of LDA

The evaluation includes all projects in the five countries where the program is implemented. Evaluators are expected to consider data collected for the baseline, mid-term, and end-line monitoring activities as well as results from the mid-term evaluation and Sprockler tool (qualitative and quantitative data: <https://visualizer.sprockler.com/en/open/Lazosdeaguaprogram>).

Approach

The evaluation of program results is intended to remain at the **outcome level** (immediate, intermediate and ultimate). Considering the systems-based approach the program adopts, a **contribution lens** is considered most appropriate for this type of evaluation.

Due to the nature of the LDA Program, its systems-based and SABC approaches, the following are some of the lenses that should guide the evaluation design, methods and implementation:

Transformation: The evaluation should be an opportunity for the LDA stakeholders to reflect on their role within the LDA ecosystem, the work they did, what they have learnt and how their work has contributed to the outcomes they sought and achieved. Methods should serve the dual purpose of gathering evidence to answer the evaluation questions while also facilitating highly participatory processes to develop greater understandings, insights, and learning among stakeholders (as opposed to simply extracting data). Closing feedback loops ought to be considered within the evaluation design.

Utility: The use of evaluation findings by key evaluation users ought to be considered throughout the evaluation process. The inception phase is expected to clarify how evaluation users will be engaged throughout the evaluation process to facilitate the use of findings.

Feminist: A feminist approach to evaluation considers, in addition to gender-disaggregated data and gendered-sensitive processes, exploration of the power dynamics among program stakeholders and attention to the transformative nature of the evaluation process itself. The design should also aim to gather a balanced and diverse representation of perspectives (especially those of women, children and other vulnerable or traditionally excluded groups) while interpreting findings through the lens of reflexivity.

Fit for purpose: Evaluators are expected to suggest methods that best suit the evaluation purposes and that will address the evaluation questions without duplicating data collection activities that are part of the program's existing MEL system.

The evaluation also considers the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability) as applied through the lens of the principles that guide them, namely that *the criteria should support high quality, useful evaluation* and that *the use of the criteria depends on the purpose of the evaluation*. To that end, not all criteria are included as part of the evaluation. The evaluation questions presented below - which derive from the evaluation purposes, specific objectives and uses - also indicate how they relate to the OECD DAC criteria.

Please note that the evaluation team selected is expected to rigorously abide by all One Drop institutional policies, including: - *One Drop's code of Ethics* (please download it at <https://www.onedrop.org/en/governance/>)

Evaluation questions

Outcomes – What was achieved? (Descriptive and causal)

1. What intended (per logic model in annex 1) and unintended, immediate, intermediate and ultimate outcomes² did the program contribute to? To what extent? (Effectiveness and contribution)
2. To what extent are the outcomes generated by the Lazos de Agua program expected to be sustained once program execution is completed? In what cases? For what reasons? (Sustainability)

Strategy Review– Did we do the right thing? (Causal)

3. How did the program's approach (The A·B·C for Sustainability model) contribute to generating the outcomes? (Effectiveness)
 - 3.1. How relevant to local needs were the programs' components (A) Access, (B) Behaviour change and (C) Capital, the way they were integrated among them, and how they were adapted? What worked well? What could be improved? What was missing? What could have been left out? (Relevance, coherence)
 - 3.2 How relevant was the design and implementation of the SABC approach to achieving behaviour change related to WASH? Does it work? If so, how? What could be improved? What is missing? What could be left out? Consider the differentiation between Inspire, Activate and Sustain activities and their sequencing. (Effectiveness, relevance, coherence)
 - 3.3 To what extent has the program structure and governance (Conveners – SIP – EPs) facilitated effective program implementation? What worked well? What could be improved? (Effectiveness, efficiency)
4. What are the key take-aways of organizations involved in the execution of LDA about the implementation of the The A·B·C for Sustainability model and SABC approach adopted by LDA?
5. What opportunities exist to further improve the systems-based model adopted by LDA?

Cost-effectiveness³: Is this approach worth the money?

6. How do the outcomes achieved by the LDA program compare to outcomes achieved by similar interventions in WASH? (Efficiency)
 - 6.1 What can be said about the cost-effectiveness of the LDA program?
 - 6.2 What can be said about cost-effectiveness, particularly about the SABC component?

² The LDA program adopts in its logical framework the terminology of Global Affairs Canada.

³ Please note that this set of questions does not refer to whether results were achieved in an economic way (i.e. efficiency in evaluation). This set of questions seeks to explore the worthiness of LDA from the standpoint of the investment amount and the results achieved, in comparison to similar interventions.

Methodology

The evaluation team is expected to suggest a methodology that addresses the approach and evaluation questions. As noted on the approach section, the nature of the program will benefit from methods that align with contribution, transformation, and gendered evaluation lenses, whereby the evaluation activities generate processes that are conducive to further reflection and learning by people participating in the evaluation.

The methodology presented ought to consider the following:

1. The Program's monitoring system has generated a significant amount of data about output and outcome level indicators that reflect the program's logic model. This includes: Household surveys, Water service providers surveys, Institutional WASH actors survey, SABC intervention registry forms which collect some aspects of quality of delivery of SABC interventions; Stories of change; Beneficiaries testimonies. The end line survey will be conducted parallel to the summative evaluation.
2. The mid-term evaluation, conducted in 2019, did a thorough assessment of various relevance, effectiveness and efficiency aspects of the program. The evaluation also explored the program's structure and processes thoroughly. The summative evaluation is expected to build upon those findings.
3. In addition to quantitative data, in 2020 and 2021, over 170 program beneficiaries were interviewed through a method called Sprockler to explore the effects of the social arts for behavior change activities in their lives. The results of this effort were not considered for the mid-term evaluation and ought to be considered within the summative evaluation.

This summative evaluation is meant to capitalize on the data generated through the abovementioned activities. Evaluators should suggest methods that complement those activities in order to address the evaluation questions.

Upon the selection of the evaluation team, the evaluation is expected to have three main phases: (A) Inception, (B) Data collection, analysis and reflection, (C) Deliverables and learning

- A. **Inception phase:** Evaluators are expected to perform desk review of documents related to the LDA program to thoroughly understand the nature of the program and existing data sources so they may thereby make methodological adjustments necessary to roll out the evaluation process.

The inception phase will yield an inception report clearly detailing: full methodology, approach, instruments to be used to collect data, data analysis plan, an outline of the final report, and an activity plan and timeline.

The Inception phase is expected to start in June 2022, culminating with a final, reviewed and agreed upon inception report by mid-July 2022.

- B. **Data collection, analysis and reflection:** During the data collection process, evaluators are expected to collect data through review of existing data sources and collect additional data through other methods, which the evaluation team should suggest based on the principle of Fit for Purpose.

While the primary goal of this phase is to gather evidence to address the evaluation questions, the process is expected to be participatory and not just extractive. As indicated in the approach

section, methods should aim to generate reflection and learning among participants. Evaluators will be encouraged to coordinate with local executing partners to facilitate activities such as reflection and learning workshops, interviews and focus groups to gather, reflect on, and/or triangulate data. Data collection instruments developed for the evaluation should aim to generate new insights and learning for the people who participate as part of the data collection efforts.

Key informants at the program level include (project level detailed below):

- Representatives from the Conveners;
- Representatives from One Drop as the Program SIP

Fieldwork: The evaluation team is expected to complete field work in at least four countries (Colombia, Mexico, Paraguay and Nicaragua) where the program is implemented. The length of the stay in each country shall be dependent on the methodology, which should be specified in the proposals and should consider the variety of key informants to be engaged with at project level, including:

- Representatives from Executing Partners (project Coordinators, M&E Specialists, social art for behaviour change coordinators);
- Government representatives (national, local, etc.)
- Project participants including artist groups, beneficiaries, trained leaders of change, community leaders, business owners, private sector entities, and other relevant WASH stakeholders

Travel is intended to take place in LDA target communities (i.e., not only in the capital). The fifth project in Guatemala ended implementation in December 2020, which offers an opportunity for evaluators to explore the question on sustainability. Bidders are expected to include fieldwork costs in their financial proposals.

Evaluators are responsible for identifying and abiding by all national and local laws, ethical requirements, policies and procedures (e.g., security protocol, health and safety, COVID, etc.) which may formally or informally regulate the evaluation practice in countries where LDA is implemented.

Ethical considerations with regard to how the evaluation team plans to conduct data collection work should be included in proposals and will be scrutinized during the selection process.

The data collection and analysis phase is expected to run from mid-July through mid-October 2022. A field trip to Nicaragua will need to occur before early August as the project is ending by mid-year. The first draft of the evaluation report is expected by mid-October.

Please note that all data collection is expected to be conducted in Spanish.

- C. **Deliverables and Learning:** Evaluators can expect two rounds of review of the draft evaluation report (including an executive summary); one by the full MEL committee and the second by the evaluation manager and MEL specialist to ensure all MEL committee observations have been addressed. MEL committee will focus on ensuring the accuracy, quality and comprehensiveness of findings, and of links to conclusions and recommendations. The latter should be relevant, targeted, realistic and actionable. The MEL committee, being advisory, shall respect the decision

of the independent evaluators about whether feedback is incorporated, as long as the process is transparent, including rationale for not incorporating feedback.

The final report shall not exceed 50 pages (not including attachments). Both the initial draft and final version of the evaluation report will be submitted to the LDA MEL Committee (through the One Drop’s representative) which will provide comments and suggestions to the evaluation team.

One Drop will hold an event in late November 2022 in San Miguel de Allende, Mexico, during which representatives of executing partners will be present as well as other key stakeholders of the program (One Drop staff, and other Conveners). This represents a unique opportunity for the evaluation team to present the findings and host a reflection session. Bidders are expected to provide details on how they intend to capitalize on this opportunity and budget any such activities in their proposal. Presence of at least the Evaluation Team Leader during this meeting is expected.

Upon delivery of the final report, the evaluation team will be expected to facilitate a virtual learning session with evaluation users and other key stakeholders to share findings and contribute to the use of evaluation findings.

All deliverables are expected to be written in English. An Executive Summary of the Final Report must be in both in English and Spanish.

Roles and responsibilities

Over the course of the evaluation mandate, evaluators will report to the LDA Monitoring Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Committee, via a point person assigned for that task. The LDA MEL Committee will review, comment and, ultimately, approve each of the deliverables and will provide overall guidance to the evaluators.

Executing partners will provide logistical support to coordinate fieldwork and interactions with government stakeholders.

Timeline

Activities and deliverables	Expected due date
RFP posted online	April 15 th
Question period for bidders	Through May 1 st
Deadline for proposal submission	May 17 th
Bidder selection and contracting	June 8 th
Evaluation kickoff meeting	June 22 nd
Inception report due	July 22 nd
Data collection and analysis phase	July 22 nd – October 15 th
Draft report submission	October 21 st
Final report submission	November 18 th
Evaluation reflection session	Late November in San Miguel de Allende, Mexico

All deliverables are required to be completed by December 15th, 2022. No exception will be granted.

Guidelines for bidders

Evaluation team qualifications

The program seeks to hire a firm or evaluation team that meets the following qualifications:

- Extensive knowledge and experience in conducting international development/humanitarian program evaluations in Latin America for a range of organizations (15+ years for senior team members)
- Experience in water and sanitation development projects (10+ years for)
- Experience with behavior change programs, ideally arts-based programs (10+ years)
- Experience with transformative evaluation approaches and methods (demonstrated experience)
- Bilingual team – English and Spanish
- Experience in the program intervention countries: Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Colombia and Paraguay

Proposals

Bidders are requested to develop proposals in English using the following structure and respecting the indicated page limit. All proposals will be assessed against the description and score listed below. The score assigned to each component will be proportional to the extent to which bidders have provided a detailed, credible and value-adding demonstration of their intent to conduct a summative evaluation that will result in rigorous evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Technical proposal

Maximum 25 pages including title page, for a total of 75 points. Should include:

- A. Cover letter (5 points)
 - Statement of interest, including full contact details for the evaluation team leader and why you believe your team is well placed to conduct this evaluation
 - Three professional references for the team leader from recent evaluation assignments
- B. Presentation of the evaluation team (10 points)
 - Short bios for each team member, indicating their expected roles, professional qualifications and experience vs RFP qualifications
- C. Past experiences (15 points)
 - Include at least three project descriptions for past evaluation assignments relevant to this mandate
- D. Understanding of the assignment (10 points)
 - Purpose
 - Objective
 - Comments on the RFP (if any)
- E. Proposed approach and methodology (15 points)
 - Evaluation matrix with revised evaluation questions
 - Overall approach

- Suggested methods
- F. Workplan (**15 points**)
- Evaluation process
 - Methodological limitations and mitigation strategies
 - Ethical considerations
 - Quality assurance procedures
 - Level of effort (table summarizing the number person days for each team member/each task)
 - Proposed timeline
- G. Annex 1 - Full CVs of all team members (no page limit – **5 points**)
Other annexes any additional information not included in previous sections of the technical proposal.

Financial proposal guidelines

Maximum 5 pages including title page, for a total of 25 points (25%)

A. Budget (**20 points**)

Personnel fees by consultant, itemized travel expenses, overheads, etc. Note: All costs should be featured in US dollars only.

The maximum budget available for the summative evaluation is USD 175,000\$. This amount includes all personnel fees, expenses (international and local transports, airport transfers, hotel, per diem and visa fees) and overhead costs but excludes taxes. Travel insurance is expected to be covered by the evaluators.

B. Suggested payment structure (**5 points**)

Bidders are invited to suggest a payment structure with a specific amount corresponding to each formal deliverable. Amounts should be proportional to the level of effort (person days) and resources utilized to complete each deliverable.

Each payment will be processed within 30 days of receiving an invoice and pending satisfaction from the LDA MEL Committee.

Selection process

Technical proposals will amount to 75% of the final grade while financial proposals will amount to 25% for a total of 100%. Only bidders scoring at least 35 points at the technical proposal stage (i.e., 35 out of 75) will proceed to the following stage, namely the assessment of the financial proposals. In-person or telephone interview(s) will be conducted with the short-listed candidates. Unsuccessful bidders can request a brief written summary of feedback from the selection committee on their respective proposal.

Question period

Exclusively between April 15 to May 1, 2022 (5 pm EST), bidders are invited to submit questions or requests for clarifications to One Drop regarding the content of this request for proposals. These questions should be submitted at One Drop at contacto@lazosdeagua.org. One Drop wishes to ensure transparency and fairness for all prospective bidders. In order to make a compiled list of questions and

responses available for all involved, bidders should submit an e-mail to contacto@lazosdeagua.org by May 1st to indicate their intention to submit a proposal (and their wish to receive the compiled questions/responses).

Proposal Submission

Proposals must be submitted as two separate PDF documents (one for the technical proposal and the other for the financial proposal) in single e-mail message at contacto@lazosdeagua.org with Anna.Zisa@onedrop.org cc'ed. Only proposals submitted by e-mail will be accepted.

All proposals must be received by Tuesday May 17th, 2022 at 5 pm EST. Late proposals will not be accepted. Failure to respect any aspects of the required proposal structure or submission guidelines will result in the disqualification of the bidder.

Appendix I

Lazos de Agua Program Logic Model									
Ultimate outcome	Improved living conditions and health of the target population								<p><u>Glossary:</u></p> <p>Agents of Change: target communities' members who have been trained on the SABC methodology and on topics related to the project's promoted behaviors and who replicate the knowledge gained through SABC interventions with a focus on WASH during and ideally beyond the project.</p> <p>Determinants: factors that influence behaviors, they may impede or motivate the practice of behaviors (i. e. barriers and motivators).</p> <p>Government institutions: generic term that covers the State Water Commission (CEA)/National Water Commission (CONAGUA) in Mexico; the Nicaraguan Aqueducts and Sewers Company (ENACAL) in Nicaragua periurban; and the National Environmental Sanitation Service (SENASA) in Paraguay.</p> <p>Institutional WASH actors: generic term that covers Municipal Planning Offices (OMPs)/Municipal Planning Departments (DMPs) in Guatemala; municipalities/regional institutions in Mexico; Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Regional Technical Unit (UTRASH)/ Municipal Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Unit (UMASH) in Nicaragua; and Sanitation Boards Associations in Paraguay.</p> <p>Microfinance institutions: generic term that covers Maya ProCredit in Guatemala; Hábitat para la Humanidad and Caja Popular in Mexico; PanaPana and Caja Rural Mano a Mano in Nicaragua; and Banco Visión and Fundación Paraguaya in Paraguay.</p> <p>Promoted behaviors: a set of defined WASH-related behaviors and central to Component B interventions. All program projects will promote: hand-washing with soap and water after using the toilet, before eating and before preparing food; duly paying the water service fee; correctly treating water for drinking at home; safely storing water for drinking at home. In addition, some projects will promote additional behaviors that are specific to their context, such as connecting to the condominium sewerage network in small towns in Paraguay and in peri-urban in Nicaragua.</p> <p>SABC: Social Art for Behavior Change</p> <p>SABC interventions: shows, workshops or artistic documentary and participatory performances of the Inspire, Activate or Sustain categories such as plays, social circus workshops, short films, radio spots, etc.</p> <p>WASH: Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</p> <p>Water and Sanitation Committees: generic term that covers Community Water and Sanitation Services Organizations which, depending on the country, are called Water Committees, Drinking Water Committees or Water and Sanitation Administrative Board in Colombia; Community Water Services Organization (OCSAs)/ Local Water and Sanitation Boards (JULAS) in Guatemala; Citizen Water Committees in Mexico; Drinking Water and Sanitation Committees (CAPS) in Nicaragua; Sanitation Boards Steering Committees in Paraguay.</p> <p>Entrepreneurs/Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) of WASH products and services: hardware stores, craftsmen, artisans, plumbers, etc.</p>
Intermediate outcomes	1000: Increased access to a safely managed level of water and sanitation services		2000: Increased practice of the promoted WASH related behaviors			3000: Increased access to an improved WASH market			
Immediate outcomes	1100: Increased access to new or rehabilitated WASH systems/facilities	1200: Improved capacity of water and sanitation committees to manage WASH systems	1300: Improved capacity of institutional WASH actors to manage and support the sector	2100: Increased favorability of the determinants related to the promoted behaviors	2200: Agents of Change perform/replicate SABC interventions	2300 (Model 2): Government institutions take ownership of the SABC methodology	3100: Improved access to credit/financial products tailored to the WASH sector	3200: Improved supply quality of WASH products and services by entrepreneurs/MSMEs	
Outputs	1110: Potable water systems built or rehabilitated	1210: Assistance provided to water and sanitation committees on conformation, administration, financial management and governance	1310: Support provided to institutional WASH actors	2110: SABC interventions designed to address determinants of promoted behaviors	2210: Training provided to Agents of Change on SABC methodology	2310 (Model 2): Training provided to public officials on SABC methodology	3110: Support provided to microfinance institutions to create or tailor credits for WASH products and services	3210: Market studies and/or research on improved WASH products conducted and shared with supported entrepreneurs/MSMEs	
Outputs	1120: Sewerage systems/sanitation facilities built or rehabilitated	1220: Technical assistance provided to water and sanitation committees on operation and maintenance of WASH systems		2120: SABC interventions implemented in target communities	2220: Tools designed and transferred to Agents of Change on how to replicate the SABC methodology in target communities	2320 (Model 2): Tools designed and transferred to government institutions on the SABC methodology	3120: Training provided to community members, water committees and entrepreneurs/MSMEs on microcredits tailored to the WASH sector	3220: Support provided to entrepreneurs/MSMEs providing WASH products or services on technical, financial management, sales and customer service	
Outputs	1130: Hand washing facilities built or improved						3130: Promotional campaigns carried out on credit/financial products created or tailored to the WASH sector	3230: Promotional campaigns carried out on improved WASH products and services	