



Ex-Post Evaluation of Support to Equitable Access to Quality Water, Basic
Sanitation and Enhanced Water Resources Management in Rural Kenya

Final Evaluation Report

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland

12 March 2024

Final Evaluation Report

Evaluation team

Jeremy Colin (Team Leader)

Martha Keega

Felix Luutsa

Kristiina Mikkola

Service Coordinator: Sari Laaksonen

An evaluation implemented by:



Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	i
Executive Summary	iii
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background and context.....	1
1.2 Evaluation objectives and scope	2
1.3 Key evaluation questions	3
2. Approach, Methodology and Limitations	4
2.1 Approach.....	4
2.2 Methodology.....	4
2.1 Limitations	4
3. Context analysis.....	5
4. Findings.....	7
4.1 Relevance	8
4.2 Coherence.....	12
4.3 Effectiveness	14
4.3.1 Enhanced institutional capacity of WSTF.....	15
4.3.2 Enhanced capacity of counties to provide an enabling environment.....	19
4.3.3 Equitable and sustainable access to water resources.....	21
4.3.4 Improved sustainable and equitable access to water services.....	23
4.3.5 Improved rural sanitation coverage in target counties.....	28
4.3.6 The role of monitoring and evaluation	31
4.3.7 Other findings on effectiveness	32
4.4 Efficiency	33
4.5 Impact	35
4.6 Sustainability.....	38
5. Conclusions.....	40
6. Lessons learned	42
7. Recommendations	43

List of annexes

Annex 1. Evaluation Terms of Reference.....	46
Annex 2. Evaluation Matrix.....	57
Annex 3. Status of water supply schemes visited.....	66
Annex 4. Evaluation Mission Itinerary.....	71
Annex 5. Programme Results Framework (final version).....	74
Annex 6. List of documents consulted.....	91

List of tables

Table 1. Contribution by Development Partners.....	2
Table 2. Government of Finland Development Policies 2012 and 2016.....	5
Table 3. Traffic light coding of evaluation findings.....	7
Table 4. Summary ranking of results on relevance.....	8
Table 5. Summary ranking of results on coherence.....	12
Table 6. Summary ranking of results on effectiveness.....	15
Table 7. Extract from Results Framework (Component Five) setting the objectives for WSTF capacity enhancement.....	15
Table 8. Extract from Final Results framework (Component One) setting the objectives for county capacity enhancement.....	19
Table 9. Extract from Final Results framework (Component two) setting the objectives for improved management of water resources.....	21
Table 10. Extract from Final Results framework (Component three) setting the objectives for improved sustainable and equitable access to water services.....	23
Table 11. Extract from Final Results framework (Component four) setting the objectives for improved rural sanitation.....	28
Table 12. ODF Achievements by county.....	30
Table 13. Summary ranking of results on efficiency.....	33
Table 14. Summary ranking of results on impact.....	35
Table 15. Summary ranking of results on sustainability.....	38
Table 16. Factors affecting the sustainability of J6P water supply schemes.....	40

List of boxes

Box 1 Note on existing water supply schemes.....	xi
Box 2. Programme extensions.....	18
Box 3. Two non-operational schemes with longstanding problems.....	26
Box 4 Note on existing water supply schemes.....	45

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CBO	Community-Based Organisation
CCO	Cross-Cutting Objective
CG	County Government
CLTS	Community-Led Total Sanitation
CRE	County Resident Engineer
CRM	County Resident Monitor
DOE	Department of Education
DOPH	Department of Public Health
DP	Development Partner
EQ	Evaluation Question
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GESI	Gender, Equity and Social Inclusion
GIS	Geographical Information System
GOK	Government of Kenya
HRBA	Human Rights-Based Approach
HWF	Hand Washing Facility
J6P	Joint Six Programme
JAOME	Joint Annual Operations Monitoring Exercise
KESSF	Kenya Environmental Sanitation and Hygiene Strategic Framework
KEWI	Kenya Water Institute
KII	Key Informant Interview
MCA	Member of County Assembly
MFA	Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
MHM	Menstrual Hygiene Management
MOH	Ministry of Health
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MOWSI	Ministry of Water, Sanitation and Irrigation
NAWASCO	Nanyuki Water and Sanitation Company
NIWASCO	Nithi Water and Sanitation Company
ODF	Open Defecation-Free
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicator
PCR	Programme Completion Report
PIF	Public Sector Investment Facility
PWD	Person with Disability
PMIS	Programme Management Information System
PMR	Programme Management Review
SCAMP	Sub-Catchment Management Plan
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SDG 6	The Sixth Sustainable Development Goal to Ensure Access to Water and Sanitation for All
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency

TA	Technical Assistance
TOR	Terms of Reference
WASCO	Water and Sanitation Company
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WASREB	Water Supply Regulatory Board
WDC	Water Development Commission
WRA	Water Resources Authority
WRM	Water Resources Management
WRMA	Water Resources Management Authority
WRUA	Water Resource User Associations
WSP	Water Service Provider
WSS	Water Supply and Sanitation
WSTF	Water Sector Trust Fund
WUA	Water Users Association

Executive Summary

Introduction and background

This report sets out the findings of the ex-post evaluation of the Joint Six Programme (J6P), which was a collaboration between the Government of Kenya, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFA) and the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA). It was implemented by the Water Sector Trust Fund (WSTF) with support from a Technical Assistance (TA) team provided by the consultancy Finnish Consulting Group, Sweden. The goal of the Programme was 'Equitable access to quality water, basic sanitation and enhanced water resources management for the underserved communities in rural Kenya'. There were five intended outcomes:

1. Enhanced capacity of counties to provide pro-poor water services.
2. Equitable access to water resources in catchment areas of focus.
3. Improved rural safe water coverage in target counties.
4. Improved rural sanitation coverage in target counties.
5. Enhanced institutional capacity of WSTF.

J6P was implemented in six counties: Kwale, Laikipia, Migori, Nandi, Narok and Tharaka Nithi, and the programme design envisaged that investments would be co-financed by WSTF and County Governments (CG). The objectives of the evaluation were to assess:

- How has the implementation model of J6 assisted in strengthening the capacity of the CGs to provide water and sanitation services? Has this created opportunities for up-scaling?
- Has the implementation of the programme helped to create a sustainable model for service provision on the community level?
- Was the operational set-up of the projects, including TA, human resources, and related financial aspects, good enough to achieve the project objectives?

The evaluation mission took place from November 19 to December 6, 2023, and included visits to all six counties plus interviews with programme stakeholders at the national level.

Findings

Relevance

Programme objectives were well aligned with country priorities in the water sector. They were not explicitly aligned with the sustainable development goals (SDG) but were broadly supportive of them. The human rights-based approach (HRBA), gender, equity and social inclusion (GESI), and climate resilience all featured in the programme design but were not given much attention during implementation. Satisfaction with J6P was generally good at the county level but mixed at the utility

level since most of the water supply schemes visited were not operational. The few households visited in villages targeted for sanitation and hygiene promotion were positive about project results.

Coherence

Within WSTF, the TA helped to strengthen management and monitoring systems for the whole organisation, not just J6P. The evaluation did not find examples of other sector programmes operating in J6P counties over the same period. Roles and responsibilities were clear, but most CGs did not play their intended role in full.

Effectiveness

Progress by component is outlined below. WSTF was diligent in monitoring physical and financial progress, less so in monitoring 'soft' aspects, especially utility performance.

Enhanced institutional capacity of WSTF

The programme adopted 42 targets under this component, and reportedly, 24 were met or exceeded; 17 were not met, and results for one were unconfirmed. The TA team played a central role in capacity building for the Fund and helped to develop some programming tools which are still being used beyond J6P. However, the working relationship between TA personnel and the Fund was difficult at times. Low absorption capacity emerged as a critical challenge for the programme and prompted MFA to commission a Programme Management Review (PMR) in late 2017. The PMR recommended that WSTF expedite the completion of Batch I water supply projects, shift the focus of attention from infrastructure development to strengthening service delivery, provide more technical support on the ground, and identify third-party organisations that could help improve utility performance. The recommendations were mostly implemented, and the speed and quality of implementation improved towards the end. The remaining capacity gaps at WSTF include the capacity to strengthen water utility performance. WSTF does not have the resources to provide the level of support the many utilities need, and the lack of data on utility performance results suggests that the Fund was unable to track this effectively.

Enhanced capacity of counties to provide an enabling environment

The programme results framework showed targets for 13 of the 16 objective verifiable indicators (OVI) under this component. Of these, seven targets were substantially met, while 6 were not met. The most substantive reported achievements were the development of county water strategies and plans and the mainstreaming of GESI in projects. The latter is somewhat surprising given that WSTF did not place much emphasis on GESI during the programme and that none of the counties adopted GESI guidelines. Network coverage maps were produced in 5 out of 6 counties, but county-level water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) databases were not adopted. The motivation of CG stakeholders affected programme results, and none of the countries made the expected capital contribution towards Batch I projects. Laikipia was an example of a county that was relatively proactive.

Equitable and sustainable access to water resources

Of the 28 targets adopted under this component, 25 were reportedly met or substantially met. These are related to, amongst other things, the adoption and implementation of Sub-catchment Management Plans, the installation of water control structures, the protection of springs and erosion gullies, and tree planting. Unmet targets related to 'soft' aspects, such as institutional structures for water resources management (WRM) conflict resolution and the monitoring and regulation of water abstraction. Being community organisations, most water resources users' associations (WRUA) struggled to play an effective management or regulatory role and felt powerless to address transboundary conflicts over water use or more local issues such as encroachment on swamp land. Some funding to WRUAs was for livelihood activities such as beekeeping and fish farming, but these were often problematic and generated little income.

The programme design envisaged that water resources management and water supply interventions would be mutually supportive, helping to ensure the sustainability of drinking water sources. In practice, there was no linkage between these components and synergies were not achieved.

Improved sustainable and equitable access to water services

The programme supported 31 utilities, some of them twice, giving a total of 42 water supply projects. Most expanded service coverage; some also rehabilitated or expanded storage, and some replaced or augmented water sources. In many cases, there was a high percentage of users with private connections, plus a small number of kiosks where water could be purchased by the jerrycan. At many schemes, metering was established prior to J6P, but billing and collection were typically simple, paper-based systems. The results framework lists 16 OVIs and shows results for half of them. Targets were substantially met for just four: the number of projects supported, the percentage of schemes chlorinating water (51% against a target of 53%), the percentage using a good practice matrix, and women's participation in decision-making within utilities (33% target achieved). Water quality tests were rarely conducted. For the other indicators reported, targets were not met. These related to the number of people gaining access (two-thirds of 199,000 target achieved); the number of house connections (approximately 7,000 against a target of 12,000); the number of schemes using renewable energy sources (6 against a target of 12); and the number of utilities becoming eligible to access credit (11 against a target of 32). Results for the remaining eight indicators have yet to be confirmed, suggesting that they have not been tracked. These are related to hours of supply, customer satisfaction, revenue as a percentage of operation and maintenance costs, reduction in non-revenue water, billing efficiency, service improvements for the poorest households, people benefiting from water service employment opportunities, and the cost of water. Without these results, the success of this component could only be assessed in broad terms.

Service coverage and quality

Six of the 17 schemes visited were fully operational, three were partially operational, and eight were not operating at all. Moreover, all functioning schemes were subject to technical and/or governance constraints, which were a serious threat to sustainability. Of the fully functional schemes, only two were supplying all of their intended customers, and only three had an adequate year-round supply. Others

experienced an excess of demand over supply, especially in the dry season. Examples of defects at the partially operational schemes included a booster station without power (this should have been provided by the CG), infrastructure damage caused by storms and elephants, and a river intake washed away by floods in 2018. Of the schemes not operating, one was not in use due to low demand during the rainy season; two had distribution lines destroyed by road construction works; three had a dry or inadequate source supply; one was unable to cover power costs due to unpaid customer bills; and one had its intake destroyed by the adjoining CG within whose boundary it was located. Some challenges had been left unresolved for years for reasons which were not clear. While data on operational efficiency were unavailable, interviews at operational schemes provided some examples of utilities that were managing operations well. At Kimng'oror in Nandi, the scheme had a plentiful year-round supply and was diligent in revenue collection. At Solio, Laikipia, J6P support enabled the gravity flow scheme to reach a previously unserved part of the community, which prompted an expansion in small-scale farming.

Some other utilities reported that they had increased their revenue, at least while their scheme was functional. Overall results for this component, however, suggest that the programme failed to make significant and lasting improvements in service quality or operational efficiency. Apart from utility capability, common factors affecting performance included:

- Planning and design faults. For example, some respondents said that the capacity and reliability of the water sources were not adequately checked before making investments in network expansion.
- Failures in local governance. Some utilities failed to collect enough revenue to cover their operational costs. Additional challenges here were the high failure rate of water meters, high power costs, local politicians who encouraged people not to pay their water bills, and the COVID-19 pandemic, which led many people to stop paying bills, a habit which then became embedded.

Equitable access

For schemes that were operational, the evaluation found no evidence of intentional exclusion in service delivery, and affordability was commonly reported as a factor in tariff setting. There was a general consensus that tariffs were affordable both for users of house connections and kiosks, though this had implications for cost recovery, especially high power costs. There was also evidence of women's participation in decision-making in utilities, with the target of 30% representation on management committees exceeding slightly to 33%, though the target was not always met for utility employees. While the programme design signalled a move away from an explicitly pro-poor approach, most of the communities visited were in the low or low-middle-income bracket, many of them being small-scale farmers.

Improved rural sanitation coverage in target counties

The results framework included 15 OVs for sanitation. Of these, no results were reported for 5: availability of hand washing facilities; maintenance of open defecation-free (ODF) status; access for the most vulnerable; and availability of menstrual hygiene management (MHM) facilities. Other targets

were fully achieved or exceeded and related to the number of school/health centre facilities constructed; schools conforming to the standard latrine to student ratio; the number of public sanitation facilities provided; the number of people with access to public sanitation facilities; the number of villages becoming ODF; and the generation of employment opportunities. The targets not met concerned the number of pupils gaining access to toilets and the percentage of school and public toilets with disability access.

Institutional sanitation and hygiene

This sub-component focussed on school sanitation, though a small number of public toilets were also constructed. Schools were closed when visited, but the few head teachers who met expressed appreciation for the facilities provided. It was not possible to verify how effectively the 'soft' part of this component was implemented, but it was noted that:

- utilities engaged directly with the selected schools, and there was little substantive involvement of the Department of Education or CG;
- the physical quality of work was often poor, though most toilets were used to some extent, and
- this was primarily a hardware intervention rather than a holistic WASH in Schools initiative.

It was also evident that several targeted schools had received successive donations of toilet blocks in recent years, but there was no coordinated approach to ensure that each school maintained a minimum standard of WASH services and hygiene. Moreover, it was clear that toilet blocks quickly fell into disrepair and disuse. The value of this programme component was doubtful, and the prospects for sustainability were poor.

Household sanitation

The programme aimed to achieve ODF status in communities within the service area of supported utilities, with implementation led by the Department of Public Health (DOPH). There was an average of 14 villages per project, and the target of 433 ODF villages was missed only narrowly. Funding was routed to DOPH via supported utilities, not via the Ministry of Health structure – a strange choice given that MOH has the responsibility of leading the government in rural sanitation and hygiene promotion. The bulk of the ODF results came from Migori and Tharaka-Nithi counties. Migori was an exceptional case; here, DOPH was already pursuing county-wide ODF status when J6P support began, a target that it achieved before the programme ended.

Equitable access to sanitation facilities

The evaluation did not identify any equity concerns relating to school or household sanitation. School facilities were provided separately for boys and girls, and in at least some of the schools, provision was made for disabled students to access them.

Efficiency

Low absorption capacity was a critical challenge for most of the implementation period, but this changed during the extension period, resulting in 90% budget utilisation. The highly centralised nature

of WSTF operations was a constraint on implementation in the counties, but the local support improved after the PMR with the appointment of County Resident Engineers (CRE).

Impact and Sustainability

J6P delivered benefits related to water supply, but these were mostly short-lived. Challenges with functionality, source sufficiency, cost recovery and local governance mean that sustainability is seriously at risk. The challenges are potentially resolvable, but this would require further funding and technical support plus, crucially, CG and utility commitment. The likelihood that the WRM and institutional sanitation components will have a long-term impact is also doubtful, but for household sanitation, the results are more encouraging.

Conclusions

J6P began when WASH responsibility had recently been devolved to county governments, and there was some uncertainty as to what could be achieved with the time and resources available. The programme also had to contend with the COVID-19 pandemic, which interrupted operations and monitoring for a significant period.

Programme design

The programme results framework did not signal clearly what would constitute success for funding each project, and there was a tendency to monitor activities more than results. Sustainability did not receive enough attention, and there was no substantive engagement on climate resilience. The fact that only 6 out of 17 water supply schemes were operating when visited calls into question the value of J6P-funded investments. The long-term value of J6P support to school WASH is doubtful because utilities engaged with schools on an ad-hoc basis; there was no county-wide government initiative to improve school WASH. The community-led total sanitation (CLTS) component was at least led by DOPH, which has formal responsibility for sanitation and hygiene promotion.

County and utility ownership

J6P promoted the decentralised management of WASH services but was itself a centrally managed programme that, for good reasons, had tight control over the use of programme funds. County government ownership of projects was low in most cases. How best to promote county-level ownership and effective management of devolved services remains an ongoing challenge in Kenya and is not unique to J6P.

Capacity development

The intent of the programme design was that J6P would support utilities with a proven track record. In practice, many of the utilities assisted by J6P had very limited technical or managerial skills, and capacity building support was insufficient to have a significant impact on utility operations.

Compliance with the Government of Kenya, MFA and SIDA policies

The programme was directly supportive of the national devolution policy. The shortfall was in the level of achievement around county government ownership and water supply service delivery. Regarding HRBA and GESI, the programme content was thin. WSTF did not adopt a GESI strategy until the very end of the programme and has yet to develop a real understanding and commitment in these areas. Similarly, the limited attention paid to climate resilience reflects the fact that WSTF does not yet have a clear vision of what it means to develop climate-resilient services. The sector as a whole is still grappling with this question, and addressing it could be a priority for future TAs in the organisation.

Lessons learned

1. Small utilities with few technical staff need more capacity building support than a programme like J6P can provide.
2. Backup support to small utilities from CGs and their utilities ('WASCO') is essential. WASCOs have a permanent local presence and are part of the devolved institutional framework.
3. Many of the problems encountered with water supply schemes had their roots in poor planning, design and/or construction. It is vital to get these basics right at the start.
4. Further WRM interventions following the same approach would make little difference to the sustainability of water supply investments.

Recommendations

The recommendations below are grouped according to the organisation(s) responsible, with the first set applicable to both development partners and WSTF.

Recommendations for WSTF and development partners on programme design

1. The design process for future WSTF programmes should pay particular attention to the following: The design document should set out the specific problems to be addressed, explain how the programme will resolve them and define what would constitute success. The inclusion of a Theory of Change showing key assumptions at each stage will help to ensure that the proposed implementation strategy is credible and founded on sound logic.
2. Instead of listing 'key results' and 'results areas,' the results framework should set out a logical progression from activities to outputs to outcomes and finally impacts. Associated targets and associated indicators should be measurable, and the monitoring framework should identify how and when this measurement will be done.
3. For programmes that involve partnerships with county governments, targets should align with the county's own priorities and targets as set out in their development plans to enhance county ownership of the programme.
4. For both water supply and sanitation services, the design should include explicit measures to support and enable sustainability, including climate resilience. Appropriate indicators and processes for tracking progress towards sustainability should be incorporated into the monitoring and evaluation framework. These should be user-friendly and understood by partners at the county and utility levels.

5. The priority for monitoring should be tracking achievements, not activities. Inputs (such as the number of projects funded or training packages delivered) should not be confused with outputs (such as the number of additional people gaining access to safe water).

Recommendations for future MFA technical support (including support under Public Sector Investment Facility, PIF)

6. Continue to provide TA in a supportive but not directive role; programme management should remain WSTF's responsibility. Reach agreement with WSTF at the outset on the objectives, scope and boundaries of the TA's role.
7. MFA should continue supporting efforts to strengthen WSTF's capability and effectiveness overall, looking beyond the timeframe of individual projects. particularly their ability to ensure the quality of physical outputs and to support the establishment of sustainable services.
8. Consider including TA to help WSTF gain a better understanding of and commitment to HRBA and GESI – for example, via orientation and training from an external organisation specialising in these areas. Then, support them in mainstreaming HRBA and GESI within programme operations.
9. Assist WSTF in identifying appropriate operational models, designs and technologies for the establishment of climate-resilient WASH services.
10. Another valuable contribution of external TA can be to introduce approaches or technologies from elsewhere that are new to the organisation and potentially useful. However, it is important that these are brought in and tested as a response to locally identified needs – they should not be imposed rigidly.

Recommendations for WSTF rural WASH programming

11. WSTF should reinstate the requirement for significant (more than 10%) upfront county government contributions and be prepared to cancel projects where these contributions are not forthcoming.
12. WSTF should give more attention to advocacy at the county level, including with MCAs, to generate support for sustainable service delivery based on revenue generation. Again, if county governments do not give their explicit support to sustainable approaches, then investments should not go ahead.
13. More attention should be paid to supporting county-wide approaches to WASH improvement in support of SDG 6 and the national sanitation strategy. This support needs to go beyond one-off support to the formulation of a strategy or master plan and address routine planning, coordination and monitoring practices.

Water supply

14. Utility performance and scheme sustainability (including financial sustainability) should be given much higher priority in future programming. To ensure that these aspects are not marginalised, a specified minimum standard of performance (tailored to utility type and scheme size) should be made a precondition for investment support. (This would be in line with the original intention of the J6P to support utilities with a proven track record).
15. Training workshops and KEWI internships are helpful but not sufficient to secure long-term improvements in utility capability and performance. Programme design should include more

on-the-ground technical support and mentoring for each utility, tailored to address the findings of a capacity needs assessment.

BOX 1 NOTE ON EXISTING WATER SUPPLY SCHEMES

Action is needed to restore the functionality of schemes visited by the evaluation mission that were not operational or only partially functional. If this is not done, considerable investments will have been wasted. It is recommended that WSTF at least tries to secure the resolution of current faults in collaboration with the relevant CGs and utilities.

Source: Evaluation team

Water resources management

- 16.** Where WRM and water supply components feature in the same programme, WRM interventions should include specific measures to support the sustainability of water supply schemes funded under the programme.

School WASH

- 17.** WSTF should not fund School WASH improvements unless these form part of a county-wide initiative led by the DOE to ensure that all schools meet minimum WASH standards.

Household sanitation

- 18.** WSTF should prioritise supporting DOPH-led initiatives to promote sanitation county-wide in support of SDG6 rather than targeting a few villages in the catchment area of water supply schemes funded by the programme.
- 19.** WSTF funding for sanitation should be routed via the lead ministry for sanitation and hygiene (health), not via water utilities, some of which are CBOs.

Public/communal toilets

- 20.** WSTF should not fund public/communal toilets for daily use by rural households for two reasons. Firstly, there is usually ample space for household toilets, which offer greater privacy and convenience. Secondly, sector experience shows that public toilets quickly become unsanitary and abandoned unless managed by a highly motivated management body, usually on a pay-to-use basis.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and context

The J6P, full title 'Support to Equitable Access to Quality Water, Basic Sanitation and Enhanced Water Resources Management in Rural Kenya' was a collaboration between the Government of Kenya (GOK) and two bilateral Development Partners: MFA Finland and SIDA.

J6P was implemented by the WSTFs with support from a TA team provided by the consultancy Finnish Consulting Group (FCG) Sweden. WSTF was established as a state corporation in 2004 and operates under the Ministry of Water, Sanitation and Irrigation. Its mandate is to provide conditional and unconditional grants to counties and to assist in financing the development and management of water services in marginalised areas or any area of Kenya which is considered by the Board of Trustees to be underserved.

J6P was initially designed to run from December 2014 to December 2018 but was extended and eventually ended in June 2021, after which there was a six-month close-out phase. When the programme began, Kenya had recently undergone a process of devolution in accordance with the 2010 Constitution and associated legislation, under which responsibility for a number of basic services, including water supply and sanitation, was assigned to newly created CGs.

J6P was implemented in six counties: Kwale, Laikipia, Migori, Nandi, Narok and Tharaka Nithi, and the programme design envisaged that investments would be co-financed by WSTF and CGs. The capacity of water utilities to deliver sustainable services and of CGs to plan, coordinate and monitor services county-wide would also be enhanced via TA provided by the programme.

The WRM component was implemented through Water Resource User Associations (WRUA) with technical support from the Water Resources Authority (WRA), formerly the Water Resources Management Authority (WRMA). In addition, the programme supported improvements in School WASH facilities and promoted household sanitation and basic hygiene via the DOPH.

The goal of the Programme was 'Equitable access to quality water, basic sanitation and enhanced water resources management for the underserved communities in rural Kenya'. This objective was to be achieved through five outcomes:

1. Enhanced capacity of counties to provide pro-poor water services.
2. Equitable access to water resources in catchment areas of focus.
3. Improved rural safe water coverage in target counties.
4. Improved rural sanitation coverage in target counties.
5. Enhanced institutional capacity of WSTF.

Specific targets were set out in a results framework, which was periodically updated. The final version, with targets and reported results, is presented in Annex 6, taken from the 2023 Programme Completion Report (PCR).

In total, 42 water supply projects were implemented at 31 utilities (some receiving Batch I and Batch II infrastructure investments), 46 sanitation projects and 15 WRM projects. In addition, there were 8 COVID-19 emergency response projects; these, of course, were not foreseen when the programme was designed.

The evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR) quote the total programme cost as EUR 16.875 million, approximately Ksh 2.025 billion, comprising EUR 13.5 million (Ksh 1.62 billion) from the two development partners and EUR 3.375 million (Ksh 0.4 billion) from the GOK as counterpart funding. The breakdown of the budget is tabulated below (**Table 1**).

TABLE 1. CONTRIBUTION BY DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS

No	Description	Amount	Amount (Ksh)	% Contribution
1.	Government of Kenya	3.8m Euro (approximately)	405,000,000	20%
2.	Government of Finland	7.0m Euro	840,000,000	80%
3.	Government of Sweden	60m SEK (6.1m Euro)	780,000,000	
	TOTAL	16.875m Euro (approximately)	2,025,000,000	100%

1.2 Evaluation objectives and scope

The purpose of the final impact evaluation was to provide independent and objective evidence to the governments of Kenya, Finland, and Sweden on the intended and unintended impacts of the J6P, its achieved results, and its sustainability. The evaluation was also expected to provide lessons for future water sector programmes that might include elements similar to those in Kenya and other countries. The information provided could be especially useful for the planned Finnish-Kenyan private sector cooperation project in the water sector in Kenya (PIF), with WSTF as the Executing Agency.

While there had previously been no full evaluation, a PMR was undertaken in 2017 due to concern over the slow rate of fund disbursement and implementation. The PMR listed many delays due to the inertia and capacity constraints of the CGs, among other things. It recommended that priority be given to completing the first cycle of infrastructure works and shifting the focus of attention to strengthening service delivery. The PMR also concluded that a programme extension was justified.

The COVID-19 pandemic imposed severe restrictions on fieldwork, and for an extended period, development partners were unable to visit the six counties and funded projects. This gave the final evaluation added importance.

Not all infrastructure work was completed when the programme ended in June 2021, and improvements in utility operations were also a work in progress. The evaluation would, amongst other things, provide information on the current status of water supply, WRM and sanitation projects. The PCR had listed a number of projects with ongoing difficulties, with responsibility for solving the problems allocated to CGs and/or utilities.

The evaluation results are expected to be utilised by the Ministry of Water, Sanitation and Irrigation (MOWSI), CGs and utilities, WSTF, development partners and other stakeholders in Kenya and other countries.

The priority objectives of the evaluation were to assess:

- How has the implementation model of J6 assisted in strengthening the capacity of the County Governments to provide water and sanitation services? Has this created opportunities for up-scaling?
- Has the implementation of the programme helped to create a sustainable model for service provision on the community level?
- Was the operational set-up of the projects, including TA, human resources, and related financial aspects, good enough to achieve the project objectives?

Scope

The evaluation was to cover the full J6P implementation period (2014-2021), though it was recognised that there could be limited useful documentation from the early years, and some key personnel involved in programme design and implementation might not be available for interview. The PMR of 2017 was, however, a useful point of reference as it reviewed progress from inception and made detailed recommendations relating to programme implementation.

Given the length of time which had elapsed since development partners had visited the programme, the evaluation mission was expected to visit all six J6P counties in addition to interviews and discussions in Nairobi.

Stakeholders consulted included WSTF personnel, former TA team members, government officials at national and county levels, utility staff, WRUA members and participating school staff, programme beneficiaries, and Development Partner (DP) representatives. A representative of the World Bank was also interviewed as Chair of the DP's Water and Sanitation Coordination Group.

The evaluation mission took place over two-and-a-half weeks from November 19 to December 6, 2023. Given that all six counties were visited, the time in each was limited to just 2-3 days. Utilities, WRUAs, schools and communities were selected in consultation with WSTF management, and sampling was purposive so as to encompass a range of projects in terms of utility type (Water Users' Association or regulated Water Service Provider), project size and reported levels of functionality, while also ensuring that selected sites could be reached in the time available. In the event, a few site visits had to be dropped due to time constraints or, in the case of Kwale County, inaccessibility due to flooding. The mission itinerary, including site visits, meetings and interviews at the national and county levels, is provided in **Annex 4**.

1.3 Key evaluation questions

During the inception phase, the evaluation questions (EQ) in the original TOR were streamlined for efficiency without altering the focus and scope of the assignment. For each EQ, a small number of related sub-questions were formulated to help explore the main question in detail. These questions were incorporated into an evaluation matrix, which is presented in **Annex 2**. This shows the evaluation questions, related sub-questions and associated data sources and methodology.

2. Approach, Methodology and Limitations

2.1 Approach

The evaluation adopted a mixed methods approach comprising a review of programme documents, results and fund utilisation data; key informant interviews (KII) and focus group discussions (FGD) at national, county, project and community levels; and direct observation in the field. Visiting all six J6P counties not only provided insights on results across all programme areas to fill knowledge gaps on the donor side; it also enabled the team to triangulate findings and distinguish between 'one-off' results or lessons and those which were applicable to the programme as a whole.

2.2 Methodology

For the evaluation mission, guides were developed for FGDs and KIIs, but rigid interview scripts were avoided to allow for free-flowing discussion while maintaining a focus on the evaluation questions. While visiting water supply, WRM and sanitation projects, efforts were made to determine the extent to which the expected results had been achieved. Given the evaluation focus on impact, the assessment of sustainability (or the prospects for sustainability) was a high priority, and for this, the site visits and document review tried to explore not only the current level of functionality but also the financial viability of schemes, management challenges and other potential sustainability risks.

GESI aspects were assessed at the national level in terms of WSTF's internal strategy and approach, while at the county and project level, KIIs and FGDs tried to explore to what extent GESI was integrated into programme operations. The intention was also to explore GESI aspects at the service user level (especially the extent to which services are considered adequate, accessible and affordable for all).

In total, the evaluation mission visited 17 water supply schemes, 6 WRUAs, four school sanitation projects, and two community sanitation projects. Details of the projects visited are provided in **Annex 4**.

2.3 Limitations

Implementation of the evaluation was affected by the following limitations:

1. Visiting all six counties inevitably meant that the time spent on each project was short (typically one to two hours), though it was sufficient in most cases to identify at least the 'headline' results and challenges. The same constraint meant that there was little time to talk to users of water supply schemes beyond members of the management committee, who were themselves service users where the scheme was run by a Water Users' Association (WUA). Where a scheme was non-functional or only partially functional, the focus of attention shifted to understanding why services were not operating as intended.
2. Since the programme ended, there has been a change of administration in each county, and many of the officials met had not been in post during the J6P implementation period. Even among those who were involved, some struggled to remember what specifically the programme

had done beyond infrastructure development, especially in terms of technical assistance at the county level.

3. A fairly modest amount of documentation was shared with the evaluation team before the mission. Consequently, not much was known about the specific content of projects before visiting them. This inevitably affected the depth of the interviews, and it is possible that some significant achievements or challenges were missed.
4. The PCR was a key point of reference for the evaluation report, and the annexe included the programme results framework and final results for each component. For a significant number of indicators, there were no results (see 4.3), and it was not possible for the evaluation to fill these data gaps.

3. Context analysis

Finland has supported the development of water services in Kenya since the 1980s. For a long period of time, Finland acted independently, especially in Western Kenya, but in 2009, its support widened through a partnership with the WSTF. For many years, Finland has directed its support to WASH services in poor rural areas; it also supported the protection of water resources. Prior to J6P, Finland, Sweden, and WSTF had promoted a community management model for water service sustainability; J6P was a new departure in that it focussed on utility-run services in rural areas. **Table 2** summarises the key MFA development policies and strategies that were applied over the programme period.

TABLE 2. GOVERNMENT OF FINLAND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES 2012 AND 2016

Policy or Strategy	Key provisions
Finland's Development Policy Programme (Government of Finland Decision-in-Principle 16 February 2012)	<p>The Policy adopted a HRBA to development. Its aim is that everyone, including the poorest people, knows their rights and is able to act for them and that the authorities know their human rights obligations and are capable of implementing them; development cooperation is based on its partner countries' citizens and their democratically elected representatives having ownership of the development of their own societies; pays increasing attention to effectiveness and impact through a results-based approach; gender equality, reduction of inequality and climate sustainability were cross-cutting objectives; a strong focus on GESI, working towards the fulfilment of equal rights to benefits, promoting inclusive decision-making and reducing inequality in the provision of services; also climate change adaptation and climate change mitigation integrated. Four priority areas were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a democratic and accountable society that promotes human rights; • an inclusive green economy that promotes employment; • sustainable management of natural resources and environmental protection; and • human development.
Finland's Development Policy, One world, common future – towards sustainable development	Both the development policy and development cooperation guided by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; the core goal is to eradicate extreme poverty and to reduce poverty and inequality; The realisation of

<p>(Government Report to Parliament, 4 February 2016)</p>	<p>human rights is a key goal in the Policy with the aim to strengthen the capacity of individuals and authorities to promote human rights as well as to assure that development cooperation is not discriminatory and people have an opportunity to participate in decision-making (HRBA); the rights of children and the most vulnerable, notably persons with disabilities, are taken account of in all activities; the policy takes account of climate change with all activities to be geared to climate change mitigation and giving support for climate change adaptation and preparedness; no cross-cutting objectives were defined; There were four priority areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhancing the rights and status of women and girls, • improving the economies of developing countries to ensure more jobs, livelihood opportunities and well-being, • democratic and better-functioning societies; and • increased food security and better access to water and energy; and the sustainable use of natural resources. <p>The 2016 Development Policy remained valid until 2021 when the Report on Development Policy Across Parliamentary Terms (MFA 2021) was published.</p>
<p>MFA 2013. Country Strategy for Development Cooperation with Kenya 2013-2016</p>	<p>The county strategy reflected the priorities set out in the Finnish Development Policy Programme of 2012, including an added emphasis on human rights, democratic ownership and accountability, and results-based management. It was based on Kenya’s long-term development Strategy (Vision 2030) and Kenya’s 2010 constitution. The strategy envisaged support to the implementation of Kenya’s key priorities. A HRBA was implemented through targeted interventions intended to improve, for example, access to justice and gender equality in line with Kenya’s new rights-based constitution, and interventions that had a direct impact on the realisation of social and economic rights. A more systematic application of results-based management was adopted, implying that the interventions were monitored and evaluated vis-à-vis their contribution to the achievement of selected development results and Finland’s respective objectives. The country strategy defined three objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kenya’s development towards a democratic and accountable society that promotes human rights; • poverty reduction through inclusive green growth in the agricultural sector; and • improved management and use of forest and water resources. This included a specific objective of ‘Improved water and sanitation services for the rural poor and more sustainable and efficient water resource management’. This reflected the funding commitment to WSTF.
<p>MFA 2017. Country Strategy for Development Cooperation Kenya 2016-2019</p>	<p>The Country Strategy 2016–2019 was fully aligned with Finland’s new 2016 development policy. The strategy promoted democratic institutions, the functioning of society, and women’s and girls’ rights. Work would be continued to improve access to water and sanitation, and private sector development and synergies with private sector involvement and trade would receive greater focus. The Country Strategy had three expected impacts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accountable devolved governance that ensures the realisation of rights. 2. Improved access to jobs and livelihoods. 3. Improved realisation of women’s and girls’ rights. <p>Support to water and governance actors contributed to impact 1 through outcome 1.2 ‘Improved access to water and sanitation services in selected counties’.</p>

	<p>This Country Strategy remained valid until May 2021 when the MFA made public the Country programme for development cooperation Kenya 2021–2024. The current strategy does not reflect water, sanitation or water resource management in its contents.</p>
--	--

Important guidelines for a Human Rights-based Approach (2015) and Results-Based Management (2015) were also issued. Cross-cutting objectives (CCO) were not included in the 2016 Development Policy Programme. In practice, gender equality, reduction of inequalities, and climate sustainability were considered CCOs. This was reflected, for example, in the Manual for Bilateral Programmes (MFA, 2016) and its update (MFA, 2018). In 2020, the MFA issued updated guidance on CCOs to support the effective implementation of the Finnish Development Policy and its CCOs. The objectives were gender equality, non-discrimination (the Development Policy focuses on addressing discrimination against persons with disabilities), climate resilience, and low-emission development (MFA, 2020).

J6P was also supported by the Swedish government via SIDA, which provided just under half of development partner funding and approximately 38% of programme funding overall (see Table 1). SIDA has supported Kenya’s water sector since the 1980s. It was instrumental in supporting water sector reform after the promulgation of the Water Act 2001 and in the establishment of new water sector institutions, including the WSTF.

The end of J6P also marked the end of Finland’s bilateral cooperation in the Kenya water sector through ‘traditional’ development cooperation. The MFA country strategy now lays more emphasis on economic development, given that Kenya is becoming a low- to middle-income country and has a young, well-educated workforce that needs more employment opportunities. WSTF, together with a consortium led by a private firm, is developing a new programme to be funded by MFA and GOK, which will be very different to J6P, having an urban focus and a substantial role for private contractors rather than CGs.

4. Findings

In this section, the report details the evaluation findings for each criterion set forth by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC). For every outcome assessed, findings are aligned with the corresponding evaluation questions and summarised with an overall ‘traffic light’ ranking system, as described in **Table 3** below:

TABLE 3. TRAFFIC LIGHT CODING OF EVALUATION FINDINGS

Traffic light coding	Grade	Meaning
Green	Very good (100%)	Evidence available with respect to all evaluation questions under respective evaluation criteria suggest fully satisfactory performance.
Yellow	Good (75%)	Evidence available with respect to most evaluation questions under respective evaluation criteria suggest satisfactory performance.

Orange	Problems (50%)	Evidence available with respect to only half of evaluation questions under respective evaluation criteria suggest satisfactory performance.
Red	Serious deficiencies (25%)	Evidence available with respect to only few evaluation questions under respective evaluation criteria suggest satisfactory performance.

Source: Evaluation team

4.1 Relevance

Evaluation questions answered in this section:

1. How well were the programme’s objectives aligned with the country and global priorities in the water sector?
2. How were human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination and climate resilience integrated into programme design and implementation?
3. To what extent are the programme’s target beneficiaries (at the community, service provider, and county levels) satisfied with the focus and results of the programme?

Key findings

- Programme objectives were well aligned with country priorities in the water sector. They were not explicitly aligned with the SDGs but broadly supportive of them.
- HRBA, GESI, and climate resilience are all featured in the programme design to some extent but were not given much attention during implementation.
- Satisfaction with J6P was generally good at the county level but mixed with water supply schemes since many were not operational when visited. Student satisfaction could not be gauged since schools were closed when visited. The few households who visited CLTS sites were positive about project results.

TABLE 4. SUMMARY RANKING OF RESULTS ON RELEVANCE

Traffic light coding	Grade	Meaning
Yellow	Good (75%)	Evidence available with respect to most evaluation questions under respective evaluation criteria suggest satisfactory performance.

Alignment with country and global priorities

J6P was the first WSTF programme designed explicitly to align with and support the devolution of responsibility for WSS to CGs under the new Constitution of 2010 and associated legislation. Cost sharing with CGs was integral to programme design and was in line with new funding responsibilities for local infrastructure and services.

Another programme feature supportive of national policy was the inclusion of capacity building for CGs to help them take on their new responsibilities – this was one of the five outcome areas in the

programme design. Specifically, the results framework envisaged capacity building support for CGs in planning and monitoring, the institutional and legal framework, and GESI.

Programme support for rural water supply was to be targeted at legally registered water utilities in a move away from the earlier community management model promoted by WSTF, which was based on the Community Project Cycle. WSTF management considered that working with legally established utilities rather than informal community groups would offer better prospects for sustainability. This was broadly aligned with the trajectory of sector strategy, which encouraged the establishment of formal utilities under the oversight of the sector regulator, Water Supply Regulatory Board (WASREB) - though prior to J6P, WSTF had only worked with such utilities in urban settings.

The programme was also aligned with the established national WRM framework and would support WRUAs in developing and/or implementing Sub-Catchment Management Plans (SCAMP). Training and guidance would be provided by the WRA (formerly WRMA), based on their manual, which envisaged WRUAs progressing to successively higher levels of capacity and funding eligibility.

Regarding rural sanitation and hygiene, no national strategy for household or institutional facilities was in place when the programme was designed, but the Kenya Environmental Sanitation and Hygiene Strategic Framework (KESSF) was launched in 2016 to support the achievement of an ODF Kenya by 2020. In practice, KESSF failed to deliver results at scale in most counties due to inadequate national commitment and funding. J6P's approach to sanitation was nevertheless aligned with the KESSF insofar as it supported DOPH in implementing CLTS, a methodology used widely in the region and in low-income countries globally to help eradicate open defecation without the widespread use of hardware subsidies.

J6P was also well aligned with global priorities in WASH. It was designed at the time of progression from the Millennium Development Goals (target date 2015), which for WASH were mostly concerned with access to basic services, to the SDGs (target date 2030), which lay greater emphasis on the sustainable use of 'safely managed' WSS services that are accessible to all. While the programme results framework did not reference the SDGs explicitly or mention 'safely managed' services, it was to some extent aligned with SDG 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation indicators in that:

1. For rural water supply, which was the priority technical area for J6P, the programme targeted improvements not only in coverage but also in utilisation and service quality, with equitable access.
2. In the case of sanitation, the results framework focussed mostly on coverage, but indicators also included the achievement of ODF status, at least for communities within the catchment area of utilities supported by the project. In addition, the programme design included some support for institutional sanitation, specifically schools and health care facilities, both of which are prioritised in the SDG targets. In practice, J6P supported schools in utility catchment areas (with some provision for MHM and built two public sanitation facilities, but healthcare facilities were not targeted).
3. There was some support for the achievement of universal WASH access via TA for the development of county water supply master plans and strategies. The same was not done, however, for school WASH or household sanitation, though J6P was supportive of county-wide initiatives spearheaded by others where these were in place (as in Migori County).

Integration of human rights, GESI and climate resilience into programme design

When designing the programme, key reference points for MFA included Finland's Development Policy Programme and the Country Strategy for Development Cooperation with Kenya, 2013–2016. As noted in Section 1, both include the HRBA as a CCO. The Country Strategy was supportive of Kenya's long-term development Strategy (Vision 2030) and the 2010 Constitution.

The programme document reflects a solid effort to address human rights, gender and non-discrimination. It makes reference to the Constitution of Kenya, where sanitation and access to safe and sufficient water are both declared as basic human rights. The Constitution also supports affirmative action with at least 30% representation of either gender in all elective and appointive positions. The same is reflected in Kenya's National Gender and Development Policy (2000). The programme document is aligned with all of these instruments.

GESI/HRBA was addressed as a separate sub-result in each of the components of J6P, with the expectation that interventions would be funded, implemented and monitored for all of them. The background analysis in the programme document focused on the importance of incorporating a gender perspective and the role of women and girls as the primary users, providers and managers of water in their households and as guardians of household hygiene. The role of the water and sanitation sector in redressing inequality and positively impacting the social, political, and economic position of women was also discussed. Gender and social inclusion issues needed to be made visible and put into practice, as many GESI issues in Kenya were still at a policy/discussion level but not implemented. The results framework included GESI-related indicators for each programme component. At the WSTF level, there was just one indicator on the employment of persons with disabilities (PWD), while at the CG level, indicators related to the adoption of GESI guidelines and an action plan, the production of disaggregated beneficiary data and the mainstreaming of GESI concerns within projects. For the three technical components, there were indicators of equitable benefits, women's participation in decision-making, and provision for PWD and MHM in school sanitation.

The TA deployed by MFA included a Social Development Adviser (national expert on gender inclusion and social equity) for some time, but this post was not retained for the whole programme period due primarily to a lack of demand from WSTF; the lack of a counterpart within the organisation was an added complication. Instead, short consultancies were commissioned when needed.

Climate resilience

Climate change and its potential effects on programme outcomes do not receive much attention in the programme document. The only significant reference to government climate change policy or plans concerns the 'water sector reform agenda 2005-2015 and the fundamental realisation that water resources in Kenya are under considerable stress due to climate change'. No reference is made to the National Climate Change Response Strategy (2010) or the first National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP 2013-2017).

In the programme document, the main references to action on climate change are under Outcome 2 (WRM) as an element of SCAMPs and WRUA training; Outcomes 3 (water supply) only refers to the provision of some solar-powered pumping for selected schemes.

The extent to which GESI, HRBA and climate change were addressed in programme implementation is assessed in section 4.3.

Beneficiary satisfaction

The programme documents reviewed do not shed much light on beneficiary satisfaction; it appears that this was not monitored under J6P.

As noted in 2.2 above, some of the senior officials who were met at the county level had not been in post during the J6P implementation period and had limited knowledge of the programme content and achievements. Among those who had been involved, there was general appreciation for programme support - particularly for water supply investments. Nevertheless, the lack of CG contributions to Batch I projects calls into question how much ownership of the programme there was at the county level, a concern reinforced in counties where serious technical or governance issues affecting water supply scheme functionality were left unresolved for several years.

It is difficult to generalise on service provider satisfaction, but in cases where a J6P-funded project had been unsuccessful or only partially successful, there was, not surprisingly, some level of frustration. The PMR found that the design of the first batch of water supply schemes had been rushed and conducted largely as a desk-based exercise, with many variations needed to rectify errors and respond to realities on the ground. There was a general consensus among programme stakeholders that design, quality of work and speed of completion were better under Batch II. Nevertheless, many schemes were not fully successful. This is discussed further in section 4.3.3

While WRUAs are not service providers, they are institutional beneficiaries of J6P, and as such, their level of satisfaction with the programme is also relevant. WRM results are explored in section 4.3.2, but it is notable that while WRUAs supported by J6P continue to operate (some with new funding from other donors), most of them struggle to play an effective regulatory role and are frustrated by their limited influence. This is a challenge related to the policy and institutional environment within which WRUAs operate and not a reflection on J6P.

In the case of schools, these were closed at the time of the evaluation, and it was possible to meet only a few head teachers who happened to be present when the evaluation team visited. They were generally happy with the toilet blocks provided under the project but made little reference to any benefits in terms of improved hygiene behaviour or maintenance.

For fully functioning schemes, satisfaction was generally high among the management committee members. Nevertheless, service quality and reliability were threatened by inadequate revenue (associated with high power costs and, in some cases, the unwillingness of users to pay) and/or the inadequacy of the source to serve all users, especially in the dry season. At Kobujoi, for example, low revenue had left the WUA unable to pay its power bills for several months, resulting in scheme shutdown – a problem which has happened several times before. At the Entasekera gravity flow scheme, power was not required, but the WUA generated revenue of just 19,000 Kenyan Shilling (KES) per month since the majority of users were served by public taps, to which no charge was applied. The WUA had minimal reserves to cover operation and maintenance costs, yet it needed to repair a leaking reservoir.

Partially functioning schemes were subject to the same challenges, and water rationing during the dry season was reported as common; see 4.3.3.

Regarding household sanitation, the CLTS component only went ahead in 4 out of 6 counties. In Migori, where J6P had contributed to the achievement of county-wide ODF status, the few households visited were happy with the toilets they had built.

4.2 Coherence

Evaluation questions answered in this section:

4. To what extent was the J6P programme coherent with the policies and programmes of other partners operating within the same context? How well was the coordination between the programmes undertaken at WSTF and County level?
5. Were the roles and responsibilities of stakeholder institutions (especially WSTF, County Governments and service providers) well defined and were synergies created?

Key findings:

- Within WSTF, the TA helped to strengthen management and monitoring systems for the whole organisation, not just J6P.
- The evaluation did not find examples of other sector programmes operating in J6P counties over the same period.
- Roles and responsibilities were clear, but most county governments did not play their intended role in full.

TABLE 5. SUMMARY RANKING OF RESULTS ON COHERENCE

Traffic light coding	Grade	Meaning
Yellow	Good (75%)	Evidence available with respect to most evaluation questions under coherence suggest satisfactory performance.

Coherence with other partners; coordination between programmes at WSTF and county level
 Within WSTF at the national level, the programme TA not only supported J6P directly but also helped to strengthen management and monitoring systems for the organisation as a whole - for example, via the Joint Annual Operational Monitoring Exercise (JAOME) and Annual Rural Harmonised Report (ARHR), both of which were directly supported by the TA. By encouraging a common approach to monitoring and reporting across the whole organisation (an initiative which some other WSTF donors also supported), MFA and SIDA sought to improve the quality and consistency of these activities and reduce duplication of effort across multiple WSTF programmes.

It is less clear to what extent WSTF actively engaged with WASH- or WRM-related programmes beyond the organisation, though the programme design was well aligned with related government-led policies and strategies. For example:

- J6P supported water supply schemes managed by legally registered utilities rather than informal community groups, and some of these were subject to regulation by WASREB;
- training and project support for WRUAs was led by the WRA and based on their established strategy and processes and
- In counties where DOPH was implementing CLTS at scale under a national sanitation strategy (notably in Migori), J6P support was harmonised with those efforts and synergies were created.

In the case of school WASH, the programme liaised with the management of each target school, but J6P support was somewhat ad hoc, with a few schools selected in the catchment area of supported utilities but no county-wide, Department of Education (DOE)-led initiative to improve school WASH to which J6P could align itself.

The extent to which there were other concurrent WASH programmes in the six counties is not clear, and where other programmes were mentioned, it was mostly to confirm that they had supported a WRUA or water supply scheme before J6P or would be doing so in the near future, now that J6P had ended. Generally, the evaluation mission did not find examples of J6P actively coordinating with other programmes in the six counties.

A positive initiative at the county level was that J6P sought to strengthen the capacity of CGs for the benefit of the sector as a whole in each county. It included, for example, TA for the development of county-wide water strategies and master plans. Nevertheless, the focus of WSTF efforts remained primarily on delivering individual projects at the sub-county level.

Clarity of institutional roles, creation of synergies

Programme documentation and feedback from respondents indicate that roles and responsibilities for the implementation of the five programme components were well defined and understood, though not all counties fulfilled their intended roles.

It is unclear whether synergies were created widely, and for the first batch of water supply projects, this seems unlikely because CGs failed to make the expected contributions. There was, however, some synergy between WSTF and WRA over WRM and with DOPH in counties where the household sanitation component met its targets.

The 2017 PMR found that for Batch I projects, the newness of devolution was one of the obstacles to county contributions, with some CGs claiming that the processes by which they could make their contributions had not yet been established and it was unclear whether contributions were even permitted for water supply schemes managed by WUAs. Such issues were later resolved, but another obstacle reported in some counties was that contributions were refused at the political level (by Members of County Assemblies, MCA) even when the necessary funds had been identified, with some MCAs unwilling to approve funding for projects outside of their own constituencies. Some politicians

also discouraged consumers from paying their water bills, which again suggests a lack of support by some senior individuals for the programme approach.

The COVID-19 pandemic was very disruptive and costly both in terms of human and financial resources, with inevitable impacts on planned expenditure. Nevertheless, there was broad consensus among stakeholders that CGs had the capacity to make contributions, especially for Batch II, when only 10% was required for water supply investments and nothing at all for sanitation or WRM projects.

Though not in the original programme design, WSTF developed a partnership with the Kenya Water Institute (KEWI). During the course of the programme, the institute delivered training packages for targeted utilities and deployed interns for several months or, in some cases, more than a year. The internships, in particular, were widely appreciated by utilities and CGs, and this was a mutually beneficial relationship in the sense that J6P was able to deploy some full-time TA at the utility level, and KEWI was able to provide its students with valuable work experience. Having said this, it was not clear that the interns' support had a lasting impact on utility operations; see 4.3.

WSTF also developed a partnership with the Kenya Water and Sanitation Network (KEWASNET), which would provide training (funded by SIDA) for water utilities and WRUAs in the area of good governance. This partnership was initiated in the 2017-18 period, and the 2018-19 Annual Rural Harmonised Report confirmed that training had been provided in all six counties. Subsequent ARHRs and the PCR, however, made no mention of KEWASNET, suggesting that this sub-component had not led to significant results. The final TA report described KEWASNET training as a useful contribution to capacity building but also noted that it was short (one day) and, in at least one case, did not result in any change in WUA performance.

Respondents did not mention KEWASNET's contribution during the evaluation. At the time of the PMR, this support was at the planning stage, but it was clear that it would address transparency and accountability rather than the technical content of service delivery and WRM. As such, it looked unlikely that KEWASNET would provide the type of support that small utilities would need in order to become effective service providers.

4.3 Effectiveness

Evaluation questions answered in this section:

- 6. To what extent has the programme achieved its five outcomes as listed below?
 - 6a. Enhanced institutional capacity of WSTF.
 - 6b. Enhanced capacity of counties to provide pro-poor water services.
 - 6c. Equitable access to water resources in catchment areas of focus.
 - 6d. Improved rural safe water coverage in target counties.
 - 6e. Improved rural sanitation coverage in target counties.
- 7. What role did monitoring and evaluation play in enhancing programme effectiveness?
- 8. To what extent and how has the programme promoted human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination, and climate resilience in its outcomes and outputs?

Headline findings:

- WSTF adopted a raft of new processes and tools with TA support and continues to use some beyond J6P.
- CGs’ capacity to play their intended role in WASH did not change significantly, but the development of a water master plan or strategy proved locally useful in some cases.
- Results for water supply fell short of targets, due especially to poor scheme functionality.
- Numerical results for sanitation were largely met; however, the value of the School WASH component is doubtful.

TABLE 6. SUMMARY RANKING OF RESULTS ON EFFECTIVENESS

Traffic light coding	Grade	Meaning
Red	Serious deficiencies (25%)	Evidence available with respect to only few evaluation questions under respective evaluation criteria suggest satisfactory performance.

4.3.1 Enhanced institutional capacity of WSTF

TABLE 7. EXTRACT FROM RESULTS FRAMEWORK (COMPONENT FIVE) SETTING THE OBJECTIVES FOR WSTF CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT

COMPONENT FIVE: CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT OF WSTF TO FULFIL ITS MANDATE	
Key Results Area	Results Areas
WSTF CAPACITY WSTF able to undertake its mandate through strengthened institutional capacity	PROJECT MANAGEMENT TOOLS Project Cycle Tools developed for standard planning, financing, implementation and monitoring of Improved Water Services, sanitation and WRM Investments
	HARMONISATION AND ALIGNMENT Operational systems within the WSTF contribute to investment alignment and harmonisation for more efficient, effective and transparent operation and coordination of investments

	<p>WSTF CAPACITY TO MONITOR AND MANAGE FIDUCIARY RISK WSTF's capacity to mitigate and manage fiduciary risk enhanced</p>
	<p>WSTF RESEARCH INNOVATION The WSTF supports innovative research initiatives in addressing key water sector challenges</p>
	<p>WSTF HUMAN RESOURCE CAPACITY The capacity of WSTF to contribute to the WSTF's fulfilment of its objectives enhanced</p>
	<p>WSTF BUSINESS PROCESS PERFORMANCE WSTF demonstrates improved business performance to realise its mandate of improving access to adequate water and sanitation services to the underserved in Kenya</p>
	<p>KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT Lessons learnt, research Information, Education and Communication on Rural WS/Sanitation and WRM Modalities developed.</p>
	<p>GESI WITHIN WSTF Gender mainstreamed within WSTF's internal operations</p>

Across the eight thematic areas listed above, the final version of the results framework identifies 42 Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI) plus six more for which the final target was zero; presumably, this means that some related activities were dropped. Of the 42, the PCR reports that targets were fully achieved or exceeded for 24, not achieved for 17, and for 1, results were yet to be confirmed.

The results area with the highest number of targets achieved was WSTF's capacity to monitor and manage fiduciary risk (9/10 targets achieved), while those with the lowest were Human Resources (0 out of 4 achieved) and Business Performance (4/8 not achieved). OVIs for which targets were dropped related to the Programme Management Information System, research and the mobilisation of funds from commercial banks.

The TA team deployed by MFA played a central role in capacity building for the Fund and supported the development of many of the tools and approaches introduced over the course of the programme. The TA final report (September 2021) explains how J6P was WSTF's principal TA programme and had the greatest number of external Advisors. From the outset, WSTF management was therefore keen for the TA team to be advisors to the organisation as a whole - not just to J6P - in particular, by providing strategic guidance, proposing innovations to improve efficiency, and researching, developing and documenting case studies and good practices. The JAOME, for example, was introduced with TA support and adopted for use organisation-wide.

The final TA report notes that when the programme began, WSTF personnel were somewhat surprised to learn that the TA team would operate as advisors, not managers and would have no control over the use of programme funds, which were managed directly by WSTF under a separate agreement.

During the first year (2015), a critical role for the TA was to revise and finalise the draft Programme Document, taking into account nationwide progress with decentralisation. By 2016, the Fund was placing more demands on the TA team to provide not just strategic guidance but operational advice on programme implementation and monitoring, which led to TA producing a wide range of tools and guidance documents. WSTF also requested the TA to support the training of newly appointed County

Resident Monitors (CRM) but did not voice a strong demand for support in the area of GESI. During this period, the TA outputs were reportedly appreciated by WSTF, though some documents were found to be overly complicated and difficult to use. Furthermore, the working relationship between the TA and WSTF deteriorated, a challenge which was never fully resolved. While the reasons for this are not entirely clear, one factor cited by some respondents was that the TA, being embedded in WSTF but employed by MFA, had divided loyalties. The first TA team was ultimately replaced, and this inevitably disrupted the continuity of support.

It became clear in 2016 that absorption capacity in the Fund was a constraint on progress and that J6P was not on track to meet its milestones and targets. The TA final report notes that 'this was a very hectic time for the WSTF, which was put under high pressure to produce agreements with the county actors in order to utilise already reserved funds, and there seemed to be little room for learning by doing through working together with the TA; the TA was producing *for* rather than *together with* the WSTF.' Concern at the slow rate of progress eventually led MFA to commission the PMR, which was conducted in late 2017.

The PMR made a series of recommendations to improve operational effectiveness, key ones being to expedite the completion of Batch I water supply projects and shift the focus of attention from infrastructure development to strengthening service delivery, provide more in-house technical support on the ground in each county; and identify third-party organisations that could help utilities to improve their effectiveness. WSTF responded positively to the review and implemented a number of changes over the following year. They included, amongst other things:

1. The appointment of CREs to supplement the CRMs already in place.
2. A new partnership with KEWI for the provision of utility training and deployment of interns.
3. The establishment of Project Management Units for each of the Fund's main programmes, with a dedicated Team Leader appointed for J6P. This gave the TA a direct counterpart in the Fund.
4. The introduction (with TA support) of a Universal Results-based Management Framework for use across all or most of WSTF's programmes.

Unfortunately, difficulties arose once again in the TA-WSTF relationship during this period, and the second Chief Technical Adviser was replaced. A successor was later appointed and continued until the programme ended in 2021.

Despite the changes outlined above, low absorption capacity remained a constraint. By mid-2018, J6P had spent only half of the programme funds and was due to end in six months. This prompted the first of three programme extensions; see Box 1.

Box 2. PROGRAMME EXTENSIONS

Over the lifetime of the J6P programme, the agreement with DPs was amended four times. In the 1st amendment in March 2017, the original Programme Document and Budget from 2014 were replaced by the revised Programme Document and Budget dated May 2016.

A second amendment was made in January 2019 to address budget deficits in Components 3 (water supply) and 5 (WSTF capacity development) and to extend programme implementation and TA (on a no-cost basis) to June 2020. Further correspondence between DPs and the National Treasury led to a second no-cost extension being agreed on the basis that it had proved challenging to procure contractors for some physical works. This resulted in the addition of a programme closure period from July to December 2020.

A fourth and final amendment to the bilateral agreement was made in September 2020 and resulted in a third no-cost extension (including TA) to June 2021 to allow for the completion of some remaining projects, particularly in Narok County. This was followed by a six-month 'close-out' phase.

During the last two years of the extended programme, the TA focused strongly on helping to secure the completion of infrastructure projects on time; the team was also asked to ensure quality investments. Capacity building for utilities was also intensified during this period. As the programme neared its end, the sustainability of investments was a growing concern for WSTF and DPs. This was a factor in the appointment of a new (part-time) Capacity Building advisor, who took up his post in August 2020. The sustainability of results is considered further in section 4.6.

While there were difficulties in the TA-WSTF relationship, WSTF respondents cited a number of initiatives, tools and examples introduced over the course of J6P that proved useful, and some were adopted for use beyond the programme. In summary, they included:

- Project management tools;
- Utility mapping using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) (covering both infrastructure and users);
- Establishment of the JAOME;
- A sustainability Index linked to the JAOME – though staff found this complicated, and there was a heavy reliance on the TA team to analyse the data and
- Deployment of CREs.

The conclusion of the final TA report that the capacity building ambitions of this component were probably too broad and ambitious seems fair, given especially that the first year was spent revising the programme document, and thereafter, there was a lot of pressure on the TA to help accelerate the delivery of results on the ground, including a substantial quality assurance role during the extension period. Moreover, there was a great deal in J6P that was new for WSTF, not least:

- working within a newly decentralised institutional framework and expecting CGs to share programme costs and

- trying to professionalise service delivery via rural utilities, many of them with limited technical and managerial capability, in place of the community management model pursued by WSTF in the past.

Among the remaining capacity gaps at WSTF, the most prominent relates to the strengthening of water utilities. Firstly, the Fund does not have the human or financial resources to provide the level of on-the-ground guidance and mentoring that many of the utilities need. Secondly, the fact that the PCR had no results data for utility performance suggests that the Fund has not yet developed a viable approach to tracking this.

4.3.2 Enhanced capacity of counties to provide an enabling environment

TABLE 8. EXTRACT FROM FINAL RESULTS FRAMEWORK (COMPONENT ONE) SETTING THE OBJECTIVES FOR COUNTY CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT

Component one: county capacity development	
Key Result Area	RESULTS AREAS
COUNTY CAPACITY ENHANCED County capacitated in fulfilling their constitutional responsibilities in establishment of an enabling environment for the provision and monitoring of WRM, WS/SAN Services	PLANNING/MONITORING County capacitated in utilising factual, evidence-based decision support systems in planning and monitoring
	INSTITUTIONAL/LEGAL FRAMEWORK A clear county legal and institutional framework for the development of effective sustainable pro-poor water services provision, sanitation and water resources management supported.
	GENDER EQUITY AND SOCIAL INCLUSION County has capacity to develop and institutionalise gender equity and social inclusion in the project cycle

Source: Final results framework

For this component, the final results framework had 16 OVIs across the three results areas, though three of them showed targets of zero, suggesting that some activities in the programme's original design were dropped. These related to the availability of county Water Supply and Sanitation (WSS) databases, disaggregated access data, and GESI action plans.

For the other 13 OVIs, targets were met/substantially met or exceeded for 7:

- No. of county exchange visits (6/6)
- Development of Water Development Strategies (6/6)
- Development of prototype Bill (1/1)
- Counties using prototype Bill (2/0)
- Percentage of county budgets and co-financing of joint WSTF/county investments¹ (15 achieved against a target of 10)
- The proportion of projects/project designs mainstreaming GESI concerns (100/100)

¹ The meaning of this indicator is not clear

- No. of counties in which comprehensive mapping exercise is conducted (5/6)

Targets were not met for the remaining 6:

- No. of annual impact reports developed from the information from the Decision Support System (DSS) (0/6)
- No. of counties having prototype county water law (3/6)
- No. of counties implementing a county water sector regulatory regime (0/6)
- No. of counties having revised sector management and operations structure (0/6)
- No. of small service providers recognised under service provision agreements (0/18)
- No. of counties with GESI guidelines (0/6)

These results suggest that the most substantive capacity building achievements under this component were the development of county water strategies (or master plans) and the mainstreaming of GESI in projects – though how the latter was assessed is not explained, and it is noted that none of the counties adopted GESI guidelines. Utility mapping (the production of network coverage maps) was also completed in 5 out of 6 counties, something which involved substantial TA support and was widely appreciated at the local level.

The results highlight that little progress was made in establishing county-level WASH databases, something confirmed by evaluation field visits. Some counties claimed to have good data on schemes run by the county water utilities (hereafter referred to as Water and Sanitation Companies, WASCO) and other regulated water services providers (WSP) but not on those operated by WUAs. They also did not have access to sanitation coverage data, though these were reportedly available at DOPH.

During interviews with county-level stakeholders, it was often difficult to clarify what the programme had achieved at this level due to changes in senior management since the programme ended. Some respondents were unsure whether the county had adopted a water strategy/master plan and, even if there was one, struggled to clarify whether it was being used. Tharaka-Nithi had performed better in this respect; it had both developed a Water Master Plan and passed a Water Act under J6P. The county now refers to these documents widely, and they were a requirement for World Bank funding under the KIWASH II project. Kwale County, too, had adopted its own Water Act.

While this outcome focuses on county capacity, the evaluation found that the motivation of CGs was also an important factor in programme results. Laikipia was an example of a CG that was relatively proactive, but some other counties failed to provide backup support to some WUA-run water supply schemes to the extent that serious technical challenges arose over the course of the programme and were left unresolved by the programme's end. There were also local challenges at the political level, as some local politicians encouraged scheme users not to pay their water supply bills; see 4.3.3.

Whether or not there was genuine concern for the status of water services, it was also evident that senior CG officials were unsure how best to resolve ongoing challenges. Some were proposing (in principle at least) to form a rural water company to take over the operation and maintenance of rural schemes currently operated by WUAs. This is an option that has been promoted for some years by the national regulator, WASREB, but has not yet been adopted widely; hence, assumptions around improved service delivery and cost recovery are yet to be tested. In Laikipia, the CG had already registered a rural water company with the intention of managing it jointly between user communities

and the CG. How exactly the company would operate, however, was still the subject of discussion locally and with WASREB.

4.3.3. Equitable and sustainable access to water resources

TABLE 9. EXTRACT FROM FINAL RESULTS FRAMEWORK (COMPONENT TWO) SETTING THE OBJECTIVES FOR IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

COMPONENT TWO: IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF WATER RESOURCES	
Key Results Area	Results Areas
WRM CAPACITY WRM initiatives protecting water resources and ensuring equity in water access thereby reducing water related conflicts and environmental degradation	WRM ORGANISATIONAL FRAMEWORK County has operational institutional structures for effectively addressing WRM issues
	WRM COMPLIANCE WRUA capacity to support measurement, regulation and abstraction compliance in addressing water issues at intra/inter county level enhanced.
	CATCHMENT CONSERVATION WRUA capacity to implement catchment conservation and protection through their sub catchment management plans enhanced
	WRUA SUSTAINABILITY WRUA operational sustainability enhanced
	WRM GESI Equitable benefits derived from WR interventions

Source: Final results framework

The results framework lists 28 OVIs under the five results areas and identifies results against baseline for most of these. It is difficult to summarise the overall level of achievement as the results are quite mixed. 25 targets were reportedly achieved in full (or almost achieved). They related to:

- The adoption and implementation of SCAMPs, with three new ones adopted and a total of 14 implemented;
- J6P’s contribution to ‘augmentation, revision and knowledge of the Water Development Commission (WDC) framework’ (1/1):
- the number of WRUAs progressing from one level to the next (the WDC framework is based on progression from level I to IV) (complex targets, largely met);
- the number of water control structures installed (16/12);
- administrative targets concerning the signing of contracts and clearance of funds (mostly met)
- numbers of springs (57/64) and erosion gullies (5/2) protected;
- number of trees planted (105,340 /99,000) and survived (66%, no target) and nurseries established (15/12), and
- the percentage of female representation on WRUA committees (30%, no target).

Targets were not met for:

- County-level institutional structures for resolving WRM conflicts (0/6);
- the establishment of inter- and intra-county WRUA associations (0/6);
- the signing of transboundary Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (0/6);

- the monitoring (3/6) and regulation (0/18) of water abstraction; and
- regular monitoring of water level stations.

For one indicator, joint WSTF/county financing of WRUA projects, there was no target or achievement, indicating that the item had been dropped. Meanwhile, results for 3 OVIs were yet to be confirmed: compliance with abstraction permits and Effluent Discharge Control Plans and increased WRUA income.

While the expected co-financing at the county level did not happen, WSTF had an MOU with WRA at the national level for the implementation of WRM projects. This involved giving a certain percentage of the funding to the national and regional level WRA offices to cover some of their operational costs. After these deductions, quite limited funding reached the WRUAs via a funding stream that was disconnected from the counties. This partly explains why most CGs did not take an active interest in this part of the programme. Other findings from field visits were much in line with the content of the PCR, as summarised below.

Implementation of SCAMPs

Physical outputs included, amongst other things, spring protection; tree planting (with roughly a two-thirds survival rate reported overall); construction of gabions and terraces to control soil erosion; rainwater harvesting via runoff from roofs; and the construction of water pans and sand dams. Some WRUAs had progressed to a higher status during or after J6P, though it was not clear whether this was attributable directly to J6P support. In Narok, for example, Naroosura WRUA had progressed from level I to level III.

Livelihood activities

Some of the funding received by WRUAs was for livelihood activities, the intention being to generate income which could be ploughed back into conservation and management activities. Beekeeping, fish farming and tree nurseries were common livelihood initiatives. The PCR reported that these had not generated significant results, and evaluation field visits tended to confirm that they had proved problematic in some cases – especially for beekeeping. In Narok, for example, local pesticide spraying killed many of the bees, while in [Migori], some hives had not been colonised. In practice, WRUAs remained heavily dependent on external funding to operate. Some had received funding from one or more donor-funded projects prior to J6P (KIWASH, for example) and/or were expecting to receive funds from new projects post-J6P, such as the USAID-funded Western Kenya Water Project and Sanitation Project (both 2022-2027). These are in the catchment areas of some WRUAs in Nandi and Migori.

Equitable benefits derived from WRM

The programme introduced the HRBA to WRUAs to help ensure that vulnerable groups were able to share in local water resources. The provision of rainwater harvesting tanks (both household and institutional) for vulnerable groups was regarded as part of this approach.

Regulation and conflict resolution

There were a few examples of WRUA's success in averting or resolving conflicts over the use of water resources. Sirimon was one, and in Narok, Naroosura WRUA also claimed to be effective in this regard, though it established its role long before J6P. In general, feedback from respondents indicated that

most WRUAs struggled to play an effective management or regulatory role by, for example, ensuring that upstream and downstream communities shared water resources equitably. Similarly, they felt powerless to address some pressing local issues, such as encroachment on swamp land or the planting of eucalyptus trees on riverbanks where they would consume excessive amounts of water. Being community organisations, WRUAs struggled to enforce controls and were not always consulted by government agencies on relevant matters such as applications for new abstraction permits.

Transboundary conflicts over access to water sources were also reported as common and something that WRUAs could rarely resolve. Examples were seen in Nandi (the Lelmokwo scheme) and Laikipia (Solio), where there are no permanent rivers, and water comes from the neighbouring counties of Nyeri and Meru. Such challenges are more likely to be resolved through the political route than by WRUAs.

Water supply – WRM linkages

Part of the rationale for including both WRM and water supply in J6P was that interventions would be located in the same catchments and be mutually supportive, helping to ensure the sustainability of drinking water sources. There is a general consensus that in most of the J6P counties, there has been little or no linkage between these components, which raises questions as to the value of bundling them together in future programmes unless real synergies can be established to safeguard the quality or reliability of water sources - though the argument for including both remains strong at an ‘in principle’ level.

One exception here was Tharaka-Nithi, where WRUAs were key stakeholders in the water sector and had a good working relationship with the Department of Water and the WSP. It was reported that the WSP had sometimes supported WRUAs directly by providing seedlings and supporting the development of tree nurseries. The WRUAs also worked very closely with Community Forest Associations in the catchment area.

4.3.4. Improved sustainable and equitable access to water services.

TABLE 10. EXTRACT FROM FINAL RESULTS FRAMEWORK (COMPONENT THREE) SETTING THE OBJECTIVES FOR IMPROVED SUSTAINABLE AND EQUITABLE ACCESS TO WATER SERVICES

COMPONENT THREE: SUSTAINABLE ACCESS TO WATER SERVICES	
Key Results Area	Results Area
IMPROVED WATER SERVICE ACCESS Water supply projects ensure improved equitable access to water services.	WS COVERAGE Increased water access and utilisation of services (coverage) for the un-served. <i>(un-served = service level 3 and 4)</i>
	WU SERVICE QUALITY / OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY Operational efficiency of water utilities in the sustainable provision of water services improved
	EQUITABLE ACCESS TO WATER SERVICES All members of society (within WU mandated water service areas) derive equal benefit from improved water services

Source: Final results framework

The programme supported 31 utilities, but some received two phases of support, resulting in a total of 42 projects. All or most of these supported an expansion in coverage; some also rehabilitated or expanded storage, and some replaced or augmented water sources. In many cases, there was a high percentage of users with private connections, plus a small number of kiosks where water could be purchased by the jerrycan. At many schemes, metering was established prior to J6P, but billing and collection were typically simple, paper-based systems, especially for smaller schemes operated by WUAs. Some projects provided additional or replacement meters.

The results framework lists 16 OVIs under the three results areas and presents results against baseline for half of them. Targets were met (or almost met) for just four:

- number of projects² supported (31 against a target of 32)
- percentage of projects which chlorinate water (51% against a target of 53%)
- percentage of projects using a good practice matrix (100% target achieved)
- women's participation in decision-making within utilities (33% target achieved)

Regarding water treatment, the evaluation was unable to validate the level of treatment reported, and it was evident that most schemes had no system in place for regular water quality testing.

For four further indicators, targets were not met. These related to:

- number of people gaining access (two-thirds of 199,000 target achieved)
- number of house connections (approximately 7,000 against a target of 12,000)
- number of schemes using renewable energy sources (6 against a target of 12)
- number of water utilities funded whose operational indicators would have improved towards possible access to credit (11 against a target of 32)³.

It should be noted here that it was not possible to validate reported beneficiary numbers in the limited time available at each utility visited. To do so, the team would have needed access to reliable customer databases showing user numbers before and after J6P support. That said, three schemes reported as operational or partially operational in the PCR were not working at all when visited; also, the Nyasare utility reported that their scheme only worked fully during the rainy season. This suggests that beneficiary numbers were somewhat lower than reported at the time of the PCR. Annex 4 includes a comparison of scheme status at the PCR stage and when visited for the evaluation.

Results for the remaining eight indicators have yet to be confirmed, suggesting that they have not been tracked over the course of the programme. These are related to hours of supply per week, customer satisfaction, revenue as a percentage of operation and maintenance, reduction in non-revenue water, billing efficiency, service improvements for the poorest households, people benefiting from water service employment opportunities, and the changing cost of water in supported areas⁴. It is important to reiterate here that it was beyond the scope of the evaluation to generate the missing results data.

² Programme documents appear to use the terms 'scheme' and 'project' interchangeably.

³ The meaning of this indicator is not clear

⁴ Again, the meaning of the indicator is unclear.

Given that results were reported for only half of the indicators and that those unreported included some key indicators on utility performance, it is again difficult to comment on the level of achievement against targets. Nevertheless, it is possible to assess programme achievements in broad terms across the three results areas.

Service coverage and quality

The evaluation mission took place during the rainy season when water sources are at their most plentiful; hence, questions on seasonal changes were important. Of the 17 schemes visited across the six counties, just six were fully operational, with a further three partially operational and eight not operating at all. At the time of the PCR, 9 of these 17 were reported as fully operational; the PCR also reported that the programme had reached two-thirds of its beneficiary target of 199,000: roughly 133,000. This figure now looks doubtful. Moreover, all functioning schemes were subject to technical and /or governance constraints, which were a serious threat to sustainability.

None of the three schemes visited in Kwale County were operating. In the other counties, the fully functional schemes were:

- Kimng'oror (WUA), Nandi
- Nyasare (WSP), Migori
- Entasekera (WUA), Narok
- Solio (WUA), Laikipia
- Kathwana (WSP), Tharaka-Nithi
- Murugi-Mugumango (WUA), Tharaka-Nithi

Of the six schemes listed above, only Nyasare and Entasekera were supplying all of their intended customers (at least in the rainy season), the latter being an unusual case whereby the majority of users accessed kiosks rather than private taps. Only three, Kimng'oror, Entasekera and Murugi-Mugumango, had an adequate year-round supply. Others experienced an excess of demand over supply, especially in the dry season. In Nyasare, for example, the utility (a WSP) reported that during dry season rationing, a typical household would receive water for just one day per week.

Constraints affecting the three partially operational schemes are summarised below.

1. Sogoo, Narok (WUA). Works included the provision of a booster station to pump water up to the main residential area to be served. Under the project agreement, the CG was responsible for providing power for the booster station but had failed to do so. Consequently, only people living close to the source could access water.
2. Doldol Luisikut, Laikipia (WUA). J6P increased the number of connections from 30 to 150, but by the programme's end, the number was back to 30 due partly to storms; elephants and vandalism had also damaged infrastructure. In addition, one storage tank had leaked from the start.
3. Sirimon, Laikipia (WUA). This scheme was serving 1200 people when J6P support started. The intake rehabilitated under the programme was washed away by floods in 2018, shortly after works were completed, and when visited, only a temporary intake made from sacks was in place

so that the scheme could only serve a fraction of the intended users. Furthermore, a high-cost central filtration unit built by J6P plus 500 water supply meters had never been used due to the intake damage.

Of the eight schemes that were not operating, one (Godoni-Chintsanze) was reportedly in working order but not currently used due to a lack of demand during the rainy season, as households were collecting rainwater; two had distribution lines destroyed by road construction works; three had a dry or inadequate source supply; one was unable to cover power costs due to unpaid customer bills (a longstanding issue) and one had its intake destroyed by the adjoining CG where it was located (see **Box 2**). Some of these challenges had arisen within the last twelve months, but others had been left unresolved for up to five years.

BOX 3. TWO NON-OPERATIONAL SCHEMES WITH LONGSTANDING PROBLEMS

Lelmokwo, Nandi (WUA). Developed in 1972 using an intake in an adjoining county, the central government managed the scheme for several years, but service ended in 2012 due to unpaid customer bills. Following devolution, the CG handed it over to the user community in 2013. J6P Phase I involved rehabilitation and expansion of the network, but before Phase II works were fully completed, the adjoining CG demolished the intake and treatment plant and replaced them with infrastructure serving that county only. The expectation now is that the scheme will access a new bulk supply from the Eldoret scheme, which is currently under construction. However, that is seriously behind schedule.

Kegonga, Migori (MIWASCO, the county government utility). This scheme was developed in 2011 by the national government. J6P support began in 2017, but shortly after completion, the main distribution lines were destroyed by road construction works and have not been replaced – this had been the situation for roughly five years when visited. According to the utility, the CG wrote to the contractor to seek a resolution but received no reply, and no further action was taken during the J6P implementation period.

Where damage occurred to infrastructure, this in itself was beyond the utility or CG's control. What is not clear is why these defects were left unresolved for so long, raising questions as to the level of responsibility felt by the CGs.

While the PCR provided no data on operational efficiency, interviews at operational schemes did, however, provide some examples of utilities that were managing operations well, including:

- Kimng'oror (WUA), Nandi. Here, it was evident that the WUA management team was highly motivated and actively ensuring that the service remained operational. They displayed a good knowledge of their financial position and were able to describe in some detail the steps they took to ensure that customers paid their bills. They also had a plentiful year-round supply from two sources.
- Solio (WUA), Laikipia. This is a gravity flow scheme with house connections. With the growth of the population, J6P support enabled the scheme to serve a previously unreachable population at the Solio Settlement Scheme. Small-scale farming improved as a result of the water supply

improvements, and some young people who had left the village returned to establish kitchen gardens.

Some utilities also reported that they had increased their revenue as a result of J6P support, at least while their scheme was functional. Overall, however, the fact that only 6 out of 17 schemes visited were fully operational suggests that the programme had failed to make significant improvements in service quality or operational efficiency, and every scheme faced sustainability threats, whether technical, financial or in terms of governance.

Apart from utility capability, common factors affecting utility performance are also related to either or both of the following:

- **Planning and design faults.** Most of the operational schemes struggled to meet user demand, and some faced severe shortages during the dry season, so they had to ration the supply. Some utility respondents said that the capacity and reliability of their water sources were not adequately checked before making investments in network expansion, a risky mistake given the high percentage of customers having private connections, which leads to much higher per capita consumption than from public taps (kiosks). Other examples quoted by respondents included an intake that was unable to withstand flooding, storage tanks that leaked from the outset, distribution pipes that were not sufficiently robust, and an overhead metal tank that quickly corroded.
- **Failures in local governance.** Programme documents note that there were some cases of funds misuse, but apart from that, some utilities failed to collect enough revenue to cover their operational costs. All or most had switched to a cash-free payment method for water bills using M-PESA (a move promoted by J6P), and this helped to simplify accounting and reduce opportunities for the misuse of funds. However, revenue collection remained low in many cases and, in some, did not cover monthly power costs. This problem was exacerbated when local politicians encouraged people not to pay their water bills because the scheme improvements had been funded through government or donor grants. Meter failure was a more common complication, especially when there was a heavy sediment load in the water due to lack of treatment, which caused meters to silt up. At Nyasare, the utility had not introduced flat rates for households with faulty meters; instead, users simply refused to pay when their meter indicated no consumption for the previous month. COVID-19 was also implicated here by some respondents. In Murugi-Mugumango and Doldol, for example, some consumers stopped paying during the pandemic and most still had arrears.

Equitable access

For schemes that were operational, the evaluation found no evidence of intentional exclusion in service delivery, and affordability was commonly reported as a factor in tariff setting. There was a general consensus among respondents that tariffs were widely affordable both for users of house connections and kiosks, though this had implications for cost recovery given that most schemes had substantial power costs due to the need for pumping. At Entasekera, Narok, where most users accessed water via kiosks (public taps), the WUA was only charging customers with private connections – partly because this was a simple gravity flow scheme fed by a stream and operating costs were low. Yet it was still

struggling to cover costs, and repairs were already needed to a storage tank built under the project, which had been leaking for some time.

There was also evidence of women’s participation in decision-making in utilities, with the target of 30% representation on management committees reportedly exceeding slightly to 33%, though the target was not always met for utility employees.

While the programme document indicated a move away from an explicitly pro-poor approach, most of the communities visited appeared to be in the low or low-middle-income bracket, many of them being small-scale farmers. One notable exception was the 7km line extension to the Godoni/Chitsanze scheme in Kwale, located next to the Shimba Hills forest reserve. This supplied water via kiosks. While there was some low-income housing, the utility described this land as prime real estate, and some very high-cost properties were starting to appear. It is not clear why this investment was prioritised under J6P.

4.3.5 Improved rural sanitation coverage in target counties.

TABLE 11. EXTRACT FROM FINAL RESULTS FRAMEWORK (COMPONENT FOUR) SETTING THE OBJECTIVES FOR IMPROVED RURAL SANITATION

COMPONENT FOUR: SUSTAINABLE ACCESS TO SANITATION SERVICES	
IMPROVED SANITATION SERVICE ACCESS Sanitation investments ensure improved equitable access to sanitation.	IMPROVED INSTITUTIONAL SANITATION ACCESS Improved access to sanitation facilities in public places (markets, schools, health centres- within mandated supply areas of water utilities)
	HOUSEHOLD SANITATION COVERAGE Household sanitation coverage increased (within WU mandated supply areas)
	EQUITABLE ACCESS TO SANITATION All members of society (within WU mandated water service areas) equitably have access to and derive benefit from improved sanitation services

Source: Final results framework

The results framework included 15 OVIs for sanitation across the three results areas. Of these, no results were reported for five:

- Percentage of institutions with sustained hand washing facilities (HWF);
- Number of villages maintaining ODF status;
- Percentage of households in mandated areas of water utility with sustained HWF;
- Percentage of most vulnerable households (those in SL4) having acquired sanitation facilities and
- Percentage of institutions with menstrual hygiene facilities.

Eight targets were fully achieved or exceeded:

- Number of school/health centre facilities constructed (65/62);
- Percentage of school children attending schools conforming to GOK latrine/student ratio in project areas (100/100);
- Number of public sanitation facilities provided (3/2);

- Number of people with access to Public Sanitation Facilities (2,200 /1,300)
- Number of triggered villages (433/400);
- Percentage of triggered villages claimed ODF (92/75);
- Number of villages attained ODF status; 399 /280), and
- A number of public toilets result in employment opportunities for women, men, youth, etc. (2/2).

A further two were not achieved:

- Number of school pupils with access to sanitation facilities (11,910 /16,040), and
- Percentage of public/school latrines facility with disability access in project sites (37/50).

Institutional sanitation and hygiene

They indicated that this component would provide sanitation facilities for a range of institutions, including healthcare facilities. In practice, J6P focussed on selected schools within the catchment area of water utilities supported by the programme. The PCR results indicate that in terms of the number of toilet blocks built and the resulting student-to-toilet ratio, project targets were fully met even though the total number of students benefiting was less than anticipated. The target for HWFs, however, was missed by a wide margin; the reasons for this are not clear.

For this component, physical works were implemented by water utilities supported under J6P, while DOPH reportedly provided some hygiene promotion for students.

When visited, the schools in each county were closed for holidays, and the team was only able to talk to a few head teachers who happened to be present. They generally expressed appreciation for the facilities provided. It was not possible to verify how effectively the 'soft' part of this component was implemented, but observation during site visits and discussions with teachers and other programme stakeholders revealed that:

- Utilities engaged directly with the selected schools, and there was little substantive involvement of the DOE or County Government; J6P support was not linked to a county-wide strategy to improve school WASH.
- The physical quality of work was typically moderate to poor, though it appeared that most of the toilets were used to some extent. Utility staff described project support purely in terms of construction activities rather than a holistic WASH in Schools initiative.
- Many schools also benefitted from tanks and gutters, etc., for harvesting rainwater from roofs. Some of these tanks had been provided by WRUAs under J6P.
- Many schools had received successive donations of toilet blocks in recent years, and there was no coordinated approach to ensure that each one maintained a minimum standard of WASH services and hygiene. Moreover, it was clear that toilet blocks quickly fell into disrepair and disuse. There was nothing to suggest that the facilities provided under J6P would be better maintained, though, at one school, J6P had provided pit linings to an existing toilet block to reduce the risk of pit collapse.

Overall, the long-term value of this programme component was doubtful, and the prospects for sustainability appeared to be poor.

Regarding public toilets, the PCR reported that two were built under the programme against a target of 3. One communal toilet block seen in Kwale (at the Mrima water supply scheme) was not a Public Sanitation Facility as WSTF currently defines it; rather, it was referred to as an ‘ablution block’. It had nevertheless been provided under the programme for public use. The WUA explained that, at first, it was used and managed by a community organisation on a pay-and-use basis. The attendant left after some time; however, after which charges ended, the facility was not cleaned and maintained, and it fell into disuse. Another public toilet block was subsequently built next to this one by another government agency, rendering the first one redundant. The J6P-funded facility had been built close to the community water supply supported by the programme but in a small commercial area. There was, however, no intervention to promote household toilets.

The rationale for this investment was unclear, and its value was very doubtful since it had provided no lasting benefits. Sector experience shows that the management of communal/public toilets is often problematic, especially in locations where people are expected to use them as their principal sanitation facility. The promotion of household toilets would have been more appropriate.

In Chogoria, Tharaka-Nithi, the team briefly saw a more substantial public toilet built under the programme by the county water utility, NIWASCO. It was closed at the time of visiting, being open only on market days and Sundays. It had three cubicles for males, 3 for females and one for PWD. NIWASCO had reportedly tried to lease it to a private operator to run on a commercial basis, but there were no applicants, and it was therefore handed over free to a private operator. The utility indicated that revenue was low, suggesting that it might not be viable to operate and maintain in the long term.

Household sanitation

TABLE 12. ODF ACHIEVEMENTS BY COUNTY

County	ODF projects	Target No. ODF Villages	Reported Results
Migori	10	183	183
Kwale	5	6	6 ⁵
Laikipia	4	28	18
Nandi	5	22	22
Tharaka-Nithi	6	170	170
Total	30	433	399

Source: PCR (2023)

The programme aimed to achieve ODF status in communities located within the service area of supported utilities, with implementation led by DOPH. Based on the data above, there was an average target of 14 villages per project, and the total of 433 ODF villages was narrowly missed.

At the local level, programme funding was routed to DOPH via J6P-funded utilities. WSTF’s justification for this was that routing the funds via the Ministry of Health (MOH) would have caused serious delays because the ministry was not motivated to prioritise this work. The funding mechanism used was,

⁵ During field visits in Kwale, the evaluation team was informed that six villages initially reached ODF status, but none of them retained it until the programme ended.

therefore, a pragmatic choice. The fact the programme ODF target was only narrowly missed suggests that this arrangement worked locally in most cases. Nevertheless, with DOPH having lead responsibility in government for rural sanitation and hygiene promotion, it is strange that programme funding for sanitation and hygiene promotion was routed via water utilities, many of which were Community-Based Organisations (CBO). Furthermore, this approach did not encourage the adoption of county-wide strategies to achieve universal access to sanitation in line with the SDGs.

The bulk of the ODF results came from just two counties: Migori and Tharaka-Nithi. Migori was an exceptional case; here, there was a happy coincidence in that DOPH was already pursuing county-wide ODF status when J6P support began, a target that it achieved before the programme ended. J6P funding thereby helped to deliver results on a much greater scale than originally envisaged – a good example of synergy. By the time of the evaluation visit, DOPH was implementing a follow-up sanitation marketing project with UNICEF support to encourage and enable households to upgrade to durable, improved facilities.

The CLTS component did not go ahead in Narok County, however, because WSTF was unable to reach an agreement with DOPH on a project budget. Similarly, in Kwale, some initial triggering was done, but there was little or no follow-up by DOPH, and the component did not continue. Interviews with WSTF and DOPH staff revealed two main reasons for Kwale's lack of progress. Firstly, the programme did not sufficiently engage DOPH at the county level, and instead, utilities made arrangements directly with individual sub-county officers. Secondly, DOPH staff considered the funding inadequate as it did not cover their allowances.

Some respondents argued that CLTS was not a good fit for J6P because the approach lacks a clear timeline from triggering to ODF certification; communities work towards ODF at their own pace. However, programme results tend to contradict this, and there is ample evidence from regional and global experience that well-managed and resourced CLTS projects can reduce the average time from triggering to ODF to as little as three months (perhaps a little more where villages are very large).

Equitable access to sanitation facilities

The evaluation did not identify any equity concerns relating to school or household sanitation. CLTS, by definition, seeks to ensure that every household gains access to a private or shared (but not communal) toilet and does not prescribe specific designs that might not be unaffordable to some; simple, low-cost options are acceptable so long as faeces are disposed of safely. School facilities were provided separately for boys and girls, and in at least some of the schools visited, provision was made for disabled students to access them. The PCR did not provide results data for the number of targeted schools with MHM facilities, and it was not possible to quantify the level of achievement during field visits. However, there were some anecdotal reports of provisions being made.

4.3.6 The role of monitoring and evaluation

The PMR commented that J6P had a tendency to monitor activities more than results, and it appears that this was not fully resolved by the programme's end. WSTF was diligent in monitoring the physical and financial progress of investments and the delivery of training, assisted in this by CRMs and CREs

(the latter for Batch II projects) deployed at the county level. The programme was less effective in monitoring 'soft' results, and for many of the OVIs in the results framework - especially on utility performance - no results data were available by the programme end. A number of factors seem to have contributed to this situation, including:

- The huge effort needed to get physical work completed, with the TA also focused on supporting the delivery and quality of physical work;
- A Programme Management Information System (PMIS) was developed, but staff found it very cumbersome to use, so it was eventually dropped and
- The programme dropped its target of establishing a reliable WSS database in each county, which complicated the use of monitoring data as a management tool.

The JAOME was often cited as a useful monitoring innovation. It took in a sample of all of WSTF's main investment programmes (urban and rural) and developed scored sustainability assessments based on four indicators: operational status, revenue collection, age and success rate, and condition of investments. Its limitation in relation to J6P was that the annual exercise took in just a sample from each WSTF programme, so it could not provide comprehensive data on all projects.

4.3.7 Other findings on effectiveness

On the question of additionality, the evaluation team have not seen any clear evidence that J6P funding led to CGs increasing or decreasing their own funding for WSS. Given that CGs failed to make the expected contributions in the first phase of the programme, it seems unlikely that their expenditure on WASH went up. That said, Tharaka-Nithi was planning to extend or replicate the use of interns via a direct partnership with KEWI. This can be attributed to the programme, which will presumably require some expenditure by the CG.

A related question in the evaluation matrix was the extent to which local demand from CGs, WRUAs and service providers determined project selection. Many respondents confirmed that the selection of counties was based on transparent criteria and that political interference was largely avoided. Within selected counties, the Project Document stated that J6P would assist 'existing water utilities and WRUAs, selected based on a demonstrated/proven track record, where such entities represent potential long-term sustainable partners.' Whether these criteria were applied without due diligence or simply ignored is not clear, but it is evident that many of the utilities funded did not, in reality, have a proven track record. Project baseline survey reports (for example, for Entasekera and Solio) mention that proposals for J6P support were submitted by the county WASCOs on behalf of each utility and assessed the adequacy of current service provision (including user satisfaction) but did not examine the capability of the service provider, the suitability of institutional arrangements or the financial viability of operations. Moreover, the fact that the Batch I schemes (and some Batch II schemes) were funded without the expected CG contributions means that the level of demand for programme support was not fully tested. Given that the approval (or otherwise) of county contributions to water supply schemes was under political control, it also seems likely that selected members had some say in which schemes were proposed to WSTF for programme support.

To avoid duplication, findings on how the programme addressed GESI, HRBA and climate resilience during implementation are covered in Section 4.5 below.

4.4 Efficiency

Evaluation questions answered in this section:

10. How efficiently has the programme utilised its resources, including financial, human, and technical, to achieve its objectives and deliver the intended outputs?

11. To what extent did WSTF streamline its management and administration systems to optimise productivity?

Key findings:

- Low absorption capacity was a critical challenge for most of the original implementation period, but this changed during the extension period, resulting in 90% budget utilisation.
- The highly centralised nature of WSTF operations was a constraint on implementation in the counties, but the balance between central and local support improved somewhat after the PMR with the appointment of CREs.

TABLE 13. SUMMARY RANKING OF RESULTS ON EFFICIENCY

Traffic light coding	Grade	Meaning
Orange	Problems (50%)	Evidence available with respect to only half of evaluation questions under effectiveness suggest satisfactory performance.

Use of financial resources

For a long period, the programme had low absorption capacity and was seriously underspent prompting DPs to commission the PMR in 2017; this also led to increasing demands on the TA to help accelerate delivery on the ground. There is broad consensus that the rate of implementation and quality of physical work improved for Batch II water supply investments.

The PCR reports that component 3 (water supply) accounted for 56% of programme funding overall and that by the end of the extension period, the programme had spent approximately 90% of the total funds allocated after adjustments for currency fluctuations and interest earned.

Among the measures adopted by the programme to improve efficiency in the use of funds, the most obvious is leveraging CG contributions. However, this failed in the first part of the programme and only picked up later when the required contribution was reduced substantially. Even then, it was not paid in every case; for example, in Migori, the CG contributed nothing to either Batch I or Batch II projects.

For the first batch of projects, the PMR learned that many of them had design faults, and resolving these was one factor in the slow rate of implementation. During the evaluation mission, similar concerns

were voiced by some respondents, for example, that the adequacy of the source supply was not always confirmed before committing to increase the number of people served and that some materials or components were not suitable (for example metal tanks that corroded rapidly and UPVC pipes that were easily damaged).

The high failure rate of water supply schemes was undoubtedly the biggest challenge to efficiency in the use of programme funds, given that the water supply component accounted for more than half of programme expenditure. Two of the non-operational schemes were reported to be technically sound but not currently in use due to lack of demand in one case (Godonzi-Chitsanze) and the inability to pay power bills in another (Kobujoi). For these schemes, service delivery could, in principle, resume without incurring further capital costs. Others, however, would require substantial work, for example, where an intake was washed away or where the source supply was inadequate.

Turning to sanitation, CLTS is a globally proven, low-cost approach to eradicating open defecation and was adopted by DOPH for nationwide use prior to J6P. As such, its use in the programme represents an efficient use of funds. That said, one limitation of CLTS is that it typically gets low-income households onto the first rung of the 'sanitation ladder', and the facilities built may not be durable – as confirmed in Kwale, where the evaluation team was informed that the six villages which initially achieved ODF did not sustain this status due to flood damage. Ideally, CLTS would be followed up by DOPH-led measures to encourage and enable households to upgrade to improved facilities. This was already happening in Migori but not elsewhere.

Use of human and technical resources

At the beginning of J6P, the Fund appointed and trained CRMs who would not only monitor progress but also help ensure good communication between WSTF and targeted CGs, utilities, and WRUAs. Following the PMR, for Batch II projects, the Fund appointed a procurement specialist at the national level and increased its presence on the ground by deploying CREs to provide expert oversight of physical works. According to the PCR, these changes played a key role in improving the timely completion of projects with improved quality and within budget. Towards the end of the implementation period, WSTF also harnessed increased support from the TA to secure the completion of investment projects. The provision of TA to WSTF was complicated by a sometimes difficult working relationship between the two parties, and successive personnel changes disrupted the continuity of this support. Nevertheless, WSTF respondents confirmed that the team made a substantial contribution to the programme, providing valuable expertise and guidance.

A further useful measure in the use of human and technical resources was the development of a partnership with KEWI, which provided training and interns to utilities. There was clear consensus among programme stakeholders that this had been very useful, and some utilities reported that with the intern's help, they had improved operation and maintenance and/or increased revenue collection. However, the results in terms of scheme functionality suggest that the internships did not have a lasting impact in most cases.

Management and administration systems

One inefficiency highlighted by the PMR was that utilities would receive multiple uncoordinated visits by different thematic specialists from WSTF headquarters. The subsequent creation of a Project

Management Unit for each of the main programmes was helpful for efficiency, and the appointment of a dedicated J6P Manager gave the TA a clearly defined counterpart for the first time.

The introduction of an online PMIS was intended to improve administrative efficiency by giving all authorised personnel access to the same management information that could be easily and regularly updated. It had already been trialled at the time of the PMR, and there was an expectation that it would soon be rolled out for general use. Staff found it too complicated, however, and it failed to deliver the efficiencies expected. It was eventually dropped and had not been replaced; it was reportedly being developed.

4.5 Impact

Evaluation questions answered in this section:

12. What evidence exists of programme impact in the areas of human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination and climate resilience?
13. Have there been any unintended impacts, whether positive or negative?

Key findings:

- J6P projects delivered benefits related to improved water supply, but these were mostly short-lived. Poor results in terms of functionality, source sufficiency, cost recovery and local governance mean that sustainability is seriously at risk. The challenges are potentially resolvable, but this would require further funding and technical support, plus, crucially, county government and utility commitment.
- The likelihood that the WRM and institutional sanitation components will have a long-term impact is also doubtful, but for household sanitation, the results are more encouraging.

TABLE 14. SUMMARY RANKING OF RESULTS ON IMPACT

Traffic light coding	Grade	Meaning
Red	Serious deficiencies (25%)	Evidence available with respect to only few evaluation questions under impact suggest satisfactory performance.

Analysis of J6P impact is challenging because the programme document and results framework do not specify expected impacts and associated indicators or targets. Instead, the design logic ends at the outcome level and, even then, makes little distinction between outputs and outcomes. Both WSTF and J6P TA teams have applied this same logic in their respective completion / final reports and have not discussed programme impacts. The evaluation has, therefore, looked for evidence of impact quite broadly.

While the programme document did not address impacts, it did set a programme goal, which was 'equitable access to quality water, basic sanitation and enhanced water resources management for the

underserved communities in rural Kenya'. Crafted in this way, the goal sounds like a step towards impact since it does not refer to the sustainability of results.

Improved access to water and sanitation was largely achieved, but for water, this access was often short-lived for the reasons set out in section 4.3.4. Similarly, the manner in which the school sanitation component was implemented raises doubts as to whether this will result in a long-term impact, as explained in 4.3.5. The CLTS projects are potentially more promising in that ODF targets were largely achieved and facilitated by DOPH, which has a permanent presence and hygiene promotion role at the sub-county level and can take further steps to encourage and enable low-income households to repair, replace or upgrade toilets in the medium term. MOH has recently renewed its commitment to achieving nationwide ODF, though this is yet to be operationalised.

Regarding WRM, section 4.3.3 highlighted that while many WRUAs have operated for years and tend to be active when they have funds, their activities are mostly on a very small, very local scale, and the intended synergies between WRM and water supply interventions have not been realised.

Human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination

In the TOR, impact-related questions focussed on human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination and climate resilience. As noted earlier, human rights and social inclusion were not explicitly addressed in programme implementation, and WSTF's GESI strategy evolved slowly, being completed only at the end of the programme. The TA team produced an early draft, but the extent to which it informed programme strategy or operations is not clear.

In water supply, equity was addressed by having house taps for all or most households, plus at least a few kiosks where water could be purchased by the jerrycan. In addition, tariff levels were set with reference to affordability, and the evaluation mission found no evidence of intentional exclusion. Some respondents who have previously used kiosks note that the unit price which they paid for water went down after gaining a private connection under J6P.

Turning to sanitation, in communities where CLTS was successfully applied and ODF status was reached, all community members benefited. In addition, some school and public sanitation facilities were made accessible to PWD.

Climate resilience

Climate resilience did not receive much attention in programme design or reports and was hardly mentioned by respondents at the county or utility level. There was a general lack of clarity on what should be done to enhance climate resilience beyond conserving water resources. WRUAs attempted to do this, but, as noted in 4.3.3, the linkage between WRM and water supply components of the programme was weak. Much of the output from WRUAs was on a very small, local scale, and their geographical area of intervention did not always overlap with the water sources used by J6P utilities. It is also noted here that, while there was a plan to provide solar power to 12 water supply schemes, in the end, this was only achieved for 6.

Impact on county governments

Both Tharaka-Nithi and Laikipia Counties have been able to attract other donors due to their efforts under J6P. In Tharaka-Nithi, the water master plan developed under the programme was being used as a key reference for planning and enabled the CG to qualify for World Bank funding for WASH initiatives. Similarly, in Laikipia, the master plan informed the development of an operational manual for a new project. In some other countries, however, a change in administration since J6P meant that some senior officials did not know whether a strategy or master plan had been developed under the programme.

Building on the success of internships under J6P, Laikipia County was in talks with KEWI with a view to setting up a long-term internship programme at the Water Department. Officials in Laikipia also confirmed that J6P had been a key factor in the production of their County Water Bill. This was yet to be gazetted but is now morphing into a County Water and Sanitation Bill, as county officials consider that water and sanitation go hand in hand. Furthermore, they reported that their County and Sub-County Water Officers had increased the frequency of monitoring visits to utilities despite resource limitations. In addition, the county water utility, Nanyuki Water and Sanitation Company (NAWASCO) had provided technical and some financial support to the Solio and Doldol WUAs during the programme, an arrangement that reportedly worked well and was continuing. The Tharaka Nithi, NIWASCO, also continued to offer technical support to WUA schemes, especially in water quality testing.

Unintended impacts

The effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on the programme must also be acknowledged. It restricted field work for some time, and J6P took on additional work in the form of emergency projects, principally to provide temporary hand-washing facilities for use in public spaces. Many of these were found to be unnecessary once the pandemic subsided. While the pandemic resulted in much greater attention to hand hygiene, this does not appear to have made a lasting impact.

Some respondents noted that during the COVID-19 emergency, some utilities provided free water to schools and healthcare facilities during the pandemic, but with the emergency over, these institutions had yet to resume payment.

One more unintended impact cited by respondents was that the Kathwana water supply project in Tharak-Nithi was a key factor in Kathwana Town being gazetted as county headquarters.

4.6 Sustainability

Evaluation questions answered in this section:

14. What measures were implemented to encourage and enable sustainability?
15. To what extent are the programme results sustainable (or likely to be sustainable in the case of projects completed only recently)?
16. What are the key lessons learned for future projects in the sector, especially the planned PIF project funded by Finland, and what are the key recommendations to the WSTF as the implementer?

Key findings:

- Sustainability was not ignored in programme design or implementation, but the measures taken were insufficient to deliver sustainable outcomes, especially for water supply schemes.

TABLE 15. SUMMARY RANKING OF RESULTS ON SUSTAINABILITY

Traffic light coding	Grade	Meaning
Red	Serious deficiencies (25%)	Evidence available with respect to only few evaluation questions under sustainability suggest satisfactory performance.

Measures to encourage and enable sustainability

The programme document acknowledged some of the potential risks to the achievement of sustainable results based on previous experience and laid out in broad terms how sustainability would be pursued under J6P. The main elements of the approach involved:

1. Working with existing water utilities and WRUAs that had a demonstrated track record helped improve their operational effectiveness and financial viability based on revenue generation.
2. Supporting the counties in establishing performance information systems for regular reporting of water service provision within a regulated environment.
3. Promoting the integration of water, sanitation, and WRM with a focused approach to address sustainability challenges. Investments would be geographically linked.
4. Addressing GESI in all activities and investments.

Regarding utility selection, it is evident that the requirement for them to have a proven track record was not fully applied, and only a minority were regulated WSPs; many were WUAs. Some were evidently capable and experienced, but many were struggling, even after J6P had provided the training and other capacity building support outlined in Section 4 above. The lack of alternative, better-performing utilities in some programme areas may partly explain why the programme funded the weak ones. The results reported in the PCR show that important indicators of utility performance were not tracked and county-level WASH management information systems were not developed as planned. The completion of physical works remained a challenge right up to the end of the programme extension

and inevitably had a higher profile in programme operations than efforts to improve and measure utility performance.

Water supply, sanitation, and WRM components were co-located with school and household sanitation interventions targeted at communities in the catchment area of water utilities supported by the programme. However, as noted in section 4.3.3, the anticipated synergy between water supply and WRM interventions was not achieved. Lastly, the programme made only limited progress with GESI, as examined in section 4.5, though water supply services were generally affordable to all, and the promotion of household sanitation was based on an allow-cost approach that pursued community-wide benefits.

Turning to climate resilience, the programme document acknowledged risks in terms of extreme events such as drought and flooding, and the WRM component sought to conserve water resources, albeit on a very local scale. Beyond this, however, the programme did not develop climate-resilient infrastructure designs or service delivery models. Furthermore, only half of the 12 solar schemes planned were installed.

The introduction of a Sustainability Index that was used in the JAOME was an attempt (with TA support) to ensure that sustainability was receiving due attention. The Sustainability Index assessed four areas: the functionality and reliability of an investment, revenue collection, age and survival rate, and the condition of the investment. Related data was fed into a mathematical formula that generated a sustainability score based on a five-year vision rather than operation without limit.

The poor quality of some construction work was another threat to sustainability, and in the latter part of the programme, WSTF reportedly made some improvements through the deployment of CREs and TA support with quality assurance.

Sustainability of results

By the end of the programme extension period, some infrastructure works were still incomplete, and sustainability challenges were already evident with other schemes. The PCR identified that remedial action was needed, some of it technical and some relating to scheme management. This came at a very late stage, however, when the programme had already ended. Hence, there was little leverage that WSTF could apply to ensure that CGs and utilities addressed these issues.

By the time of the evaluation, only 6 out of 17 schemes were fully operational, for the reasons given in Annex 4 and Section 4.3.4. The capacity building and TA provided under J6P, while appreciated by utilities, were evidently not enough in most cases to make a lasting impact on utility performance.

In the case of school sanitation, toilets appeared to be viable when visited, though schools were closed. However, there was evidence that previous toilet blocks built at the same schools had rapidly fallen into disrepair and that little had been done to establish viable operation and maintenance arrangements for new facilities, which were built without substantial engagement by the DOE. The likely sustainability of these facilities, therefore, seemed doubtful.

Enabling factors for sustainability

Table 16 summarises the main enablers and challenges to the sustainability of water supply schemes identified by the evaluation.

TABLE 16. FACTORS AFFECTING THE SUSTAINABILITY OF J6P WATER SUPPLY SCHEMES

Enabling factors	Risks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utility status formalised and operations well established prior to J6P • Utility has some staff with essential technical and managerially skills. • Highly motivated management team • Training and capacity building support, including internships. • Gravity flow systems needing no pumping • Plentiful, reliable year-round water sources, sufficient to meet the needs of the population served • Backup support and guidance from the CG and/or county WASCO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design faults, e.g. failure to check the sufficiency of source supply • Poor construction/installation quality • Utility has no track record of performance • Utility has no/few staff with relevant technical or management skills • High power costs • Inefficient billing and revenue collection, compounded by low willingness to pay • Use of untreated water (high sediment load contributes to meter failure) • Lack of political support for selected projects and for payment of bills. • COVID-19 contributed to a decline in bill payments • Inadequate backup support from CG/WASCO • Trans-county disputes over access to water sources

5. Conclusions

J6P was different to earlier WSTF programmes: it sought to improve rural water supply via utilities and operated within a new institutional framework whereby WASH responsibility had recently been devolved to newly formed county governments, which were expected to make a significant contribution to project investment costs. There was much in the programme that was new to WSTF and county governments, and this inevitably created some uncertainty as to what could be achieved with the time and resources available. In addition, the programme had to contend with the COVID-19 pandemic, which interrupted operations and monitoring for a significant period. All of this has to be borne in mind when reviewing the programme's achievements.

Programme design

A weakness in programme design was that, especially for the water supply component central to J6P, it did not signal clearly what would constitute success for each project. The programme document

referred to outcomes, but the results framework did not show a clear progression from activities to outputs to outcomes and then impacts; it only had Key Results and Results Areas and the associated OVs were a confusing mix of process and results indicators. Moreover, many indicators relating to utility performance were not tracked, so WSTF was unable to report the final results in the PCR. The PMR highlighted a tendency to monitor activities more than results, and it appears that this continued to the end of the programme, in part because WSTF was struggling to secure the completion of its investment projects.

Sustainability was not ignored in programme implementation, but it did not receive enough attention at the project level, and there was no substantive engagement on climate resilience. There were some sustainability-related indicators in the results framework, and the adoption of a Sustainability Index helped to keep the issue on WSTF's agenda. Nevertheless, the fact that only 6 out of 17 water supply schemes were operating when visited shows that sustainability is seriously at risk, and this calls into question the value of J6P-funded investments.

The long-term value of J6P support to school WASH is also doubtful based on the outcome of similar, earlier projects in the same schools and the fact that J6P-funded utilities implemented the projects via direct engagement with the targeted schools; there was no county-wide, government-led initiative. The CLTS component was at least led by the DOPH, which has long-term responsibility for promoting sanitation and basic hygiene in rural areas.

County and utility ownership

There was an inherent contradiction in J6P in that it sought to promote decentralised management of WASH services but was itself a centrally managed programme which, for good reasons, had tight control on the use of programme funds.

Dropping the expected county government contribution from 30% to 10% (with nothing required for sanitation and WRM) was a pragmatic decision that enabled the projects to go ahead. However, the trade-off was that county government ownership of the projects remained low in most cases, and some serious defects needing CG intervention were left unresolved for years. During some field visits, there was an evident lack of concern among county and WASCO officials about the poor functionality of schemes.

How best to promote county-level ownership and effective management of devolved services remains an ongoing challenge for the government and DPs in Kenya; it is not an issue limited to J6P or the WASH sector. .

Political interference was a further constraint, with some MCAs encouraging users not to pay their water bills or unwilling to approve projects outside of their constituency.

Capacity development

At the county level, J6P supported the development of county water master plans and strategies, but these were easily forgotten, especially when there were changes in senior management at WASCO and county level. Only in Laikipia and Tharaka-Nithi were they being actively used, and it is noted here that

Laikipia is an exceptional case in that the county WASCO, Nanyuki Water, is one of the strongest water utilities in the country. Some CGs reported that their officers were now visiting WUAs more often, but there is little evidence overall of a significant change in county-level practices for overseeing WASH.

The intent of the programme design was that J6P would only support utilities with a proven track record. In practice, this was not fully applied, and many of the WUA-run schemes assisted by J6P had few staff and even fewer people with the necessary technical or managerial skills. Capacity building efforts were enhanced significantly in the second part of the programme, but this support was insufficient in most cases to make a real impact on service delivery, revenue generation or maintenance. Many WUAs need more substantial, ongoing hand-holding support, but WSTF would struggle to provide this much assistance on the ground, given its centralised position and country-wide responsibilities. It is therefore encouraging to note that, at the time of writing (March 2024), WSTF is developing two new partnerships with organisations that can potentially provide utility training and mentoring.

Compliance with GOK, MFA and SIDA policies

Returning to the GOK and DP policies that shaped the design of J6P, it is evident that not all of the programme implementations were followed to the extent originally expected. The programme was directly supportive of the devolution policy being implemented by GOK under the 2010 Constitution. Indeed, the programme approach was based explicitly on this. The shortfall, however, was in the level of achievement around county ownership and water supply service delivery.

Regarding HRBA and GESI, these featured in the results framework, but the programme content was thin and did not extend much beyond seeking a minimum level of female representation on committees and making some provision for PWD when building toilet blocks. WSTF did not adopt a GESI strategy until the very end of the programme, and it is evident that the organisation has yet to develop a real understanding of and commitment to HRBA and GESI, which can then be mainstreamed into its programming.

Similarly, the limited attention paid to climate resilience in the programme reflects the fact that WSTF does not yet have a clear vision of what it means to develop climate-resilient services. In fairness, the sector as a whole is still grappling with this question, and much of the guidance available is at an in-principle level rather than offering technologies, designs and operational approaches that can be adapted for local use. Addressing this could be a priority for future TAs in the organisation.

6. Lessons learned

At a strategic level, the main lessons emerging from J6P are as follows:

1. Small utilities that have evolved from CBOs and have few (if any) technical staff need far more training, technical assistance and mentoring support than a programme like J6P can provide. A different programme model that lays far more emphasis on improving utility performance is needed. (*See recommendations 4,7,9, 12,14,15*)

2. Backup support to small utilities from CGs/County WASCOs is essential as there will always be some issues which a WUA cannot resolve on its own, whether technical, financial or governance-related (for example, resolving transboundary disputes). WASCOs have the advantage that (unlike WSTF) they have a permanent local presence and are part of the devolved institutional framework. The mentoring role played by NAWASCO in Laikipia is a good example of such support. *(See Recommendations 3,11,12)*
3. Many of the problems encountered with water supply schemes had their roots in poor planning – in particular, not checking the sufficiency of source supplies before extending the network. Poor design and construction also contributed to functionality problems. It is vital for WSTF to ensure that these basic requirements are met at the start, as resolving problems retrospectively can be difficult and expensive. *(See Recommendations 1,4,5,7)*
4. The current government model for WRUA training and funding enabled some local-level practical action on water resources management but had no impact on the sustainability of J6P water supply schemes; neither did it help Water Resource Users' Associations to play a role in regulating the use of water resources. Further, WRM interventions following the same approach would make little difference to the sustainability of water supply investments. *(See Recommendation 16)*

7. Recommendations

The recommendations below are grouped according to the organisation(s) responsible, with the first set applicable to both development partners and WSTF.

Recommendations for WSTF and development partners on programme design

1. The design process for future WSTF programmes should pay particular attention to the following: The design document should set out the specific problems to be addressed, explain how the programme will resolve them and define what would constitute success. The inclusion of a Theory of Change showing key assumptions at each stage will help to ensure that the proposed implementation strategy is credible and founded on sound logic.
2. Instead of listing 'key results' and 'results areas,' the results framework should set out a logical progression from activities to outputs to outcomes and finally impacts. Associated targets and associated indicators should be measurable, and the monitoring framework should identify how and when this measurement will be done.
3. For programmes that involve partnerships with county governments, targets should align with the county's priorities and targets as set out in their development plans to enhance county ownership of the programme.
4. For both water supply and sanitation services, the design should include explicit measures to support and enable sustainability, including climate resilience. Appropriate indicators and processes for tracking progress towards sustainability should be incorporated into the monitoring and evaluation framework. These should be user-friendly and understood by partners at the county and utility levels.

5. The priority for monitoring should be tracking achievements, not activities. Inputs (such as the number of projects funded or training packages delivered) should not be confused with outputs (such as the number of additional people gaining access to safe water).

Recommendations for future MFA technical support (including support under PIF)

6. Continue to provide TA in a supportive but not directive role; programme management should remain WSTF's responsibility. Reach agreement with WSTF at the outset on the objectives, scope and boundaries of the TA's role.
7. MFA should continue supporting efforts to strengthen WSTF's capability and effectiveness overall, looking beyond the timeframe of individual projects. particularly their ability to ensure the quality of physical outputs and to support the establishment of sustainable services.
8. Consider including TA to help WSTF gain a better understanding of and commitment to HRBA and GESI – for example, via orientation and training from an external organisation specialising in these areas. Then, support them in mainstreaming HRBA and GESI within programme operations.
9. Assist WSTF in identifying appropriate operational models, designs and technologies for the establishment of climate-resilient WASH services.
10. Another valuable contribution of external TA can be to introduce approaches or technologies from elsewhere that are new to the organisation and potentially useful. However, it is important that these are brought in and tested as a response to locally identified needs – they should not be imposed rigidly.

Recommendations for WSTF rural WASH programming

11. WSTF should reinstate the requirement for significant (more than 10%) upfront county government contributions and be prepared to cancel projects where these contributions are not forthcoming.
12. WSTF should give more attention to advocacy at the county level, including with MCAs, to generate support for sustainable service delivery based on revenue generation. Again, if county governments do not give their explicit support to sustainable approaches, then investments should not go ahead.
13. More attention should be paid to supporting county-wide approaches to WASH improvement in support of SDG 6 and the national sanitation strategy. This support needs to go beyond one-off support to the formulation of a strategy or master plan and address routine planning, coordination and monitoring practices.

Water supply

14. Utility performance and scheme sustainability (including financial sustainability) should be given much higher priority in future programming. To ensure that these aspects are not marginalised, a specified minimum standard of performance (tailored to utility type and scheme size) should be made a precondition for investment support. (This would be in line with the original intention of the J6P to support utilities with a proven track record).

15. Training workshops and KEWI internships are helpful but not sufficient to secure long-term improvements in utility capability and performance. Programme design should include more on-the-ground technical support and mentoring for each utility, tailored to address the findings of a capacity needs assessment. This will likely require partnerships with other specialist organisations, whether government, private sector or non-governmental organisations.

BOX 4 NOTE ON EXISTING WATER SUPPLY SCHEMES

The TOR called for recommendations on future programming. Nevertheless, it is important to highlight that action is needed to restore the functionality of schemes visited by the evaluation mission that were not operational or only partially functional. If this is not done, considerable investments will have been wasted. While resolving some defects will require considerable funds, some others are related more to revenue collection. It is recommended that WSTF at least tries to secure the resolution of current faults in collaboration with the relevant CGs and utilities. **If there is scope to accommodate some of the work needed within the PIF funding package, this would be very useful.**

Source: Evaluation team

Water resources management

21. Where WRM and water supply components feature in the same programme, WRM interventions should include specific measures to support the sustainability of water supply schemes funded under the programme.

School WASH

22. WSTF should not fund School WASH improvements unless these form part of a county-wide initiative led by the DOE to ensure that all schools meet minimum WASH standards.

Household sanitation

23. WSTF should prioritise supporting DOPH-led initiatives to promote sanitation county-wide in support of SDG6 rather than targeting a few villages in the catchment area of water supply schemes funded by the programme.
24. WSTF funding for sanitation should be routed via the lead ministry for sanitation and hygiene (health), not via water utilities, some of which are CBOs.

Public/communal toilets

WSTF should not fund public/communal toilets for daily use by rural households for two reasons. Firstly, there is usually ample space for household toilets, which offer greater privacy and convenience. Secondly, sector experience shows that public toilets quickly become unsanitary and abandoned unless managed by a highly motivated management body, usually on a pay-to-use basis.

Annex 1. Evaluation Terms of Reference

Support to Equitable Access to Quality Water, Basic Sanitation and Enhanced Water Resources Management in Rural Kenya

Terms of Reference for ex-post evaluation (impact evaluation)

1. Background to the evaluation

1.1. Programme context (policy, country, regional, global, thematic context)

The Constitution of Kenya 2010 recognises the importance of access to water and has thus enshrined it as a fundamental human right in Chapter 4, Article 43(b) and 43(d), and this right is to be progressively realised. Similarly, under the Medium-Term Plans (MTPs) of Vision 2030, the National Government recognises the need to enhance water and sanitation services as captured in the social pillar toward universal access for all.

The Water Act 2016 recognises that water and sanitation-related functions are a shared responsibility between the National Government and the County Governments.

Adopted in the UN General Assembly in September 2015, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) enumerate 17 goals that the nations of the world are committed to working towards. Specifically, SDG 6 is to ensure the availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all, elaborating on the specific targets and timelines to be achieved. The Joint Six Programme (J6P) "Support to Equitable Access to Quality Water, Basic Sanitation and Enhanced Water Resources Management in Rural Kenya" was designed to contribute to these global, regional and national commitments in water and sanitation and to embody a human rights-based approach in implementation.

The constitutional reforms in 2010 created an entirely new layer of elected government at the county level. It gave responsibility for water and sanitation to this new tier of government, the 47 elected County Governments. The responsibility was shared with the central government so that Water Services Boards retained a major implementation responsibility of the urban and cross-county boundary programmes. WSBs were later transformed into Water Works Development Authorities.

The subsidiary legislation was reformed to align with the Constitution by promulgating the Water Act 2016. Ownership and governance of the water service providers (WSP) was moved to the Counties. A regulatory authority, the Water Service Regulatory Board, was created to oversee the WSP.

Changes were more fundamental in the case of rural water and sanitation. Counties were expected to finance both the investment and operations of these services from their own revenue and/or with the help of development partners. During the inception of the J6 project, there was little or no national government involvement, except for the availability of funds through the Water Sector Trust Fund.

The reformed water services provision system, especially in the rural water and sanitation sector, was in its infancy at the beginning of the J6 programme, and the Counties were seeking the modes of decision-making, resources, and operational practices for service provision in rural areas.

Since the 1980s, Finland has supported the development of water services in Kenya. For a long period of time, Finland acted independently, especially in Western Kenya, and since 2009, its support has widened through the Water Sector Trust Fund (WSTF). Traditionally, Finland directed its support to improving the water and sanitation services in poor rural areas, where the local communities have been instructed to maintain the services in question. In addition, Finland supported the protection of water resources. The end of J6P also marked the end of Finland's bilateral cooperation in the water sector through "traditional" development cooperation.

The government of Sweden has, through the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), supported Kenya's water sector since the 1980's. SIDA's support was instrumental in supporting the water sector reform after the promulgation of the Water Act 2001. SIDA widely supported the establishment of the new water sector institutions, including the WSTF. SIDA has continued to support the water sector investment through WSTF since 2000 and provided financing to the J6.

The extent to which the implementation and utilisation of the resultant outputs and outcomes of the programme have impacted households and ecosystems can only be documented by undertaking an evaluation. The results of the evaluation are expected to influence policy for better delivery of sustainable water and sanitation services, as well as water resources management in the face of climate change.

1.2. Description of the programme to be evaluated

The Joint Six Programme (J6P) "Support to Equitable Access to Quality Water, Basic Sanitation and Enhanced Water Resources Management in Rural Kenya" was based upon collaboration between the Government of Kenya and the two Development Partners (DPs): Government of Finland and Government of Sweden. The Water Sector Trust Fund (WSTF) implemented the programme, which was supported by a Technical Assistance team provided by the consultancy FCG Sweden. WSTF is a state corporation established under the Water Act of 2016. The mandate of WSTF is to provide conditional and unconditional grants to counties and to assist in financing the development and management of water services in marginalised areas or any area which is considered by the Board of Trustees to be underserved in Kenya.

The J6 Programme was implemented in six selected counties: Kwale, Laikipia, Migori, Nandi, Narok and Tharaka Nithi. These counties played critical roles in co-financing, project identification and monitoring, as water and sanitation services provision is a devolved function. The water resource management component of the programme was implemented through Water Resource User Associations (WRUAs) with technical support from Water Resources Authority-WRA (formerly Water Resources Management Authority-WRMA).

The programme targeted communities, schools and households as final beneficiaries. In order to ensure gender and social inclusion (GESI) in the programme, civil society organisations were involved in developing strategies and policies to provide capacity building support to community groups. The

water scheme management teams were trained by Kenya Water Institute (KEWI) on operations and maintenance of the resulting infrastructure funded through the programme.

The goal of the Programme was “Equitable access to quality water, basic sanitation and enhanced water resources management for the underserved communities in rural Kenya”. This objective was to be achieved through five outcomes:

1. Enhanced capacity of counties to provide pro-poor water services;
2. Equitable access to water resources in catchment areas of focus;
3. Improved rural safe water coverage in target counties;
4. Improved rural sanitation coverage in target counties, and
5. Enhanced institutional capacity of WSTF.

The J6P was initially designed to be implemented for a period of four years, from December 2014 to December 2018.

However, due to a delay in the start of the active implementation phase of the programme, the period was extended to June 2021. The cost of the programme was EUR 16.875 million, approximately Ksh 2.025 billion, comprising EUR 13.5 million (Ksh 1.62 billion) from the two development partners and EUR 3.375 million (Ksh 0.4 billion) from the Government of Kenya as counterpart funding. The breakdown of the budget is tabulated below.

Table 1: Contribution by Development Partners

No	Description	Amount	Amount (Kenya Shillings)	% Contribution
4.	Government of Kenya	3.8 M Euro (approx)	405,000,000	20%
5.	Government of Finland	7.0M Euro	840,000,000	80%
6.	Government of Sweden	60M SEK (6.1M Euro)	780,000,000	
	TOTAL	16.875M (Euro approx)	2,025,000,000	100%

1.3. Results of previous evaluations

Whereas the Programme has had no previous evaluation undertaken, there was a programme management review (PMR) of the programme in 2019, which informed changes to the implementation design of the Programme.

The PMR was undertaken due to the delays and concerns about the slow implementation and fund disbursement of J6P. The PMR listed many delays due to the inertia and capacity constraints of the County Governments, among other things. The PMR emphasised high priority to accelerate the completion of first cycle infrastructure works and shift the focus of attention to strengthening service delivery in line with programme objectives. The PMR also concluded that an extension was justified.

The WSTF undertook Joint Annual Operations Monitoring Exercises, also covering J6P. These are harmonised monitoring events that serve the current monitoring needs of any donor financing various programmes through WSTF.

In addition, the programme's completion report provides results achieved at the end of the programme's implementation. Therefore, this impact evaluation is expected to provide insights into the relevance of the programme to the targeted beneficiaries and to assess the extent to which the overall objective of the programme was achieved.

2. Rationale, purpose and objectives of the evaluation

The purpose of this final impact evaluation is to provide independent and objective evidence to the governments of Kenya, Finland and Sweden on the intended and unintended impacts of the Joint Six Programme, its achieved results, and its sustainability. The evaluation is also expected to provide lessons learned and best practices related to the planning and implementation of future water sector programmes that might include similar elements in Kenya and other countries. The information provided can be especially useful for the planned Finnish-Kenyan private sector cooperation project in the water sector in Kenya, (Public Sector Investment Facility - PIF), with WSTF as the Executing Agency.

The Joint Six Programme reported achievements across the five outcome areas. However, all construction was not fully finished by the end of the programme in June 2021, and the day-to-day operation of the water utilities was still being established. Therefore, the evaluation will provide information on the current status of water supply, water resources and sanitation projects that were (or are in the final steps of being) handed over to the duty bearers (Water Service Providers, WRUAs and e.g. schools in terms of sanitation projects). The completion report of J6 from February 2023 lists a number of projects with ongoing difficulties. The responsibilities of solving these problems have been allocated to the county governments or WSPs.

The evaluation results are expected to be utilised by the Ministry of Water, Sanitation and Irrigation, County governments and water utilities, WTSF, development partners and other stakeholders in Kenya and other countries.

The priority objectives of this evaluation are to assess:

- How has the implementation model of J6 assisted in strengthening the capacity of the County Governments to provide water and sanitation services? Has this created opportunities for up-scaling?
- Has the implementation of the programme helped to create a sustainable model for service provision on the community level?
- Was the operational set-up of the projects, including Technical Assistance (TA), human resources, and related financial aspects, good enough to achieve the project objectives?

3. Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will cover the full J6P implementation period (2014-2021), though it is recognised that there may be limited useful documentation from the early years, and some key personnel involved in programme design and implementation might not be available for interview. The PMR of 2017 is, however, a useful point of reference as it reviewed progress from inception and made a number of detailed recommendations relating to programme implementation. The evaluation is to follow up on which recommendations were implemented and beneficial to the J6. Some may have fallen by the

wayside, and this should also be documented. The focus of the evaluation should be on concrete and measurable results, and as such, a major part of the mission will be accomplished in the counties.

The evaluation covers all six J6P counties (Kwale, Laikipia, Migori, Nandi, Narok and Tharaka Nithi) and the work accomplished in them. The fieldwork is expected to take place in selected projects in all six counties as well as in Nairobi. In the inception report of the evaluation, the evaluation team should set out which projects will be visited after consulting WSTF. The selection should reflect the range of projects implemented in terms of technical content and scale and cover both higher and lower-performing examples (the latter should include schemes that were incomplete when the project ended). In total, 42 water supply projects, 46 sanitation projects, and 15 water resources management projects were implemented. In addition, there were 8 COVID-19 emergency response projects; these were not foreseen when the programme was designed.

The stakeholders to be consulted include Kenyan government officials (both at the National and County level), Technical Assistance (TA) team members, beneficiaries of the Programme, WSTF staff and management, WSP, WRUA and schools involved in sanitation implementation, and Finnish and Swedish government representatives. Some other donors active in the sector should also be consulted. The number will depend on the time available, but it should include at least some of the following: USAID, DANIDA, EU, KfW and World Bank (which is the current donor coordination chair).

4. Issues to be addressed and evaluation questions

While the evaluation questions below and in Chapter 2 of this ToR indicate the priority issues under each criterion, the evaluation team should not limit the evaluation to these questions only. Emphasis should be placed on assessing the impact, effectiveness and sustainability of the Programme. The following cross-cutting objectives will be integrated into the application of all evaluation criteria: gender equality, human rights-based approach (HRBA) and non-discrimination (focus on disabilities), climate resilience and low emission development. The evaluation questions set out below will be reviewed and finalised during the inception phase.

The evaluation will be based on the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee's (DAC) six criteria for evaluations: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability.

The evaluation criteria to be applied and the key evaluation questions are presented below:

Relevance refers to the extent to which the objectives of the programme are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country priorities, global priorities, and partners' and Finland's policies. This includes an evaluation of how the promotion of human rights and gender equality, non-discrimination and promotion of climate resilience (climate change mitigation, adaptation and preparedness) as defined by international and regional conventions, national policies and strategies, have been integrated into programme design and implementation.

Within the context of the water sector goal of improving access to water and sanitation services in a sustained environment and mainstreaming gender and social inclusion and other non-discrimination issues, as well as national-level policies in this regard:

1. How well were the programme's objectives aligned with the country and global priorities in the water sector?
2. How were human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination and climate resilience integrated into programme design and implementation?
3. To what extent are the programme's target beneficiaries (at community, service provider and county level) satisfied with the focus and results of the programme?

Coherence refers to the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution. Two dimensions of coherence should be covered: External coherence (Is the intervention consistent with other related interventions in the same context? Does it add value while avoiding duplication of effort?) and Internal coherence (Does the intervention create or strengthen synergies and interlinkages within the institution/government (policy coherence)? Is the intervention consistent with relevant international norms and standards?)

1. To what extent was the J6P programme coherent with the policies and programmes of other partners operating within the same context? How well was the coordination between the programmes undertaken on WSTF and County level?
2. Were the roles and responsibilities between the implementing partners (County Governments, WSP) and financing partner WSTF well defined, and did they create synergies?

Effectiveness describes the achievements towards the programme outcome and key outputs or whether they are expected to be achieved in the future. Evaluation of promotion of human rights and gender equality, non-discrimination and promotion of climate resilience is integrated in the analysis.

1. To what extent has the programme achieved its stated outcomes and outputs?
2. What role did monitoring and evaluation play in enhancing programme effectiveness?
3. To what extent and how has the programme promoted human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination, and climate resilience in its outcomes and outputs?
4. Did the project achieve additionality, i.e. did project funding result in additional use of resources towards water and sanitation in the targeted counties? Did the project funding reduce or increase the counties own budgeting towards water and sanitation?

Efficiency is defined by how well the various activities have transformed the available resources into the intended results in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. The use of resources to promote human rights and gender equality, non-discrimination and promotion of climate resilience is integrated into the analysis. Comparison should be made against what was planned. Furthermore, the management and administrative arrangements are analysed.

1. How effectively has the programme utilised its resources, including financial, human, and technical, to achieve its objectives and deliver the intended outputs?
2. To what extent has the programme streamlined its processes and procedures, including management and administrative arrangements, to minimise inefficiencies and maximise the productivity of its operation?

Impact describes how the programme has succeeded in contributing to its targeted wider development impact, i.e. impact for its final beneficiaries, including promotion of human rights and gender equality,

non-discrimination and promotion of climate resilience. The evaluation of impact covers intended and unintended, short- and long-term, positive and negative impacts.

1. To what extent has the programme contributed to strengthening the capacity of the WSTF, and what are the central remaining capacity gaps?
2. What evidence exists of the programme's contribution to the targeted wider development impact, including the promotion of human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination, and climate resilience, both in the short-term and long-term?
3. What have the intended and unintended, positive and negative impacts of the programme been, taking into consideration the promotion of human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination, and climate resilience?

Sustainability refers to the likely continuation of programme achievements when external support comes to an end. Typically, sustainability covers economic/financial, institutional, technical, socio-cultural and environmental dimensions. Sustainability also includes an analysis of the likely continuation of achievements in human rights and gender equality, non-discrimination and promotion of climate resilience. Evaluation of phasing out (exit) plans is part of the sustainability analysis.

1. To what extent are the programme results sustainable (or likely to be sustainable in the case of projects completed only recently)?
2. What measures have been implemented to ensure the long-term sustainability of the programme's achievements in terms of economic/financial viability, institutional capacity, technical feasibility, socio-cultural acceptance, and environmental impact while also considering the continuation of advancements in human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination, and climate resilience?
3. How well-developed and comprehensive were the phasing out (exit) plans for the programme?
4. What are the possible strengths/weaknesses/opportunities/threats that enhance or inhibit the sustainability of programme achievements, including cross-cutting objectives? To what extent are the implementing partners committed to achieving the results and maintaining them?
5. What are the key lessons learned for future projects in the sector, especially the planned public sector investment facility (PIF) project funded by Finland, and what are the key recommendations to the WSTF as the implementer?

The evaluation questions will be finalised in the inception report.

5. Methodology

The choice of methodology will be left for the evaluation team to propose in the inception report. With the aim of having an objective and independent evaluation, the team is expected to conduct the evaluation according to international criteria and professional norms and standards adopted by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFA; see annexes). The methodology defines methods of data collection and analysis. It is expected that multiple methods are used, both qualitative and quantitative. Consultations with the relevant partners and stakeholders will be conducted. These include Kenyan, Finnish and Swedish government officials, members of the TA team, WSTF personnel and final beneficiaries of the Programme.

Validation of results should be done through multiple sources to the extent possible, with data disaggregated by relevant categories. The evaluation must be gender and culturally sensitive and respect the confidentiality, the protection of the sources and the dignity of those interviewed. The evaluation is expected to summarise the evidence-based findings of the overall performance of the project under each OECD evaluation criteria using a four-level grading system: (4/green = very good), (3/yellow = good), (2/orange = problems) and (1/red = serious deficiencies). The overall performance grading must reflect the findings of all evaluation questions under each evaluation criteria.

6. The evaluation process and time schedule

The evaluation is expected to be conducted from October 2023 to February 2024. It will be structured into four phases, as outlined below. Fieldwork will take place in selected sites in all six J6P counties and Nairobi provisionally from November 20 to December 6.

N	Phase	Deliverable	Timeframe
1	Preparation		
	Remote meeting with MFA to clarify expectations and scope of field work		
	Review and revision of TOR		
2	Inception		
	Remote inception meeting with the Finnish MFA, Embassy of Sweden and WSTF.	Consensus of the purpose and scope of the evaluation	After signing of contract
	Preliminary review of documentation and results data; finalisation of evaluation questions; development of evaluation matrix and tools; and formulation of detailed work plan	Inception report with time schedule for the rest of the assignment	2 weeks from inception meeting
3	Field		
	Kick-off meeting in Nairobi including presentation from WSTF on programme content, achievements and challenges.		1 week from inception report
	National level KIIs and FGDs with WSTF personnel, government partners and donors.		
	Visits to all six J6P counties including meetings/interviews with county government and (where present) WSTF staff, consultants and contractors; visits to project sites including KIIs/FGDs with service providers, WRUAS and beneficiary communities.		
	De-briefing meeting with WSTF, other government partners and MFA/SIDA	Presentation on field findings	3 weeks from inception report
4	Analysis and Reporting		
	Preparation and submission of draft evaluation report.	Draft evaluation report	7 weeks from inception report
	Remote presentation of findings to 1) Finland, Sweden and WSTF and 2) wider stakeholders in the water sector in Kenya. In the latter workshop, future related	Presentation on evaluation findings	

recommendations (including for PIF financing) should also be discussed. The invitees to this workshop should include relevant Kenyan government, World Bank (donor chair), USAID, DANIDA, GIZ, EU and other stakeholders.	and recommendations	
Revision and submission of final report	Final report evaluation	6 weeks from stakeholder workshop

7. Reporting

The evaluation team will submit the following deliverables:

- Inception report (draft and final inception reports)
 - Presentation of the field findings (at the end of the field phase)
 - Draft final report
 - Presentation of the evaluation findings and recommendations
 - Final report
- **Inception Report** (maximum 20 pages). The Inception Report should outline the evaluation criteria, approach, scope, detailed methodology, work plan, work tasks within the evaluation team, and plan for site visits and meetings. The report should also mention the documents reviewed in preparation for the evaluation. The outline of an inception report can be found in the MFA Evaluation Manual, which can be found at <https://um.fi/development-cooperation-evaluation-manual>
 - **Draft Final Report**. The report, which combines the desk study and the field findings, should be submitted to MFA, WSTF and the Embassy of Sweden through PowerPoint presentations and submission of the draft final report for comments before final submission. The outline for an evaluation report can be found at: <https://um.fi/development-cooperation-evaluation-manual>
 - **Final Report** (maximum 50 pages excluding annexes). The structure of the contents of the reports shall be agreed upon during the debriefing meeting
 - **Presentation on the evaluation findings**: The consultant is expected to make PowerPoint presentations to MFA, Embassy of Sweden, WSTF and other key stakeholders. Also, the findings will be presented in a larger workshop with all actors in the water sector

Each deliverable is subjected to specific approval. The evaluation team is able to move to the next phase only after receiving a written statement of acceptance by the MFA. The reporting schedule is included in the contract.

The language of the reports is English, and they must be in clear and concise language.

8. Quality assurance

The quality assurance system agreed to in the context of the framework agreement (FADER) between MFA and the service provider will be implemented as a part of the evaluation. Details should be included in the inception report.

9. Expertise required

The assignment shall be implemented by an independent evaluation team led by a team leader. At a minimum, the evaluation team shall consist of:

- two international experts, one of them nominated as a Team Leader with a proven track record of successfully leading evaluation teams; and
- two national experts.

The team shall demonstrate solid experience and knowledge in at least the following fields:

- **Technical expertise relevant to the project**, including water supply, sanitation, water resource management, and rural livelihoods, preferably from East Africa.
- **Programme evaluation and planning**: Project cycle management (PCM) and Results Based Management (RBM), and their application in programme design, monitoring and evaluation (M&E)
- **Institutional and human resources development, organisational change management**: Experience with assessment of institutional capacity (part of sustainability analysis), preferably in the water and sanitation sector.
- **Experience and knowledge should also be demonstrated in the fields of** poverty reduction, human rights-based approach, cross-cutting objectives in the Finnish development policy, and the application of these issues in project design, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.
- **Quality assurance**: in accordance with the quality assurance approach proposed in the tender.
- **Finnish development policy guidelines**: at least one team member has knowledge of the guidelines from over a longer period of time given the length of the programme to be evaluated
- **Working languages**: fluency in English and Swahili, both written and oral. At least one senior person in the team must have fluency in Finnish.

10. Budget

The estimated budget for this evaluation is 130.000 EUR, excluding VAT. The budget includes the fees of the experts and reimbursable costs.

11. Mandate

The evaluation team is entitled and expected to discuss matters relevant to this evaluation with pertinent persons and organisations. However, it is not authorised to make any commitments on behalf of the Government of Finland, those of the partner countries or on behalf of the implementing organisations.

Annexes:

Annex 1: MFA evaluation manual <https://um.fi/development-cooperation-evaluation-manual>

Annex 2: Tentative list of materials for the desk study

1. Project Document

2. Programme Review Report
3. Programme Completion Report
4. Programme Annual Progress reports
5. TA reporting

(All templates related to evaluation: <https://um.fi/development-cooperation-evaluation-manual>)

Annex 2. Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Question	Related Questions	Sources of Information	Comments
<i>Relevance</i>			
<p>1. How well were the programme's objectives aligned with the country and global priorities in the water sector?</p>	<p>What were the national and global WASH priorities when the programme was designed? How have they changed since then?</p> <p>Which of these priorities was the programme trying to address?</p>	<p><i>Documents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project document - Sector policy and strategy docs - Donor reports from design period - Sector status reports from 2012 onwards (if available) <p>Kickoff meeting at WSTF</p> <p><i>National level KIs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WSTF: CEO, J6P Manager, CEO - TA team - MFA, SIDA, other donors (WB?) 	
<p>2. How were human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination and climate resilience integrated into programme design and implementation?</p>	<p>What specific strategies or interventions were adopted for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Human rights - Gender - Non-discrimination - Climate resilience <p>How did TA deployed by MFA help the programme to address human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination and climate resilience?</p>	<p><i>Documents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project document - WSTF operational strategies and guidelines - J6P progress reports, JAOME reports - Sub-project designs and progress reports - TA reports <p>Kickoff meeting at WSTF</p> <p><i>National level KIs</i></p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WSTF: J6P Manager and other personnel responsible for J6P - TA team <p><i>County-level KIIs / FGDs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - County government officials - WSP managers, CBOs - WRUA members <p>DOPH</p>	
<p>3. To what extent are the programme's target beneficiaries (at community, service provider and county level) satisfied with the focus and results of the programme?</p>	<p>Did all community-level projects deliver the intended results? If not, what are the reasons for the shortcomings?</p> <p>In what ways did the programme develop county government and service provider capacity?</p> <p>Why was county government support to J6P weaker than expected?</p>	<p><i>County-level KIIs / FGDs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - County government officials - WSP managers, CBOs - WRUA members - DOPH <p>Project visits including FGDs with community beneficiaries</p>	<p>Weak CG support is cited as a constraint in the PCR</p>
<p><i>Coherence</i></p>			

<p>4. To what extent was the J6P programme coherent with policies and programmes of other partners operating within the same context? How well was the coordination between the programmes undertaken at WSTF and County level?</p>	<p>What other rural WASH or WRM programmes operated over the same period?</p> <p>What WASH co-ordination platforms were in place at national and county level?</p> <p>How were J6P's COVID response projects coordinated with support from other partners and organisations?</p>	<p><i>Documents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - JAOME and WSTF annual reports - TA reports <p><i>National level KIs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MFA, SIDA, WB (others?) <p><i>County level KIs / FGDs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - County government officials - WSP managers, CBOs - WRUA members - DOPH 	
<p><i>Effectiveness</i></p>			
<p>6. To what extent has the programme achieved its five outcomes as listed below?</p>	<p>Were there some types of project (in terms of scale or content) which tended to be more or less successful?</p> <p>What were the enablers or barriers to success?</p>	<p><i>Documents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reported results - PCR (2023) and TA final report (2021) <p><i>National level KIs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WSTF: CEO, J6P Manager and other personnel responsible for J6P - TA team 	

<p>6a) Enhanced institutional capacity of WSTF.</p>	<p>How were WSTF's capacity building needs identified?</p> <p>How was capacity enhanced, and which gaps remain?</p> <p>What were the strengths and weaknesses of the TA modality adopted compared to the TA models used in other WSTF programmes?</p>	<p><i>National level KIIs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WSTF: J6P Manager and other personnel responsible for J6P - TA team 	<p>This question was under impact in the TOR, but WSTF capacity building was one of the five programme outcomes, hence it has been moved here.</p>
<p>6b) Enhanced capacity of counties to provide pro-poor water services.</p>	<p>How were county government capacity building needs identified?</p> <p>How was capacity enhanced, and which gaps remain?</p>	<p><i>National level KIIs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WSTF: J6P Manager and other personnel responsible for J6P - TA team <p><i>County level KIIs / FGDs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WSTF: CRMS and REs - County government officials - WSP managers, CBOs - WRUA members - DOPH 	
<p>6c) Equitable access to water resources in catchment areas of focus.</p>	<p>Did WRM projects deliver tangible benefits?</p> <p>Have WRUAs remained active? What has enabled or limited their viability?</p>	<p><i>Documents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sub-project documents and reported results <p><i>County level</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KIIs with CRMs <p><i>Project level</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FGDs with WRUAs - Site visits 	

<p>6d) Improved rural safe water coverage in target counties.</p>	<p>Are schemes that were not yet operational when the programme ended, now fully functional?</p> <p>What did J6P do beyond infrastructure development to help create sustainable services?</p>	<p><i>Documents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sub-project documents and reported results <p><i>County level</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KIs with CRMs <p><i>Project level</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KIs WSP/CBO managers - Site visits 	
<p>6e) Improved rural sanitation coverage in target counties.</p>	<p>What were the relative contributions of J6P and other projects/initiatives to the CLTS results?</p> <p>Were DOPH fully committed to J6P sanitation objectives?</p>	<p><i>Documents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sub-project documents and reported results <p><i>County level</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KIs with CRMs <p><i>Project level</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KIs with DOPH officials - Site visits 	

<p>7. What role did monitoring and evaluation play in enhancing programme effectiveness?</p>	<p>How was monitoring data used to inform planning and decision making at national and local level?</p> <p>How useful to J6P was the JAOME?</p> <p>How were human rights, gender, non-discrimination and climate resilience addressed by programme monitoring and reporting systems?</p>	<p><i>National level KIIs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WSTF: CEO, J6P Manager, M&E Lead and other personnel responsible for J6P <p>TA team</p>	<p>WSTF has standardised monitoring and reporting across all of its programmes</p>
<p>8. To what extent, and how, has the programme promoted human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination, and climate resilience in its outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>For each outcome (see Q6): Has the project built capacity on human rights, gender, non-discrimination and climate resilience among stakeholders?</p>	<p>As for Qs 6a) to 6d)</p>	
<p>9. Did the project achieve additionality, i.e. did project funding lead to counties increasing or decreasing their own funding for water and sanitation?</p>	<p>To what extent did local demand (from county governments, WRUAs and service providers) determine project selection?</p> <p>How did government funding systems enable or constrain county contributions to J6P?</p>	<p><i>National level KIIs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WSTF: CEO, J6P Manager, M&E Lead and other personnel responsible for J6P <p><i>County level KIIs / FGDs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WSTF: CRMS and REs - County government officials - WSP managers, CBOs - DOPH 	
<p><i>Efficiency</i></p>			

<p>10. How efficiently has the programme utilised its resources, including financial, human, and technical, to achieve its objectives and deliver the intended outputs?</p>	<p>Did WSTF strike an appropriate balance between centralised and decentralised TA and guidance to the counties?</p>	<p><i>Documents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progress reports and PCR - TA reports - 2017 PMR <p><i>National level KIs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WSTF: CEO, J6P Manager, M&E Lead and other personnel responsible for J6P - TA - MFA, SIDA 	
<p>11. To what extent did WSTF streamline its management and administration systems to optimise productivity?</p>	<p>What changes were made to the management and administration of J6P following the 2017 PMR?</p> <p>What was the effect of dropping the PMIS? Was a better system adopted?</p>	<p><i>Documents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progress reports and PCR - TA reports - 2017 PMR <p><i>National level KIs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WSTF: CEO, J6P Manager, M&E Lead and other personnel responsible for J6P - TA - MFA, SIDA 	
<p><i>Impact</i></p>			
<p>12. What evidence exists of programme impact in the areas of human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination and climate resilience, at project and county level?</p>		<p><i>Documents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progress reports and PCR - TA reports - 2017 PMR <p><i>County level</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KIs with CRMs, county government officials 	

		<i>Project level</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KIs with WSP/CBO managers, DOPH, WRUAs Site visits and community consultation	
13. Have there been any unintended impacts, whether positive or negative?			Overall and with respect to human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination and climate resilience
<i>Sustainability</i>			
14. What measures were implemented to encourage and enable sustainability?	<p>Were well-developed phasing out (exit) plans implemented at project and county level?</p> <p>To what extent have sustainability actions plans been implemented by service providers?</p> <p>How have the measures contributed to the promotion of human rights, gender equality, non-discrimination, and climate resilience?</p>	<i>National level KIs</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WSTF: CEO, J6P Manager, M&E Lead and other personnel responsible for J6P - TA - MFA, SIDA <i>Documents</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progress reports and PCR - TA reports - 2017 PMR <i>County level</i>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KIIs with CRMs, county government officials <p><i>Project level</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KIIs with WSP/CBO managers, DOPH, WRUAs - Site visits and community consultation 	
<p>15. To what extent are the programme results sustainable (or likely to be sustainable in the case of projects completed only recently)?</p>	<p>What factors will enable or inhibit sustainability?</p> <p>To what extent are the implementing partners committed to sustaining programme benefits?</p>	<p><i>County level</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KIIs with CRMs, county government officials <p><i>Project level</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KIIs with WSP/CBO managers, DOPH, WRUAs - Site visits and community consultation 	
<p>16. What are the key lessons learned for future projects in the sector, especially the planned public sector investment facility (PIF) project funded by Finland, and what are the key recommendations to the WSTF as the implementer?</p>	<p>What are the key lessons learned for WSTF and implementing partners?</p> <p>Are there specific lessons relevant to the planned (PIF) project?</p>		<p>Need information on the proposed PIF project</p>

Annex 3. Status of water supply schemes visited

8/17 not operational

3/17 partially operational

6/17 fully operational

Scheme and utility type	J6P-funded investments	Total population reached (PCR)	Status reported in PCR (assessed 2022)	Status at time of evaluation mission (Nov-Dec 2023)
KWALE COUNTY				
1. Godoni/Chitsanze (KWAWASCO)	7km pipeline, 75m ³ elevated steel tank and 2 kiosks	380	Operational.	Not operational due to low demand - plenty of rainwater available. But KAWASCO said it was functional and used in the dry season. An overhead steel tank had corroded quickly and was replaced using funds from another source. The location is prime real estate and some expensive houses are being built, though most existing ones are low/middle income.
2. Mrima Borehole (WUA)	8.5Km pipeline, 100m ³ masonry tank, 5 kiosks, solar power.	2,350	Partially operational as solar panels have just been installed to power the pump. Failed governance; proposed hand over to KWAWASCO	Not operational due to inadequate power and inadequate source yield (according to WUA). Pre-existing scheme, was under community management then WUA formed under J6P. Last functioned 3 months earlier (Sept 2023). CG has offered to provide 2 new boreholes, works pending due to rains. Plan to have hybrid solar/genset power.
3. Panama Shimoni WUA	4km pipeline, 75m ³ steel elevated tank, 3 new and 5 rehabilitated kiosks.	0	Not operational. Failed governance; proposed hand over to KWAWASCO	Not operational. Scheme established in 2013. J6P extended coverage but pump/source was not adequate to supply everyone and the scheme failed in 2021. Since then, using alternative sources. With CG support, will soon be connecting the scheme to a nearby test borehole drilled under a World Bank project. This has a much bigger yield than the earlier source.
NANDI COUNTY				

<p>4. Kobujoi (WUA)</p>	<p>1.7km pipeline, CFU and masonry tank, high lift pump and pump house, weir and sump, electrical supply, 350 meters, computer, printer, office furniture.</p>	<p>6,995</p>	<p>Fully operational. Weak governance – needs enhancement and improved O&M systems</p>	<p>Not operational due to non-payment of power bills. Old scheme, first established in 1982 using steam intake. Had house connections and meters but payment was poor and supply stopped for a while due to unpaid bills. When J6P support began (around 2018) the scheme had been out of order for some time due to technical failures. The programme rehabilitated the supply, built a new weir, replaced meters, expanded coverage. When visited the scheme had been non-operational for several months, again due to unpaid power bills. Revenue did not cover operational costs. Even the Governor (a customer) had unpaid bills.</p>
<p>5. Lelmokwo (WUA)</p>	<p>Phase I: 7.4km pipeline length, 100cm masonry tank, 500 meters, elevated steel tank Phase II: Office with toilet, 19km new pipeline, 5km rehabilitated pipeline, 600 meters.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>Not operational. The project is now part of the larger Kipkaren Dam water project being constructed to serve Eldoret. Lelmokwo expects to receive 2,500m³ treated water per day upon completion.</p>	<p>Not operational. Scheme was first developed in 1972, operated for many years with source in an adjoining county. Managed by central government but service ended in 2012 due to unpaid bills. After devolution, in 2013 CG handed over the scheme to the user community. J6P Phase I involved rehabilitation and expansion of the network but no changes to the source. Phase II works not fully completed (pumps not installed). The adjoining CG demolished the intake and treatment plant, replaced it with infrastructure serving people in that county only. Since then the scheme has not operated. Expectation now is that the scheme will access a new bulk supply from the Eldoret scheme, however that is way behind schedule and has contractual problems.</p>
<p>6. Kimng'oror (WUA)</p>	<p>Phase I: 13km pipeline, office block, CFU and masonry tank, high lift pump and genset, 200 meters, computer, printer, office furniture. Phase II: New intake, raw water pipeline, rehab. of existing intake, 2 toilets, septic tank, office furniture</p>	<p>3,591</p>	<p>Fully operational. Weak governance – needs enhancement and improved O&M systems</p>	<p>Fully operational. Pre-existing scheme improved/expanded with J6P support, and WUA established. Serving most (but not all) of the intended customers. Connected to grid, has genset from J6P but never used. Source (spring and stream) is plentiful all year. Under community management pre-J6P, now a more formal WUA.</p>

	and power, small works.			
MIGORI COUNTY				
7. Nyasare (WSP)	Phase I and II projects: Borehole, protection of 3 springs, 2km pipeline, billing software and meters, rehabilitation of infiltration gallery (springs), submersible pump, 100m ³ masonry tank, 12km pipeline, tools and equipment.	4,325	Fully operational. No sustainability concerns	Fully operational in rainy season only. Established, regulated utility, independent of MIWASCO and serving 42,000 people. Water is chlorinated but high sediment load which causes many meters to silt up and fail. Some infrastructure is worn out, needs replacement. Main sources are 4 springs, not sustainable or adequate and in dry season households typically get water for just one day per week. When meters fail, customers argue that they owe nothing as meter shows zero, so revenue suffers. Utility has not switched to flat rates for non-functioning meters.
8. Rongo (MIWASCO)	9km pipeline, 2 chemical dosers, CFU, 3 kiosks, 225m ³ masonry tank, 200 meters	8,178	Partially operational.	Not operational though work began recently to restore the supply. Again, the distribution line was damaged by road construction works and the scheme has been out of order for an extended period. Now hoping to get support for new works from the Western Kenya Project.
9. Kegonga (MIWASCO)	50m ³ and 100m ³ masonry tanks, high lift pump set 20m ³ /hr and 225m head and pump set 20m ³ /hr and 10m head low lift, electric motor to existing pump, laboratory and equipment, 3 kiosks, 200 meters, 11 km pipeline, power connection	120	Not operational.	Not operational. Scheme developed in 2011 by national government. J6P support started in 2017. Shortly after completion the main distribution lines were destroyed by road construction works and have not been replaced – this has been the situation for roughly 5 years.
NAROK COUNTY				

10. Entasekera (WUA)	Weir, 2 kiosks, 4 cattle troughs, 2 x 50m ³ tanks, 10km gravity main, meters.	2,356	Fully operational Weak governance	Fully operational. Spring catchment in forest, serving community via gravity flow to two kiosks. One tank visibly leaking. No charge for kiosk water, only for the small number of private connections in commercial centre. So very little revenue generated (roughly KES 19,000 per month). Scheme does not require power but needs funds for O&M.
11. Sogoo (WUA)	2 boreholes, 2 submersible pumps, surface pump, 225m ³ and 100m ³ storage tanks, 8km rising main, pump and powerhouse, distribution lines, Transformer.	1,525	Partially operational Weak governance Needs power connection to boost water to a section of the supply area.	Partially operational. Developed by NARWASCO then hand over to WUA. Fed by 2 boreholes, one at a school. Network in place but the booster station needed to pump water up to main population has not been connected to power – this was the CG’s responsibility. Only households located before the booster station receive water as they benefit from pumping at source. There is also a dispute over ownership/maintenance responsibility for the school borehole. If the booster gets connected to the grid, power bills will be a challenge.
12. Pinyiny (WUA)	Equip borehole, pump house, 3 kiosks, 1km rising main, 6km transmission line, 100m ³ masonry tank, 3.7 km distribution line, elevated steel tank 108m ³ .	0	Under implementation. Project borehole was affected by drought leading to inadequate supply – need another.	Not operational. Original borehole (drilled pre-J6P) proved to be dry and so were two subsequent ones, despite positive geophysical tests.
LAIKIPIA COUNTY				
13. Doldol Luisukut (WUA)	Borehole, storage tanks (50m ³ and 75m ³), rising main, pipeline.	3,962	Operational. High NRW, environmental issues (sand harvesting)	Partially operational. J6P increased connections from 30 to 150 but due partly to storms this was back to 30 by project end; infrastructure also affected by vandalism (people and elephants). One of the storage tanks leaked from the start and meters were affected by silting up. Water quality poor: very alkaline and not rested regularly.
14. Solio (WUA)	Rehabilitation of Intake, 31km gravity main, 96km distribution lines,	16,955	Operational.	Fully operational though demand exceeds supply capacity and water is rationed. More storage is needed. Implementation and post-construction support was provided by NAWASCO.

	2 masonry tanks (225m ³) meters, office block.			
15. Sirimon (WUA)	<p>Phase I: improvements to intake and gravity main, main tank cover, storage tank 100m³, 4.7km pipeline, Kibiro pipeline (3.7 km), Kalalu pipeline (3.8 km), yard tap, office and sanitation unit.</p> <p>Phase II: Composite filtration unit and fixtures, backwash system, chemical store, 500 meters.</p>	0	Not operational. Intake washed away. Failed governance	Partially operational. Pre-existing scheme serving 1,200 households before J6P. The intake rehabilitated by J6P was washed away by floods in 2018, shortly after completion and only a temporary, handmade intake made from sacks is now in place. This enables the scheme to serve only some of the intended service users, and there is no billing. The (high cost) CFU built by J6P has never been used in the 4 years since completion due to the lack of intake.
THARAKA-NITHI COUNTY				
16. Kathwana (NIWASCO)	2 storage tanks (225m ³), intake, 8km pipeline.	5,430	Fully operational No sustainability concerns	Fully operational though demand exceeds supply due to population growth. Some vandalism by residents without connections. Huge water treatment plant is under-utilised as it receives much lower flows than the design capacity. Improvement of the water supply was a key factor in Kathwana town being gazetted as country headquarters.
17. Murugi-Mugumango (WUA)	1,865 meters	20,000	Doing well, sustainable and potential reference for other community water utilities	Fully operational and the utility is in the process of registration with WASREB. Doing well though not yet serving all of the service area population – need to extend distribution network.

Annex 4. Evaluation Mission Itinerary

Team A: Team Leader plus National Consultant

Team B: Senior Evaluation Specialist plus National WASH Specialist

Week One		
Nov	AM	PM
Mon 20	Evaluation team meeting	Kickoff meeting with WSTF, MFA, SIDA including WSTF presentation on J6P content, achievement and challenges.
Tues 21	Swedish Embassy: Meeting with Lisa, SIDA	WSTF: Further discussions with J6P Manager; field visit planning
Weds 22	<i>Kwale County</i> Fly to Ukunda, transfer to Kwale Meet County Water Dept and KAWASCO	<i>Kwale County</i> Meet County Water Dept and KAWASCO Godoni-Chitsanze water supply scheme (KAWASCO)
Thurs 23	Mrima water supply project (WRUA) and public toilet. Shimoni water supply scheme (WRUA)	Shimoni water supply scheme (WRUA) School sanitation (Shimoni Primary) KII with former CRM (A. Kingi)
Fri 24	Meet CEC Water, County Government Meet Mbuguni WRUA at KAWASCO office	Meet DOPH Sub-county Officer Fly to Nairobi
Sat 25		
Sun 26	Team A drive to Nandi Team B drive to Laikipia	
Week Two: Team A		
Nov - Dec	AM	PM
Mon 27	<i>Nandi County</i> Kobujoi water supply scheme (WUA) Kobujoi CLTS Kundos WRUA	<i>Nandi County</i> Lelmokwo water supply scheme (WUA)
Tues 28	Meet CECM, MD Kapsabet Water Company, Deputy Director Water	Kimng'oror water supply scheme (WUA) Drive to Migori
Weds 29	<i>Migori County</i> Nyasare water supply scheme (WSP) Meet Sub-county PH Officers	<i>Migori County</i> Suna East CLTS project, Nyasare School sanitation: Rangenga Primary Sch xxx WRUA (met in field)
Thurs 30	Kegonga water supply scheme (MIWASCO) Meeting at MIWASCO office	Rongo water supply scheme (WUA) Drive to Narok
Fri 1	<i>Narok County</i> Entasekera water supply scheme (WUA)	<i>Narok County</i> Naroosura WRUA Meeting at County Government HQ
Sat 2	Drive to Nairobi	

Sun 3		
Mon 4	Team meeting: review findings, prepare de-brief Remote KII with Leonard, KEWI	
Tues 5		De-briefing meeting at WSTF
Weds 6	Wrap-up meeting with Matts Remote KII with Jukka	Mission ends

Week 2: Team B		
Nov - Dec	AM	PM
Mon 27	<i>Laikipia County</i> Meeting with County Government team Doldol water supply scheme (WUA)	<i>Laikipia County</i> Doldol WRUA
Tues 28	Solio water supply scheme (NAWASCO) Sirimon water supply scheme (WUA)	Sirimon WRUA Drive to Kathwana, Tharaka-Nithi
Weds 29	<i>Tharaka-Nithi County</i> Meeting with County Government team	<i>Tharaka-Nithi County</i> Kathwana water supply scheme (WASCO) Murugi-Mugumango water supply scheme (WUA)
Thurs 30	Chogoria Public Sanitation Facility Kibunga Kakamiki sub-WRUA	Drive to Nairobi
Fri 1	KIIs in Nairobi: WRA (Ms Joyce Orina)	WSTF: Mr Elly Ochere, Ag. Manager, Planning, Research, Monitoring and Evaluation; Ms Rose Nyikuri, Engineer
Sat 2		
Sun 3		
Week Three		
Mon 4	Team meeting (all day): analyse findings, prepare de-briefing presentation. Remote KII with Leonard Makokha (Lecturer), KEWI	Team meeting continued
Tues 5	Analysis of findings continued	De-Briefing meeting at WSTF
Weds 6	Wrap-up meeting at Embassy of Finland Remote KII with Jukka Ilomäki (former CTA)	Mission ends

Annex 5. Programme Results Framework (final version)

ANNEX 1 RESULTS BASED MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK FOR THE J6P		WATER SERVICES TRUST FUND RESULTS FRAMEWORK	
PROJECT NAME		Support to equitable access to quality water, basic sanitation and enhanced water resources management for the underserved communities in rural Kenya	
PROJECT OBJECTIVE		Six Counties have improved water resources management and service provision of water supply and sanitation	
PROJECT PURPOSE		Through the financing instruments available in the Water Services Trust Fund the Counties are supported to improve their capacity of improved water resources management and service provision of water supply and sanitation.	
Key Result Area	REF	RESULTS AREAS	
COMPONENT ONE: COUNTY CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT			
COUNTY CAPACITY ENHANCED County capacitated in fulfilling their constitutional responsibilities in establishment of an enabling environment for the provision and monitoring of WRM,WS/SAN Services	11	PLANNING / MONITORING County capacitated in utilizing factual, evidence based decision support systems in planning and monitoring of investments.	
	12	INST/LEGAL FRAMEWORK A clear county legal and institutional framework for the development of effective sustainable pro-poor water services provision, sanitation and water resources management supported.	
	13	GENDER EQUITY AND SOCIAL INCLUSION County has capacity to develop and institutionalise gender equity and social inclusion in the project cycle	
COMPONENT TWO: IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF WATER RESOURCES			
WRM CAPACITY WRM initiatives protecting water resources and ensuring equity in water access thereby reducing water related conflicts and environmental degradation	21	WRM ORGANISATIONAL FRAMEWORK County has operational institutional structures for effectively addressing WRM issues	
	22	WRM COMPLIANCE WRUA capacity to support measurement, regulation and abstraction compliance in addressing water issues at intra/inter county level enhanced.	
	23	CATCHMENT CONSERVATION WRUA capacity to implement catchment conservation and protection through their sub catchment management plans enhanced	
	24	WRUA SUSTAINABILITY WRUA operational sustainability enhanced	

	25	WRM GESI Equitable benefits derived from WR interventions
COMPONENT THREE: SUSTAINABLE ACCESS TO WATER SERVICES		
IMPROVED WATER SERVICE ACCESS Water supply projects ensure improved equitable access to water services.	31	WS COVERAGE Increased water access and utilisation of services (coverage) for the un-served. <i>(un-served = service level 3 and 4)</i>
	32	WU SERVICE QUALITY / OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY Operational efficiency of water utilities in the sustainable provision of water services improved
	33	EQUITABLE ACCESS TO WATER SERVICES All members of society (within WU mandated water service areas) derive equal benefit from improved water services
COMPONENT FOUR: SUSTAINABLE ACCESS TO SANITATION SERVICES		
IMPROVED SANITATION SERVICE ACCESS Sanitation investments ensure improved equitable access to sanitation.	41	IMPROVED INSTITUTIONAL SANITATION ACCESS Improved access to sanitation facilities in public places (markets, schools, health centres- within mandated supply areas of water utilities)
	42	HOUSEHOLD SANITATION COVERAGE Household sanitation coverage increased (within WU mandated supply areas)
	43	EQUITABLE ACCESS TO SANITATION All members of society (within WU mandated water service areas) equitably have access to and derive benefit from improved sanitation services
COMPONENT FIVE: CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT OF WSTF TO FULFIL IT'S MANDATE		
WSTF CAPACITY WSTF able to undertake its mandate through strengthened institutional capacity	51	PROJECT MANAGEMENT TOOLS Project Cycle Tools developed for standard planning, financing, implementation and monitoring of Improved Water Services, sanitation and WRM Investments
	52	HARMONISATION AND ALIGNMENT Operational systems within the WSTF contribute to investment alignment and harmonisation for more efficient, effective and transparent operation and coordination of investments
	53	WSTF CAPACITY TO MONITOR AND MANAGE FIDUCIARY RISK WSTF's capacity to mitigate and manage fiduciary risk enhanced
	54	WSTF RESEARCH INNOVATION The WSTF supports innovative research initiatives in addressing key water sector challenges
	55	WSTF HUMAN RESOURCE CAPACITY The capacity of WSTF to contribute to the WSTF's fulfilment of its objectives enhanced
	56	WSTF BUSINESS PROCESS PERFORMANCE WSTF demonstrates improved business performance to realise its mandate of improving access to adequate water and sanitation services to the underserved in Kenya

	57	KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT Lessons learnt, research Information, Education and Communication on Rural WS/Sanitation and WRM Modalities developed.
	58	GESI within WSTF Gender mainstreamed within WSTF's internal operations

Key Result Area	Result code reference	RESULTS	Account code reference	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS (Quantifiable)	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS / ASSUMPTIONS	UNIT OF MEASURE	BASELINE YR 1 FY 15/16	INITIAL PROG TARGET	REVISED TARGET	ACHIEVED/RESULTS	
COMPONENT ONE: COUNTY CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT												
COUNTY CAPACITY ENHANCED County capacitated in fulfilling their constitutional responsibilities in establishment of an enabling environment for the provision and monitoring of WRM,WS/SAN Services	11	PLANNING / MONITORING County capacitated in utilizing factual, evidence based decision support systems in planning of investments.	111	# Counties with accurate WS coverage DSS/ databases and information systems	Database reviews Annual county water service coverage reports (similar to WASREB impact - for county	County Political Buy-in to public display of information.	#	0	6	0	0	
				112	# No. of Annual impact reports developed from the information from the Decision support system (DSS)		County documents/reports Case studies/analysis reports on data	#	0	18	6	0
				113	# No. of Counties in which comprehensive mapping exercise is conducted		Mapping reports Information system verification	#	1	6	6	5
				114	# County exchange visits		County Exchange visit reports	#	0	12	12	12
				115	# Counties with water development strategies demonstrating coherent staged approach to WRM,WS/SAN development)		County water strategies/Plans	#	0	6	6	6

12	INST/LEGAL FRAMEWORK A clear county framework for the development of effective sustainable pro-poor water services, supported.	121	# No. County Prototype Bill developed	Approved Prototype Bill by CoG	MWI/WASREB support and County Political Buy-in to joint support of WARIS type performance reporting system. County support to SSP/WUs to acquire legal status	#	1	1	1	1
		122	# Counties having prototype county water law	County water bills SPAs with SSPs		#	0	6	6	3
		123	# Counties utilising county prototype water bill for the management of the water sector)	County/WSTF project financing agreements County financing of similarly identified projects (WRM, WS/SAN)		#	0	6	0	2
		124	% County budgets and co-financing of joint WSTF/ county investments	Programme analysis on County contributions to the investment programmes		%	0	30	10	15
		125	# Counties implementing a County Water Sector regulatory regime	Operational guidelines for sector regulations Utilities under the regulatory regime and reporting to the County		#	0	6	6	0
		126	# Counties having revised sector management and operations structure	County cases studies		#	0	6	6	0
		127	# SSP (small service providers) recognised under service provision agreements	SPAs - signed agreements		#	0	18	18	0
13	GENDER EQUITY AND SOCIAL INCLUSION County has capacity to record and address the	131	# Counties with GESI guidelines	County WRM, WS/SAN M&E reports Case studies	Assumes coherent delineation of reporting on WU performance between WASREB and Counties	#	0	6	6	0
		132	Proportion of projects/ project designs mainstreaming GESI concerns	Project design reviews, Projects monitoring and assessments		%	0	100	100	100

		needs of the underserved, ensuring GESI	133	# Counties with M&E providing disaggregated data (in access to WRM, WS/SAN)	County WRM, WS/SAN M&E reports		#	0	6	0	0
			134	# Counties with GESI action plans	County WRM, WS/SAN M&E reports		#	0	6	0	0

Key Result Area	Result code reference	RESULTS	Account code reference	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS (Quantifiable)	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS / ASSUMPTIONS	UNIT OF MEASURE	BASELINE YR 1 FY 15/16	INITIAL PROG TARGET	REVISED TARGET	ACHIEVED/RESULTS
COMPONENT TWO: IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF WATER RESOURCES											
WRM CAPACITY WRM initiatives protecting water resources and ensuring access and equity in water access thereby reducing water related conflicts and environmental degradation	21	WRM ORGANISATIONAL FRAMEWORK County institutional structures for addressing WRM issues/conflicts operate effectively	211	County has operational institutional structures for effectively addressing WRM issues/conflict # County (inter/intra) and WRUA associations registered # of agreements/MOUs agreed and implemented	County Register WRUA reports WRMA reports	Assumes WRUAs recognised and supported by Counties. Counties and WRMA have clear understanding of delineated roles in respect to WRUA activities	#	0	6	6	0
							#	0	6	6	0
							#L-I	6	18	3	3
							#L-II	6	30	11	12
							#L-III	0	18	9	6
#L-IV	0	6	1	2							
			212	Basin wide action plans to address water resource management, climate change issues developed, implemented and uated	WRUA reports WRMA reports						

			# of WRUAs with Sub catchment management plans # Level I, II, III and IV (completed)							
			213 # Intercounty/inter-WRUA Transboundary MOUs signed	Signed intercounty / inter-WRUA agreements		#	0	6	6	0
			214 # \$/% co-financing of joint WSTF/ county catchment conservation efforts	Co-financing/financing agreements		%	30	30	0	0
			215 # Contributions made to the augmentation, revision and knowledge of the WDC framework	Revised WDC Modules Printed versions and their circulation		#	-	1	1	1 ⁶
22	WRM COMPLIANCE WRUA capacity to support measurement, regulation and abstraction compliance in addressing water conflicts at intra/inter county level enhanced.	221	(SCAMP IMP) # of WRUAs/area with: # Water abstraction data / surveys undertaken # WAPs developed/endorsed by county	WRUA reports WRMA reports	Assumes continued coordinated support of WRMA and County in support of , WRUAs	#	0	18	5	3
		222	(SCAMP IMP) # WRUAs/Sub catchment areas with water flow data/abstraction compliance mgt data % of legal abstractors operating in compliance to permit conditions	WRUA assessment reports WRMA reports		%	20	40	40	TBC ⁷
						#	0	18	18	0

⁶ WDC Booklets were revised to include the additional 3 chapters of alternative Livelihoods, climate change adaptation and Flood and drought mitigation.

⁷ TBC - To be confirmed during end of programme evaluation

			# Water level stations regularly monitored and reported by WRUA							
			223 (SCAMP IMP) #/% of polluters operating in compliance to their Effluent Discharge Control Plans	# of polluters with EDCPs # compliant to their EDCPs		%	0 0	50 70	50 70	TBC
			224 (SCAMP IMP) # of water control structures, common intakes, self – regulating weirs, bulk meters – constructed/installed	# Of structures		#	0	36	12	16
			225 Increased % of funding to WDC directed toward measurement for management of WR, (ie control structures bulk meters vis-a-vie catchment conservation)	% WDC Contract analysis (case studies)		%	Low	40	40	46 ⁸
23	WRUA CAPACITY WRUA capacity to implement catchment conservation and protection through	231	# SCMPs contracts signed	WRUA/County-WSTF agreements funding cycles	Assumes continued support of WRMA and/or sourcing of qualified SAs,	#	0	18	18	23
		232	# WRUAs contracts completed / % FAS/funds cleared	Financial Reports		#	100	100	100	100

⁸ Sirimon WRUA Contracts (2 levels of funding)

	their sub catchment management plans enhanced	233	# Springs protected # Erosion gullies protected Km of river pegged Meters of gabion works # of nurseries established # of trees planted % survival rate	WRUA contracts WRUA reports Monitoring reports	Agency agreements	# # Km Mtrs # # %	12 12 20 200 12 12,000 70	84 84 200 60 108,000 70	64 2 172 950 15 99,000 TBC	57 ⁹ 5 42 610 12 105,340 66
24	WRUA SUSTAINABILITY WRUA operational sustainability enhanced	241	# WRMA agency/contracts or agreements with WRUA providing a sustained income base	WRMA agency/contracts	Assumes willingness of WRMA to enter into Agency agreements with WRUAs	#	0	24	24	5
		242	# WRUA membership	WRUA reports		#	-	7,200	7200	4,155
		243	% WRUA activities budgets financed by Counties	County budgets		%	30	30	0	100
		244	WRUA incomes increased	County M&E system ¹ - Case studies WRUA incomes and income options/operations		Ksh	-	-inc	TBC	TBC
25	WRM GESI Equitable benefits derived through WR interventions	251	Equitable benefits derived by all including vulnerable groups % women represented in WRUA committees	GESI disaggregated data at baseline and impact reporting Case studies		%	30	30	TBC	30% ¹⁰

⁹ 12 of these were fenced of only without necessarily constructing structures

¹⁰ The composition of committee members for all WRUAs maintained the 2/3 gender rule

Key Result Area	Result code reference	RESULTS	Account code reference	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS (Quantifiable)	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS / ASSUMPTIONS	UNIT OF MEASURE	BASELINE YR 1 FY 15/16	INITIAL PROG TARGET	REVISED TARGET	ACHIEVED/RESULTS
COMPONENT THREE: SUSTAINABLE ACCESS TO WATER SERVICES											
IMPROVED WATER SERVICE ACCESS Water supply projects ensure improved equitable access to water services.	31	WS COVERAGE Increase in water access and utilisation of services (coverage) for the un-served.	311	# of people gaining access to improved drinking water sources (as measured by improved water service level SL, as relates to quality, quantity and access)	Contracts WPM uated data Project completion and verification reports PMIS	Budgets as indicated are made available	#SL1 #SL2 #SL3 #SL4	0	SL#1,2 168,000 pop	199280	133,696
	32	WU SERVICE QUALITY / OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY Operational efficiency of water utilities in the sustainable provision of water services improved <i>(largely reflecting alignment to</i>	321	# Of WUs Projects supported			#	0	40	32	31
			321	Number of people receiving improved quality of service from existing improved water sources Household connections, Hours of supply/week ; % of projects whose quality of water supplied/chlorinated Satisfaction Level / complaints response time etc.	Contracts PMIS Project completion reports / field verification reports	Budgets as indicated are made available	# #/wk % #	0 21 20 -	15,000 35 50 50	11,970 TBC 53 50	7,063 ¹¹ TBC ¹² 51 TBC ¹³
			322	Changes in WU operational performance indicators improved (selected from WASREB performance	County WUs(Impact) reports (QTR/Annual)	County prioritizes utility performance	% -% %	- - -	100 60 90	75 20 90	TBC ¹⁴ TBC TBC

¹¹ Metered connections

¹² To be confirmed during evaluation

¹³ To be confirmed during evaluation of Joint Operations Monitoring Exercise

¹⁴ To be confirmed at evaluation stage

		WASREB indicators)		indicators) o Revenue as % O&M o Reduction in NRW o Billing %							
			323	% Proportion of WUs with (GOOD PRACTICE MATRIX with indicators) Incl: Legal entity, WUs have strategic plan, business plans, agreed tariff, customer care etc.	Contracts Case studies Good practice report matrix		%	0	100	100	100
			323	# WUs making use of appropriate, renewable energy sources	Contracts PMIS		#WU	0	12	12	6
			324	# WUs funded whose operational indicators would have improved towards possible access of credit.	PMIS Case studies in promotion of WU credit worthiness assessment		#	24	72	32	11 ¹⁵
33	EQUITABLE ACCESS TO WATER SERVICES All members of society (within WU mandated water service areas) with equitable access to and derive benefit from improved water services	331	% of the poorest households (those HH in service level 3 and 4 rising to service level 1 or 2) % Women participation in decision making on the utilities # Women and men benefiting from water service employment opportunities The changing cost of water in supported areas	County QTR disaggregated data showing equal access Case studies WU score card/customer satisfaction survey	WU internalises importance of addressing the needs of all the community		% % # % rdn	20 30 120 10	50 30 600 20	TBC 33 600 20	TBC 33 ¹⁶ TBC TBC

¹⁵ Only 11 of the 24 supported WUs have improved their performance

¹⁶ Women represented in all management committees/Boards

Key Result Area	Result code reference	RESULTS	Account code reference	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS (Quantifiable)	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS / ASSUMPTIONS	UNIT OF MEASURE	BASELINE YR 1 FY 15/16	INITIAL PROG TARGET	REVISED TARGET	ACHIEVED/RESULTS
COMPONENT FOUR: SUSTAINABLE ACCESS TO SANITATION SERVICES											
IMPROVED SANITATION SERVICE ACCESS Sanitation investments ensure improved equitable access to sanitation.	41	IMPROVED INSTITUTIONAL SANITATION ACCESS Improved access to sanitation facilities in public places (markets, schools, health centres- within mandated supply areas of water utilities)	411a	# of school/health centre facilities constructed	Project progress reports	Budgets as indicated are made available	#	24	144	62	65
			411b	# of school pupils with access to sanitation facilities	Project Reports		#	-	-	16,040	11,910
			412	% of school children attending schools conforming to GOK latrine/student ratio in project areas	Midterm and end term evaluation reports		%	30	60	100	100% ¹⁷
			413a	# of public sanitation facilities provided	County Reports		#	0	12	2	3
			413b	# of people with access to sanitation with PSFs	Reports		#	-	1600	1300	2,200
			414	% of institutions with sustained hand washing facilities	CPHO statistics		%	30	60	100	TBC ¹⁸
	42	HOUSEHOLD SANITATION COVERAGE Household sanitation coverage	421a	# of triggered villages	Contact/proposal and PMIS CPHO statistics, CHW reports	CPHO is able and willing to conduct CLTS activities in WU mandated service areas		BL	480	400	433
			421b	% of villages triggered claimed	Reports		%		80	75	92.1

¹⁷ 100% in the institutions supported.

¹⁸ To be confirmed during evaluation

		increased (within WU mandated supply areas)	422	# villages attained ODF status	ODF Verification reports/certifications		# Villages	0	376	280	399
			423	# of villages maintaining ODF status (1 year after ODF attained)	ODF follow up monitoring reports		#	0	220	220	TBC ¹⁹
			424	% of HH in mandated areas of WU with sustained hand washing facilities.	WU/CPHO statistics National census		%	BL	50	50	TBC
	43	EQUITABLE ACCESS TO SANITATION All members of society (within WU mandated water service areas) equitably have access to and derive benefit from improved sanitation services	431	% of most vulnerable HHs (SL4) (those in having acquired sanitation facilities)	PMIS / Project M & E field reports	CPHO is able and willing to further develop post CLTS Follow up programme	%	BL	50	TBC	TBC
			432	% of public/school latrines facility with disability access in project sites	PMIS / Project M & E field reports		%	0	50	50	37%
			433	% of institutions with menstrual hygiene facilities	PMIS / Project M & E field reports		%	0	50	50	TBC
			434	# Public toilets result in Women and men/youth etc benefiting from sanitation service employment opportunities (including contractors)	PMIS / Project M & E field reports		#	0	12	2	2

¹⁹ To be confirmed later

Key Result Area	Result code reference	RESULTS	Account code reference	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS (Quantifiable)	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS / ASSUMPTIONS	UNIT OF MEASURE	BASELINE YR 1 FY 15/16	PROG TARGET	REVISED THE TARGET	ACHIEVED/RESULTS	
COMPONENT FIVE: CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT OF WSTF TO FULFIL IT'S MANDATE												
WSTF CAPACITY WSTF able to undertake its mandate through strengthened institutional capacity	51	PROJECT MGT TOOLS Project Cycle Tools developed for standardized planning, financing, implementation and monitoring of Improved Investments	511	No of Counties using the new Project cycle tools	Rural cycle contracts signed, PMIS, VfM Reports	County, CRM and WSTF Staff buy-in to J6P Project Cycle	PC	0	6	6	6	
				512	Project cycle tools operationalised and revised based on their effectiveness/lessons learnt		WSTF reports, PMIS PC Tool revisions	PC	0	6	6	6
				513	Proportion of WSTF investments mapped onto an MIS		PMIS assessment	%	0	100	0	0
				514	Develop GIS capabilities at the Fund (maji data based or similar)		Information system review	No.	0	1	1	0
				515	Review of the PMIS to incorporate the revised tools		PMIS assessment	No.	0	1	1	0
				516	Training and capacity development of the WSTF staff, CRMs and the implementing partners on the revised tools		Training reports	PC	1	4	4	4
	52	HARMONISATION AND ALIGNMENT Operational systems within the WSTF contribute to investment alignment and	521	Operational systems within the WSTF harmonized and aligned for different funding sources. follow up of (ALIGNMENT MATRIX) To include: #joint oversight/steering	WSTF ALIGNMENT MATRIX reporting follow up by WSTF Annual reports (Outsourced review reports and case studies and the	Unified intention to harmonise systems amongst all stakeholders	PC	1 1 1	3 3 1	3 3 1	2 ²⁰ 3 1	

²⁰ PSC and PSG

		harmonisation for more efficient, effective and transparent operation and coordination of investments		committees #joint/single audit systems harmonised #joint/single universal results framework #common WSTF reporting systems (County to WSTF and WSTF to investors) joint operational monitoring joint programme evaluations and assessments joint/single online WRM/WS/SAN information system (maji data) joint/single PMIS system (common systems for follow up and reporting of projects urban/rural) joint/single approaches to VAT	follow up of recommendations)			1 0 1 1	3 1 1 1 1	3 3 1 1 0 0 1	3 3 1 0 0 1
53	WSTF CAPACITY TO MONITOR AND MANAGE FIDUCIARY RISK WSTF's capacity to manage fiduciary risk enhanced	531	Location specific unit costs follow up systems - established and maintained	Unit costs guidelines	Willingness of stakeholders to support transparent public information systems	#	0	6	1	1	
		532	% WSTF CRM participation in procurement process at county level	Procurement reports		%	0	100	100	100	
		533	% County Tender assessments/contractor selection results made public on web	Web page review		%	0	100	100	100	
		534	% Audit annual QCs - performance improved (reduced vol/amount of QCs)	Audit and audit follow up reports		-%	-	less than 3%	<3	1	
		535	County Based Risk survey assessments on investment programmes	Risk Assessment Reports		#	0	12	6	6	
		536	% Project Monitoring and assurance visits to total projects	Project Monitoring reports		%	0	60	60	100	

			No.								
			537	% Monthly Project financial and physical project progress reports	Monthly project progress reports		%	0	100	100	100
			538	% Enterprise risk management framework survey recommendations implemented	WSTF enterprise risk action plan and reports		%	0	100	100	TBC
			539a	Conduct Annual harmonised Audits	Annual Harmonised Audit reports		#	1	3	3	4
			539b	Conduct annual operations monitoring of investments	County operations monitoring reports		#	1	3	3	3
			539c	% Independent Spot Check monitoring visits of total No. of projects	Monitoring reports		%	0	40	40	> 40
54	WSTF RESEARCH INNOVATION The WSTF support innovative in research to address key water sector challenges	541	Research funding cycle defined and call for research proposals	Online web calls Documented Project Cycle	Water Bill 2014 indicates role of WSTF in terms of its research promotion role	#	0	1	1	1	
		542	# of innovative research initiatives	WSTF reports		#	0	12	0	0	
		543	Evidence of research results applied in investment programmes	Case studies		#	0	6	0	0	
55	WSTF HUMAN RESOURCE CAPACITY The capacity of WSTF to contribute to the WSTF's fulfilment of its objectives enhanced	551	% technical staff as % of total staff	WSTF M&E systems	Balance / Over-reliance on WSTF staff vis-a-vie outsourced resources	%	36	55	55	50	
		552	Annual % Staff attrition	WSTF HRD Records		%	-	5	5	< 5	
		553	# Staff Training on Sanitation, Project Management, M&E, GIS, PMIS WRM and Water Management, governance and procurement	Staff Training records		#	5	40	25	20	
		554	Staff gender balance	WSTF HRD Records		#	42	50	50	39.1	
56	WSTF BUSINESS PROCESS PERFORMANCE WSTF demonstrates	561	Development index (Development versus recurrent expenditure)	Accounts	Links between investments and accounts for aligned	%	53	85	85	81	
		562	Project processing efficiency	PMIS		days	-	90	90	120	

		improved business performance over time	563	Red flag alert system operational - % of projects red flagged (system for red flagging projects /counties)	Red flag reports	reporting	S	0	1	1	1
			564	% Funds mobilised from (GOK) per year	Accounts		%	15	30	30	19
			565	#/% Funds mobilised from (DPs) per year	Accounts		KS B	1.5	3.0	3.0	> 3
			566	#/% Funds mobilised from (corporate/private sector) per year	Accounts		KsM	2	32	32	<32
			567	Develop HRMIS	Implementation Reports		#	1	1	1	1
			568	# total funds mobilised (commercial banks) per year	WSTF investments		#		50	50	0
	57	KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT Lessons learnt, research Information, Education and Communication on Rural WS/Sanitation and WRM Modalities developed.	571	# Articles/academic products published	Papers		#	0	12	12	2 ²¹
			572	# Research initiatives promoted/funded	Call for proposals, Grantee reports		#	0	12	0	0
			573	# Impact and VfM studies undertaken	VfM reports/Case studies		#	0	2	1	0 ²²
			574	# Support to Water Forums national/ international events	Congress Reports		#	0	2	2	2
			575	# Documentation of the investment cycles/ End of Programme evaluation	Documentation reports		#	0	1	1	0 ²³
			576	WSTF annual impact report published	Web		#	3	Annual	2	2
	58	GESI within WSTF Disability mainstreaming in the internal activities of the WSTF	581	People living with Disability engaged in the Fund	Reports to National Commission on PWDs	Annual Report	%	5	5	5	3

²¹ Articles by Aalto Students published

²² This is yet to be conducted

²³ End of programme evaluation to be carried

Annex 6. List of documents consulted

Government of Kenya

The Constitution of Kenya, 2010

Government of Kenya. (2010). National Climate Change Response Strategy.

Government of Kenya. (2013). National Climate Change Action Plan.

WSTF Documents

Support to Equitable Access to Quality Water, Basic Sanitation and Enhanced Water Resources Management for Underserved Communities in Rural Kenya, Joint 6 Programme (J6P). (2016).

Joint Six Programme Completion Report, February 2023.

Annual Rural Harmonized Report 2015-2016.

Annual Rural Harmonized Report 2016-2017.

Annual Rural Harmonized Report 2017-2018.

Annual Rural Harmonized Report 2018-2019.

Annual Rural Harmonized Report 2019-2020.

Annual Rural Harmonized Report 2020-2021.

Annual Rural Harmonized Report 2021-2022.

Joint Annual Operations Monitoring Report 2017.

Joint Annual Operations Monitoring Report 2018.

Joint Annual Operations Monitoring Report 2019.

County Engagement Strategy 2019.

Baseline Survey for Migori County, Final Report, (Volume I- Main Report), LOG Associates Ltd, February 2016.

Baseline Survey for WSTF Rural and Water Resources Investment - Laikipia County Final Report, Tech Training and Research Limited, March 2016.

Human Rights-Based Approach and Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan, Mainstreaming HRBA and GESI in Water and Sanitation. (The undated draft was shared with the PMR mission in 2017).

Baseline Survey Report for Sogoo Water Project in Narok County 2019.

Solio Water Project Baseline Survey Report 2019.

Baseline Survey Report Entasekera Water Project 2019.

Gender Equality & Social Inclusion Strategy, 2021.

Joint Six Programme Completion Report, February 2023.

Documents produced by the J6P TA team

Bi-Annual Report on Technical Assistance 1/2019 (Jan-June 2019).

Bi-Annual Report on Technical Assistance 2/2019 (July-Dec 2019).

Bi-Annual Report on Technical Assistance 1/2020 (Jan-June 2020).

Bi-Annual Report on Technical Assistance 2/2020 (July-Dec 2020).

Home Office Coordinator Mission 1, Brief Report, 2015.

Home Office Coordinator Mission 2, Brief Report, 2016.

Home Office Coordinator Mission 3, Brief Report, 2017.

Home Office Coordinator Mission 4, Brief Report, 2017.

Home Office Coordinator Mission 6, Brief Report, 2018.

Home Office Coordinator Mission 8, Brief Report, 2019.

Home Office Coordinator Mission 9, Brief Report, 2019.

Final Report on Technical Assistance, 2021.

Other J6P Related Documents

Colin, J., Muniale, F., & Mutuku, C. (2017). Joint Six Programme (J6P), Kenya, Programme Management Review 2017.

Doldol Water and Sanitation Association Summary Progress Report for the Period 2018-2023, 27.11.2023.

Solio Settlement Scheme Water Users Association, Handing Over Report, 20th January 2023.

Tharaka Nithi County / NIWASCO. Presentation on J6P projects for Water Sector Trust Fund-Impact Evaluation 29/11/2023.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA) Documents

Christoplos, I., Alffram, H., Holmberg, A., Tran-Nguyen, E., Tuomaala, R., Kamau, C., Phiri, D., Phiri, Wilhelm, G., & Paabøl Thomsen, C. (2023). Evaluation of Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) in Finland's Development Policy and Cooperation, Volume 1 Main Report, MFA Evaluation Report 2023:5.

Correspondence between the Embassy of Finland and the National Treasury during March-September 2017 constituting the First Amendment of the Bilateral Project Agreement.

Correspondence between the Embassy of Finland and the National Treasury and Planning during January-February 2019 constituting the Second Amendment of the Bilateral Project Agreement.

Correspondence between the Embassy of Finland and the National Treasury and Planning during October 2019-February 2020, constituting the Third Amendment of the Bilateral Project Agreement.

Correspondence between the Embassy of Finland and the National Treasury and Planning during March - September 2020 constituting the Fourth Amendment of the Bilateral Project Agreement.

MFA (2012). Finland's Development Policy Programme (Government of Finland Decision-in-Principle 16 February 2012).

MFA (2012). Manual for Bilateral Programs.

MFA (2013). Country Strategy for Development Cooperation with Kenya 2013-2016.

MFA (2015). Human Rights Based Approach in Finland's Development Cooperation, Guidance Note 2015.

MFA (2015). Results Based Management (RBM) in Finland's Development Policy, Guidelines.

MFA (2016). Finland's Development Policy, One world, common future – towards sustainable development (Government Report to Parliament, 4 February 2016).

MFA (2016). Manual for Bilateral Programmes, 15.09.2016.

MFA (2017). Country Strategy for Development Cooperation Kenya 2016-2019.

MFA (2018). Manual for Bilateral Programmes, 15.09.2018.

MFA Guideline for the Cross-Cutting Objectives in the Finnish Development Policy and Cooperation Cross.

MFA (2021). Country Programme for Development Cooperation Kenya 2021–2024.