

# **End Term Evaluation of Green Growth and Employment Programme**

**ANNEXURES  
AUGUST, 2022**

## Table of Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 1.0 Annex 1: GGEP Evaluation Design Matrix.....          | 2  |
| 2.0 Annex 2: Terms of Reference.....                     | 10 |
| 3.0 Annex 3: Sampling Procedure .....                    | 21 |
| 3.1 Sampling for projects .....                          | 21 |
| 3.2 Sampling for Household Survey.....                   | 23 |
| 4.0 Annex 4: Sustainability Index .....                  | 25 |
| 4.1 Methodology .....                                    | 25 |
| 4.2 Criteria for scoring .....                           | 25 |
| 4.3 Decision Criteria.....                               | 25 |
| 5.0 Annex 5: Creditworthiness Index .....                | 28 |
| 5.1 Methodology .....                                    | 28 |
| 5.2 Scoring .....  | 28 |
| 5.3 Decision Criteria.....                               | 28 |
| 6.0 Annex 6: List of Documents Reviewed .....            | 34 |
| 7.0 Annex 7: List of Key Evaluation Participants.....    | 35 |
| 8.0 Annex 8 Data Collection Tools .....                  | 38 |
| 8.1 Household Survey, Water and Sanitation Projects..... | 38 |
| 8.2 Household Survey, WRM Projects .....                 | 43 |
| 8.3 Key Informant Interview Guides .....                 | 46 |
| 8.3 Focus Group Discussion Guides .....                  | 53 |
| 9.0 Annex 9: Evaluation Team .....                       | 57 |

## 1.0 Annex 1: GGEP Evaluation Design Matrix

|             |                                  |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| Consultancy | GGEP End of Programme Evaluation |
| Client      | WaterFund/ DANIDA                |
| Consultant  | Advance Development Initiative   |

| Evaluation Criteria | Key Evaluation Question  | Sub-questions  | Indicators   | Tools & data sources   |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Relevance           | How are the objectives of the intervention consistent with the beneficiary needs and Key Stakeholders policies and priorities? | 1.1 Are the interventions objectives and strategies relevant to Water, Sanitation and WRM needs/priorities of intended beneficiaries?<br><i>Analysis of the causal link Appropriateness concept and design to the needs of the targeted beneficiaries.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant primary stakeholders.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of programme documents                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline survey report</li> <li>County reports</li> <li>Project progress reports</li> <li>GGEP proposal</li> </ul> </li> <li>Interview with primary stakeholders</li> <li>Household surveys</li> </ul> |
|                     |  | 1.2 To what extent are the intervention objectives relevant to WATERFUND, DANIDA, County and National Government policies and strategic objectives?  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and DANIDA/WATERFUND/County/priorities</li> <li>Coherence with existing County and National legal framework</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document reviews</li> <li>Interview with WATERFUND/DANIDA/County/National Government Staff</li> </ul>   |
|                     |  | 1.3 Is the project internally coherent in its design?  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of interlinkage within objective hierarchy (Programme logic)</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review (ToC, Results framework)</li> <li>Interviews with Key WATERFUND/DANIDA staff</li> </ul>   |
| Coherence           | How compatible is the programme  | 2.1 What are the synergies and interlinkages between the intervention and other  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Harmonization between GGEP and other county-based interventions and previous programmes by DANIDA/WATERFUND</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review (ToC, Results framework)</li> <li>Interviews with Key WATERFUND/DANIDA staff</li> </ul>   |

| Evaluation Criteria | Key Evaluation Question   | Sub-questions   | Indicators   | Tools & data sources  |
|---------------------|---|---|--|---|
|                     | with other interventions within the counties?                               | <p>interventions carried out by DANIDA/WATERFUND/IP</p> <p>2.2 How consistent is the intervention with other actors' interventions in the same context (ASALs')</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of interlinkage within objective hierarchy (Programme logic)</li> </ul>  |   |
| Effectiveness       | To what extent have the expected outputs of the intervention been achieved? | <p>Output 1. ASAL counties capacity and engagement in integrated water, sanitation and water resources related planning improved.</p> <p>3.1 Are counties effectively using water and sanitation data for planning and performing their regulatory functions?</p> <p>3.2 Do counties have an effective water sector legislative and policy formulation framework to support planning and implementation?</p> <p>3.3 To what extent are the counties involved in planning and implementation of integrated water and natural resources management?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of updated database on water and sanitation</li> <li>sources of water and sanitation data in the counties</li> <li>Counties using the database for planning and regulatory functions</li> <li>Evidence of effective county water sector policies and legislations</li> <li>County effectively utilizing existing water sector policy and legislation to support planning and decision making</li> <li>County capacity to engage in water and natural resources management</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interview with county staff</li> <li>Review county policies and planning documents</li> <li>Review of programme documents e.g., Midterm and end of programme report</li> </ul> |

| Evaluation Criteria | Key Evaluation Question | Sub-questions  | Indicators  | Tools & data sources  |
|---------------------|-------------------------|--|---|---|
|                     |                         | <p>Output 2. Water and sanitation access and deficit in the ASALs addressed</p> <p>3.4 Has the number of households with access to water services increased?</p> <p>3.5 Has the number of households with access to sanitation services increased?</p> <p>3.6 Has the intervention improved water and sanitation services?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % Increase in number of households accessing water services</li> <li>• % Increase in number of households accessing sanitation services</li> <li>• % Of households reporting satisfaction with the water and/or sanitation services</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Household survey</li> <li>• Interview with implementing partners</li> <li>• FGD with primary stakeholders</li> <li>• Observation</li> </ul>                                  |
|                     |                         | <p>Output 3: Sustainable and community-based management of water resources improved</p> <p>3.7 Has the intervention improved Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM)?</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in geographic area with improved planning for water resources</li> <li>• Progress in implementation of sub-catchment or other management plans</li> <li>• Number of WRUA's that moved from one level to another (higher) level</li> <li>• New catchment protection activities implemented by CBNRM</li> <li>• % Increase in total water storage capacity</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview with CBNRM organizations and IP</li> <li>• Documentation Review</li> <li>• Observation</li> </ul>  |
|                     |                         | <p>Output 4: Capacity of Implementing Partners (IP) (WRUA, CBO, and WU/WSP) improved</p> <p>3.8 Has the capacity of implementing agents improved?</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effectiveness of capacity building to implementing partners</li> <li>• Number of successfully implemented projects</li> <li>• % Number of service agents reporting improved service provision</li> <li>• Credit worthiness index of the projects funded</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kirkpatrick model</li> <li>• Interview with CBNRM/WUA/WSP/NGO organizations and other IP</li> <li>• HH Surveys</li> <li>• Documentation Review (Audited Accounts)</li> </ul> |

| Evaluation Criteria | Key Evaluation Question          | Sub-questions   | Indicators  | Tools & data sources  |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
|                     |                                  | <p>Output 5. Experience generated from public private partnerships in water provision in the ASALs.</p> <p>3.9 Has the intervention led to new innovative PPCP funding and management approaches?</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of new PPP funding and management approaches piloted</li> <li>• % Of external finance leveraged by the piloted PPP models</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews Key SH</li> <li>• Documents review</li> </ul>   |
|                     |                                  | <p>Output 6: Strengthened Institutional Performance of WATERFUND</p> <p>3.10 How has the intervention impacted WATERFUND project management practice?</p> <p>3.11 Has the intervention improved WATERFUND efficiency?</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of operational Management Information System (MIS)</li> <li>• Effective use of MIS to map and manage water and sanitation supported investments</li> <li>• Improved capacity of WATERFUND to identify, implement, and monitor</li> <li>• Proportion of questioned costs funded through the DED against total WATERFUND investments</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with WATERFUND</li> <li>• Review of financial documents</li> </ul>  |
| Efficiency          | How efficient was the programme? | <p>4.1 Was project implementation as cost effective as budgeted?</p> <p>4.2 Has the intervention been implemented within the scheduled time?</p> <p>4.3 Could financial resources have been used more efficiently (Value-for-money)?</p> <p>4.4 To what extent did the programme implementation utilize existing expertise</p> <p>4.5 To what extent have regulatory, administrative, time, other resources and</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % Variation of planned vs actual project costs</li> <li>• Timeliness and adequacy of implementation</li> <li>• Value for money</li> <li>• Existing and outsourced skills</li> <li>• Measures put in place to mitigate delays and cost overruns</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of management tools used to optimise efficiency and monitor progress.</li> <li>• Review of documents used to monitor the efficiency and budget monitoring, e.g., updated unit prices and costs.</li> <li>• Interview with project staff and implementing partners</li> <li>• CBA</li> </ul> |

| Evaluation Criteria | Key Evaluation Question  | Sub-questions   | Indicators   | Tools & data sources   |
|---------------------|--|---|--|--|
|                     |  | procedures contributed to or hindered the achievement of output   |  |  |
| Impact              | How effective have the project strategies and approaches in contributing to <i>Enhanced water resources management and investments in selected ASAL counties for improved and sustained access by communities and households to water and sanitation for their domestic and productive needs</i> | <p>What are the overall effects of the intervention, intended and unintended, long term and short term, positive and negative?</p> <p>5.1 How has improving water access and water resources management in the ASAL's contributed to improved resilience and green growth?</p> <p>5.2 To what extent has improved access to water for human and livestock use as well as provision of sanitation improved socio-economic development of ASAL communities?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New climate-proofed/ green technologies implemented.</li> <li>• Improvement in livestock productivity</li> <li>• Improved livelihood</li> <li>• Increased job opportunities from investment and trade esp. for women and youth</li> <li>• Evidence of unintended consequences (positive or negative) attributable to the intervention.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HH Survey</li> <li>• Interview with CBNRM organizations</li> <li>• Documentation Review</li> <li>• Observation</li> </ul> |

| Evaluation Criteria  | Key Evaluation Question  | Sub-questions   | Indicators  | Tools & data sources   |
|----------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Sustainability       | What is the likelihood that results will continue once Programme funding and assistance has ended? | <p>6.1 How sustainable are the intervention results from a social-political and climatic point of view?</p> <p>6.2 How sustainable are the intervention results from an economic and/or financial perspective?</p> <p>6.3 How sustainable are the intervention results from an institutional point of view?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existence of enabling conditions e.g., wide-spread stakeholder buy-in</li> <li>• % Of facilities funded through the engagement that are climate proofed</li> <li>• Environmental and social considerations incorporated into the GGEP's contributions to long-term improvements and sustainability.</li> <li>• Ability to cover O&amp;M costs</li> <li>• Willingness of stakeholders (County Governments' and other partners) participation, responsibility, ownership, and to contribute resources to support projects/ Evidence of planned programmes and allocated budget lines</li> <li>• Government led Institutional arrangement and existing synergies/ partnerships to enable communities to play a meaningful role in the planning and upkeep of the new services.</li> <li>• The extent of local ownership of the programme</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of project financial records</li> <li>• Interviews with WUA, WSP and CBNRM Staff</li> <li>• Interview key partners</li> <li>• Sustainability index,</li> </ul> |
|                      | What is the likelihood that the programme can be up scaled and/or replicated                       | 6.4 Can the programme be up scaled or replicated?   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existence of conditions that support scale-up efforts e.g., lessons / best practices are being captured and shared</li> <li>• Effectiveness of the programme design/ implementation strategies and/or mechanisms to realize successful replication or up scaling</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with WUA, WSP and CBNRM Staff</li> <li>• Interview key partners</li> </ul>   |
| Cross-cutting issues | What are the key crosscutting issues that  | <p>Context</p> <p>7.1 To what extent has the programme adapted to its <b>context?</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent to which the programme context has changed: <b>contextual risk</b> (security and conflict, droughts), <b>programmematic risks</b> (uncoordinated</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with Key SH</li> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>  |



| Evaluation Criteria | Key Evaluation Question      | Sub-questions   | Indicators   | Tools & data sources   |
|---------------------|------------------------------|---|--|--|
|                     | considered in the programme? |   | developments, unclear devolution mandates) and <b>institutional risks</b> (capacity, planning and funding) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mechanisms and/or strategies in place to mitigate or respond to changing implementation context</li> <li>• Evidence demonstrating enabling/hindering factors that contributed most to the achievement/failure of expected outcomes</li> </ul>                          |  |
|                     |                              | GESI<br>7.2 How has the <b>GESI</b> issue been considered throughout the programme?<br><br><i>Equity will be expanded to review a broader social differentiation (gender, ethnicity, socio-economic background, disability, youth, and other vulnerable groups)</i> | The extent to which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GESI is reflected in participation at formulation/design, implementation and distribution of costs and benefits</li> <li>• GESI issues are considered in programme management.</li> <li>• Gender relations and equality are likely to be affected by the intervention</li> <li>• Approach and success of gender mainstreaming in the water sector</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with Key SH</li> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• FGD with primary stakeholders</li> <li>• Observation</li> </ul>      |
|                     |                              | Partnerships<br>7.3 To what extent did partnerships and stakeholder cooperation, affect the achievement of results?   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of quality collaboration between partners</li> <li>• The degree to which partners have been involved in planning and implementation.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with partners</li> </ul>   |
|                     |                              | Environment, Social and Governance (ESG)<br>7.4 What are some of the potential ESG risks and opportunities in GGEP investments?   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental responsibility through compliance with all relevant environmental laws, standards, and regulations</li> <li>• Social responsibility through labour relations, human rights, diversity, and inclusion</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview with Key stakeholders</li> <li>• ESG Scoring</li> <li>• FGD with primary stakeholders</li> <li>• Observation</li> </ul> |

| Evaluation Criteria | Key Evaluation Question | Sub-questions  | Indicators   | Tools & data sources   |
|---------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|
|                     |                         |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Governance: compliance, ethics, controls, and procedures</li> </ul>   |  |
|                     |                         | <p>M&amp;E</p> <p>7.5 To what extent were the results of the intervention influenced by Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Learning (MERL) mechanisms?</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of MERL framework</li> <li>M&amp;E information is used for decision making to improve programme performance</li> </ul>                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interview with Key stakeholders</li> </ul>  |
|                     |                         | <p>Innovation and learning</p> <p>7.6 Does the intervention provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?</p> <p>7.7 Has the intervention identified a new way of working that could be shared with others?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lessons learned from project implementation</li> <li>Novel methods/strategies</li> <li>Strengths and weaknesses in maximizing leveraging in water sector</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interview with WATERFUND/DANIDA/County and Beneficiaries</li> <li>FGD with primary stakeholders</li> <li>Case study (Document success stories)</li> </ul> |

## 2.0 Annex 2: Terms of Reference



### TERMS OF REFERENCE

#### FINAL EVALUATION OF GREEN GROWTH AND EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMMEMME AND WATER AND LIVELIHOODS SUB PROGRAMME CONSULTANCY SERVICES.

##### 1.0. Introduction

##### 1.1. Water Sector Trust Fund

The Water Sector Trust Fund (WaterFund) is a Financing Institution established under the Water Act (2016) with the mandate to assist in financing the development and management of water services in marginalized areas or any area that is considered by the Board of Trustees to be underserved including:

- a) Community level initiatives for the sustainable management of water resources.
- b) Development of water services in rural areas considered not to be commercially viable for provision of water services by licensees.
- c) Development of water services in the under-served poor urban areas; and
- d) Research activities in water resources management and water services, sewerage, and sanitation.

Water Sector Trust Fund has continued to invest in the implementation of Water, Sanitation Services and Water Resource Management activities through the following financing mechanisms:

**Rural Investments-** This is an approach applied towards financial support to Implementing Agents in the underserved rural areas to apply for, manage, implement, and maintain their own water and sanitation facilities. The main stakeholders are the Community Based Organizations, Water Utilities and Rural Water Services Providers in collaboration with the County Governments.

**Urban Investments** is an approach applied towards improvement of access to underserved Low-Income Areas in Urban Areas of Kenya. The key implementing partners in this approach are the Water Service Providers in collaboration with the County Governments.

**Water Resources & Climate Change Investments:** is a mechanism for supporting Water Resource Users Association (WRUAs), promoted by the Water Resources Authority, to manage their water resources within sub catchments.

**Result Based Financing:** This is a mechanism where Water Services Providers and Community Based Organizations obtain project loans from commercial banks against bankable proposals. WaterFund then subsidizes the implementer for the loan at an agreed percentage once deliverables are attained. WaterFund is responsible for ensuring that the fiduciary risks are minimized through effective operationalization of a compliance monitoring system. WaterFund engages in appraisal of proposals and ensuring that the investments are sound and sustainable in water supply, Water Resource Management and Sanitation activities.

**Research and Innovation Financing:** support towards financing of research and innovation initiatives within the sector. The outputs of these initiatives are geared towards generation of new knowledge in the sector, provision of innovative, practical, and cost-effective solutions in the realization of sustainable provision of water, sanitation and sewerage services in addition to water resources management as well as addressing gaps through collaborations and adaption of innovative models for better service delivery.

### 1.2. Green Growth and Employment Programme Brief

Water Sector Trust Fund, under the support of the Governments of Kenya and Denmark has been implementing the Green Growth and Employment Programme (GGEP) to support access to and management of water resources in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands. The operating framework of its implementation is detailed in the bilateral agreement between the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Water Sector Trust Fund in a development engagement that entered into force on 1st July 2016. The programme implementation period is July 2016 to June 2021 with a further No Cost Extension up to December, 2021.

#### **Overall Objective and key outputs of the GGEP Programme**

The GGEP Programme is implemented in the counties of Garissa, Isiolo, Lamu, Marsabit, Mandera, Tana River, Turkana and Wajir and aims to achieve its objectives through the following components:

Output 2: Water and sanitation access and deficit in the ASAL addressed

Output 2: Water and sanitation access and deficit in the ASAL addressed 46

Output 3: Sustainable and community-based management of water resources improved

Output 4: Improved capacity of and engagement by implementing agents (CBOs, Water Services Providers and WRUAs) for planning and efficient water service delivery

Output 5: Enhanced experience for promoting public private partnerships in water provision ASALs

Output 6: Strengthened institutional performance of WaterFund

### 1.3. Water and Livelihoods Sub Programme Brief

WaterFund and the Government of Denmark through DANIDA, signed a financing agreement on 20th December 2017, to support a 'Water and Livelihood Programme (WLP) in Refugee, Host and Other Vulnerable Communities of Kenya.' This is an addendum support of 40 DKK million, in addition to the Green Growth and Employment Programme funding, supporting 8 ASAL Counties in Kenya. The programme targets the Refugee and Host Communities in Turkana West Sub County of Turkana County.

The expected programme outcome is "Enhanced water resources management and investments in Turkana West and selected ASAL Counties, for improved and sustained access by communities and households to water and sanitation for their domestic and productive needs. The programme is being implemented by five selected partner agencies, in five Wards of the target Sub County, addressing both the host community needs and those of the refugee families, in Kakuma and Kalobeyi settlements. The programme core focus areas are in, water access, sanitation, hygiene, and water resources management, with concepts of livelihood through small scale agriculture and social empowerment.

## **Overall Objective and key outputs of the WLP Programme**

The overall objective of the programme is to enhance water resources management and investments in Turkana West Sub County for improved and sustained access by communities and households to water and sanitation for their domestic and productive needs

The programme will achieve the following outputs.

Output 1: County capacity and engagement in water related planning enhanced

Output 2: Water and sanitation access and deficit in the ASALs addressed including those in refugee impacted ASAL areas

Output 3: Sustainable and community-based management of water resources improved

Output 4: Capacity of implementing agents improved for planning and efficient water service delivery.

Output 5: Strengthened institutional performance of WATERFUND

### **2.o. Rationale, purpose, and objectives of the evaluation**

The purpose of this final evaluation is to provide independent and objective evidence to WaterFund and DANIDA, the development arm of the Royal Danish Embassy for Foreign Affairs on achieved results in GGEP and WLP projects and their sustainability. The evaluation is also expected to provide lessons learnt and best practices related to the planning, design and implementation of water sector programme that might include similar elements in other countries and the establishment of similar funding mechanisms that WaterFund has in Kenya.

These learning will be utilized to inform and strengthen the various approaches adopted by DANIDA and WaterFund in the implementation of projects through different implementation agents (Water Service Providers, Water Users Associations, Water Resources Users Associations, Community Based Organizations and Conservancies) and International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs). Further, it is expected that, the learning will be utilized by the Ministry of Water, Sanitation and Irrigation and other stakeholders in the Water Sector.

The evaluation will inform DANIDA and Government of Kenya inter alia on the extent to which the objectives of the programme were met in terms of provision of water and sanitation services access and water resources management in the counties of implementation in addition to the functionality and sustainability of funded water supply, sanitation and water resources management projects that are (or are in final steps of being) handed over to the duty bearers (County Governments, Water Service Providers, WRUAs, and Communities and institutions such as schools and hospitals in terms of sanitation projects).

The Specific objectives of this evaluation are to assess:

1. The extent to which the interventions have brought intended and unintended change to the beneficiary groups in line with the targets of the GGEP and WLP and how well they were achieved.
2. Functionality and sustainability of water supply, water resources management and sanitation projects and where funded projects are found to be non-functional, the reasons and challenges should be well documented.
3. Effectiveness of the established systems of engagement with Counties in water planning, implementation, and assessment of implementation capacities of implementing partners including adherence to the financing agreements and other contractual obligations.
4. Capacity building approaches effectiveness and efficiency in delivery of sustainable water supply and water resources management projects with focus on O&M training.

5. The programmes' level of influence in promoting Public Private Community Partnerships in water service provision in ASALs.
6. The outcomes and impact of the policy and institutional support structures to WaterFund and at county level (outputs 1 and 6 across the two programmes).

### **3.0. Scope of the evaluation**

The evaluation will cover the full GGEP and WLP Programme implementation as detailed in the revised Development Engagement Documents. The recommendations made in the Programme Midterm Review of 2018 and their implementation are to be reviewed. The evaluation should focus on concrete and measurable results and as such, major part of the mission will be accomplished in the 8 programme target counties.

The fieldwork is expected to take place in selected projects in all eight counties as well as in Nairobi. In the inception report of the evaluation, the evaluation team will present a two-tier plan (for GGEP and WLP) showing the sampled projects and the selection criteria. The selection should include at least two thirds of the water and sanitation projects and half of Water resources management projects implemented by WRUAs and Conservancies, and cover both functioning as well as projects showing operational difficulties and sustainability challenges. Drought Emergency Response (DERP) projects funded under GGEP should be well covered.

The stakeholders to be consulted include Royal Danish Embassy (DANIDA), Kenyan government officials (both at National and County level), Programme Technical Advisory team members, beneficiaries of the Programme, WaterFund staff (headquarter and county) and Management, WSPs, CBOs, Conservancies and WRUAs and Institutions involved in sanitation implementation. Specifically, for WLP, the top leadership of the International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) and the programme implementation teams will be consulted in addition to UNHCR and other agencies active in implementation of projects in refugee and host communities. Other development partners active in the sector should also be consulted including, Finland, Sweden, EU and IFAD.

### **4.0. Evaluation Criteria and Questions**

The Evaluation will be based on the Organization of Economic Corporation and Development (OECD) Criteria of: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability and Coherence. The details of each criterion and other detailed information is outlined in the OECD/DAC Evaluation Criteria (See Annex 1). The consultant will where possible use the latest criteria of the OECD and develop relevant evaluation questions corresponding to each Criteria. The evaluation questions will form part of the inception report which will be in two parts (for GGEP and WLP).

### **5.0. Methodology**

An external consulting firm with evident expertise on water services, water resources management and sanitation will be competitively be procured to undertake the evaluation for the "Green Growth and Employment Programme to support access to and management of water resources in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands" (**GGEP Programme**) and "Water and Livelihoods Programme aimed at Enhanced water resources management and investments in Turkana West and selected ASAL Counties, for improved and sustained access by communities and households to water and sanitation for their domestic and productive needs. In this regard, the firm shall provide WaterFund, and DANIDA with a team with clear reporting structure, an inception report, containing an overview of their understanding of the assignment, time schedule, planned activities, suggested methods and potential interviewees as well as any other parties they wish to engage to be approved by WaterFund and Partners.

To provide a comprehensive analysis, it is expected that the firm will use a balanced range of qualitative and quantitative methods which includes but not limited to the following.

- **Desk Review:** Review of existing secondary information and reports relevant to the programme and to the context of the two countries (Kenya and Denmark). This will provide an analysis and discussion of facts and data within the assignment context. The literature will include among others Development Engagement documents (Initial and Revised), Programme mid-term review reports, baseline survey reports, Programme' progress reports, Results Framework and M&E plan, contextual information, or other projects' information on counties where the programmes are being implemented.
- **Quantitative data collection;** Field visits in the implementation areas for sampling of beneficiaries for interviews/survey, data collection and observations; conduct structured household interviews with sampled programmes' beneficiaries using survey tools; using Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) tools, thematic area specialized tools etc.
- **Qualitative data collection:** This will include interviews with key informants and other stakeholders using informant's guides and interviews with field staff; Focus Group Discussions with sampled potential beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries (Randomized Control Trials).
- **Field observations and reflections;** for triangulations of information reflections and feedback sessions with the consortium team members.
- **Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)** and resilience measurement approaches, to be undertaken by analyzing unique resilience capabilities at Community and individual level. The main aim of CBA analysis will be to help WaterFund, and its partners predict the ability of different households in coping with the changes in climatic conditions (how resilient are the households?), how their participation in water conservation initiatives is influenced by livelihood activities. The extent to which greening of infrastructure has led to cost reduction in operation of water systems.
- **Assessment of the training interventions:** This would involve the use of Kirkpatrick's model and other applicable methods to assess the effectiveness of trainings delivered to direct and indirect beneficiaries of the programmes' interventions.
- **An assessment of the employment opportunities;** presented because of the GGEP programme.

## Survey design

WaterFund will support the consultant in the formulation of participatory design where the main programmes' implementers will be involved to give their inputs and views in the evaluation design process, which is key in projects' intervention design. The data collection tools to be used should be able to capture-crosscutting issues particularly on gender, social inclusion, and accountability to the extent possible. The tools will be pre-tested to ensure that enumerators and the study population alike have the same understanding of the evaluation methodologies, topics and revised based on identified shortcomings. This also includes simplifying of the study tools where necessary to reduce interpersonal and other data bias in order ensure quality evaluation data and information.

## Sampling plan

The evaluation samples will be done using the beneficiaries' database (WSPs/WUAs/CBOs/INGOs records) which contains all the information for all the beneficiaries reached in the eight counties. As highlighted previously, the qualitative study should use participatory assessment tools such as Focus Group Discussions (FGD's), Key Informant Interview guides (KII's) to both stakeholders and non-stakeholders.

## **Data collection and analysis**

The data collection teams must have required technical and localized knowledge, experience and integrity and show how they will mitigate data collection abuses and make it reliable. This will give the exercise the credibility it requires for wider acceptance of the findings by the stakeholders. Enumerators will be contracted and trained by the consultant on data collect and recording. Analysis of the collected data needs to be done in line with each of the programme's logic model. Further necessary statistical tests/analysis should be performed to determine relationships between various factors.

The consultant will decide which management of information system to use, what statistical software to use for data analysis and provide human resource to undertake the data analysis.

## **Presentation of findings**

The consultant will be responsible for writing and presenting the evaluation report to both WaterFund and DANIDA.

## **Key deliverables/outputs**

Outputs:

- Inception report
- Report/ documentation on the following per programme:
  - I. The extent to which the programme has achieved its developmental impact goal as per the programme design and logical framework
  - II. The test on theory of change results.
  - III. The stakeholder's analysis
  - IV. Learning in the programme
  - V. Opportunities for up-scaling of the programme
  - VI. Recommendations based on the findings for Green Growth Mainstreaming in projects and alternative approaches to water resource management in ASALs
- Raw data used for analysis
- Final evaluation summary version to be shared with project participants

## **WaterFund Responsibilities**

- Manage the final evaluation contract on a day-to-day basis including processing funds for disbursement to the consulting firm.
- Support in provision of required secondary data source(s) to the consultant
- Support in facilitating field activities as arranged by the consultant through liaison with key stakeholders.
- Facilitation in provision of operational support in terms of technical inputs necessary and approval where required in consultation with DANIDA.

## **DANIDA**

- Facilitate necessary approval for Funds utilization
- Facilitation in providing operational support in terms of technical inputs and necessary approval where required.



- In liaison with WaterFund support the consultant in acquiring necessary accreditations and access to information in relation to the Programme

## 6.o. Reporting

The Consultancy firm shall submit 4 colored bound hard copies and soft copies in portable storage (flash disc) with briefing reports for each phase of the assignment, based on the below indicative schedule:

- **Inception Report** (maximum 25 pages). The Inception Report should be produced after 2 weeks from the contract signing date. The Inception Report should outline the evaluation criteria, the approach, scope, detailed methodology, work plan, work tasks within the evaluation teams and plan for site visits and meetings. The report should also highlight initial findings and conclusions of the desk study per programme including brief highlights of the documents reviewed in preparation for the evaluation.
- **Draft Final Report.** The draft report shall be submitted 3 weeks after the field work. The report which combines the desk study, and the field findings should be submitted to WaterFund, DANIDA and other key stakeholders through PowerPoint presentations and submission of draft final report for comments before final submission.
- **Final Report** (Max of 60 pages excluding annexes). The final report shall be submitted to the WaterFund, DANIDA and other key stakeholders in 2 weeks after receiving the comments on the draft final report. The structure of the contents of the reports shall be agreed during the debriefing meeting.
- **Presentation on the evaluation findings:** The consultant is expected to make PowerPoint presentations to WaterFund, DANIDA and other key stakeholders.

Each deliverable is subjected to specific approval. The evaluation team can move to the next phase only after receiving a written statement of acceptance by the WaterFund.

### Language

All reports shall be written in English and should be in clear and concise language. The Consultancy Firm will need to be able to have staff that can communicate with the local population in the project communities.

## 7.o. Quality Assurance

The following guiding principles and standards should be adhered to to enhance quality assurance of the exercise.

### Independence

Independence entails the ability to undertake the evaluation without undue influence, pressure of any conflict of interest by any party including the implementing partners, the WaterFund or the Development Partner. Independence of the evaluation is necessary for credibility of results while allowing the evaluators to be impartial and free from undue pressure throughout the evaluation process.

Evaluators for the GGEP and WLP programme should have the full freedom to conduct their evaluative work impartially and must be able to freely express their assessment results. The independence of the evaluation function underpins the free access to all pertinent information that evaluators require on the evaluation subject.

## **Objectivity**

The evaluation must be based on verifiable facts. The evaluator should make every effort to ensure that the data on which the evaluation is based does not contain inconsistencies or inaccuracies. The presentation of facts should be clearly and recognizably distinguished from judgments.

## **Transparency**

Transparency is an essential element of evaluation that establishes trust and builds confidence, enhances stakeholder ownership, and increases public accountability. Evaluation results should be publicly accessible. The evaluation should be conducted in a way that can be followed clearly by all stakeholders and third parties. The questions to be addressed, the data base, the approach, findings, and conclusions must be presented in the report in a clear and accessible way.

## **Validity and reliability**

The evaluation must measure what the Terms of Reference specifies as requiring measurement, and in a way that the reader can understand. The results of the evaluation should be stable, i.e. that a repeat of the evaluation should produce the same results and conclusions.

## **Partnership**

Where possible and in so far as it does not conflict with other principles, all key partners should be involved in the implementation of the evaluation.

### **Human rights and Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI)**

The universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender equality should be integrated into all stages of an evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluators and key partners to ensure that these values are respected, addressed, and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'leaving no-one behind'.

## **8.o. Duration and Location**

### Starting Period

The tentative starting date of the assignment is from **April 2022**

### Expected Duration

The Consultancy Firm will need to provide the Services requested including final reporting within 3 calendar months from the starting date (including period for submission of comments on reports by WaterFund and DANIDA). As part of the inception report, the Consultant should furnish the WaterFund with a team of experts with clear reporting structure, a clear work plan for the entire exercise.

Foreseen finishing date of the contract is to be determined.

### Location of Assignment

The geographical intervention area is Nairobi, Mandera, Wajir, Marsabit, Garissa, Tana River, Lamu, Isiolo, and Turkana counties.

## 9.o. Expertise required

### a) General

To fulfill the assignment, the Consultancy Firm should provide a team composed of experienced Project Management experts, Economists/Development Experts, Rural Water Supply Projects engineer, Natural Resource Management/Environmentalist, and Community/Social Development/Governance experts.

The firm should also provide additional staff that will be required in an assignment of this scale. The Consultancy firm will propose a lead expert and a suitable field team with clear separate roles to undertake the field work

The lead expert is expected to coordinate the team experts and must have the expertise to plan the exercise, manage the overall assignment, manage the analysis done on the field data, and prepare and quality assure the report

### b) Profile of the Consultants Team

#### *Overview of Consultant Teams*

It is essential that the team has qualifications and extensive experience in evaluation of water, sanitation and water resources related programme, including interventions and evaluations of pro-poor rural water supply and sanitation schemes and community-based development. Since a large part of the work will involve interaction with local communities, it is important that the team is familiar with the diverse local cultures.

The team should have a proven track record in Development Programme evaluation with an understanding of project cycle management and be able to identify bottlenecks and challenges in the project implementation and make recommendations. The team should be able to operate in the project areas and be able to communicate in different local languages.

Governance expert will form part of each evaluation core teams specifically to review the different models of implementation for both GGEP and WLP Programme adopted by WaterFund and DANIDA and provide an analysis of the institutional arrangements for sustainable service provision.

### Qualifications and Skills

#### *Minimum Requirements for Lead experts*

#### Academic

- A university degree in economics, statistics, engineering, development studies, environmental studies, social science or equivalent.
- Master's Degree in both economics, monitoring and evaluation, engineering, development studies, environmental studies.
- Professional training in Monitoring and Evaluation

#### Experience

- Minimum of 10 years' experience in the Kenyan water sector.
- Demonstrated experience in evaluation of rural water supply and sanitation projects
- Experience in assessing cross cutting issues such as gender balance, HIV/AIDS responsiveness, good governance, and environmental protection in the project implementation
- Experience in rural water supply and sanitation and hygiene linked to programme design, implementation, oversight management and monitoring and evaluation.

- Experience with contracting procedures and procurement

#### *Expertise in Community Development/Sociology*

##### Academic qualification

- A university degree in either Sociology, social work, community/social development, development studies, or equivalent. /Governance Expert
- Masters' Degree in the following areas: project planning and management, community development/economics, monitoring and evaluation, development studies,
- Professional training in Project Monitoring and Evaluation

##### Experience

- Demonstrated Social expertise and experience in conducting evaluation studies of comparable magnitude within the last 7 years
- Experience in conducting research in community-based projects

#### *Expertise in Governance Issues*

##### Academic qualification

- A bachelors' degree in Social Sciences (Political science, law, governance, public administration, social studies, development studies, international relations) or a related field with focus on governance
- Master's degree in Social Sciences field (Political science, law, governance, public administration, social studies, development studies, international relations or other relevant discipline is added advantage, preferably with a specialization in governance and projects results-based management.

##### Experience

- A minimum of 8 years' practical experience in the field of governance in project specific areas of intervention (water, sanitation, and water resources management); at the national or international level in providing governance advisory services.
- Strong expertise in governance, rule of law, civil society engagement, democratic reform, gender, and human rights; in the specific areas of intervention (water, sanitation and water resources management);
- Experience and knowledge in planning, design, monitoring, and evaluation of governance projects and programmes, as well as integrating gender equality and environmental considerations into programming.
- Extensive knowledge of Country's (Kenya) governance context
- Experience in liaising with government representatives, development partners and civil society organizations on governance issues.
- Strong communication skills and ability to communicate effectively orally and in writing for a variety of audiences and purposes.

#### *Expertise in Environmental Studies/Natural Resources Management*

##### Academic qualification

- A university degree in Environmental Studies, Environmental economics, Natural Resources Management, Integrated Water Resource Management, Climate Change, development studies or equivalent.
- Masters' Degree in the following areas: Environmental studies, Integrated Water Resource Management, Climate Change, Natural Resources Management, Project planning and

management, community development/economics, monitoring and evaluation, development studies,

- Registered ESIA expert with good standing
- Professional training in Project Monitoring and Evaluation

#### Experience

Demonstrated Environmental expertise and experience in conducting evaluation studies of comparable magnitude within the last 7 years

- Experience in conducting Environmental and Social Impact Assessments on projects.

The Consultancy Firm may propose a team consisting of professionals. The skills mix of the team members should cover all the areas of expertise required.

#### *Research Assistants*

The Consultancy Firm will propose teams consisting of professionals with competent skills mix to adequately cover all the areas of expertise required. Specifically, the number of qualified research assistants proposed should match the assignment scope and provide adequate support to the expert teams. A minimum of Ten (10 No.) qualified Research Assistants should be proposed for the assignment

#### Academic qualification

- A university degree in either Engineering, Sociology, economics, development studies, environmental studies or equivalent.
- Professional training in research/ Monitoring and Evaluation

#### Experience

- Demonstrated Experience in conducting research for a minimum of 2 No. projects in community-based projects

#### Required Equipment

Appropriate field transport will be required for the field teams. The field teams will require laptops and hand-held GPS units/ GPS enabled cameras for capture of relevant photographs. Each field team should also be equipped with cameras to record field observations.

### **10.0. Budget and Payment Schedule**

Based on the proposed professional expertise to undertake the assignment and other associated costs including reimbursable, the consultancy firm is expected to prepare and submit a viable financial proposal with the total cost being inclusive of all applicable taxes.

#### Payment Schedule

- 30% on the approval of the Inception Report, field monitoring tools, sampling plan and field schedule
- 50% after approval of the Draft report
- 20% after submission of approved Final report

### 3.0 Annex 3: Sampling Procedure

#### 3.1 Sampling for projects

The consultant utilized a two-stage sampling process. First, projects were sampled in each county considering specific parameters for evaluation. Secondly, study participants were sampled from the selected projects within each county.

The selection of projects observed the following requirements.

- i. The selection included at least two-thirds of the water and sanitation projects and half of Water resources management projects implemented by WRUAs and Conservancies
- ii. Drought Emergency Response (DERP) projects funded under GGEP were well covered.
- iii. Projects selected for the field study were randomly sampled from each category (i) with points (i) and (ii) above considered.

Table showing classification of projects

| GGEP-DERP Projects |            |   |   |
|--------------------|------------|---|---|
| No.                | County     | Water and Sanitation Projects   | WRM Projects  |
| 1                  | Tana River | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rehabilitation of Ndura (1), Ndura(2), Handaraku and Marava Shallow wells</li> <li>2. Rehabilitation of Geresu water pan</li> <li>3. Rehabilitation of Lakole water pan</li> <li>4. Rehabilitation of Bulto Mulu water pan</li> <li>5. Nanighi water and sanitation project</li> <li>6. Kipao water and sanitation project</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Madogo WRUA</li> <li>2. Kigaruni WRUA</li> <li>3. Lagha Tula WRUA</li> <li>4. Ndera Community Conservancy</li> <li>5. Lower Tana Delta Conservancy</li> </ol>   |
| 2                  | Lamu       | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Poromoko Water and Sanitation project</li> <li>2. Mkunumbi water project phase 2</li> <li>3. Pangani water project phase 2</li> <li>4. Kiunga Water and Sanitation Project</li> <li>5. Kizingitini Water and Sanitation Project</li> </ol>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amu Island WRUA Project</li> <li>2. Kiunga Community Conservancy Project</li> <li>3. Pate Marine Community Conservancy Project</li> <li>4. Hanshak Nyongoro Community Conservancy Project</li> </ol>  |
| 3                  | Garissa    | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Harajab Water and Sanitation Project</li> <li>2. Libahlow Water and Sanitation Project</li> <li>3. Shebta-aad Water and Sanitation Project</li> </ol>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ali Kune WRUA</li> <li>2. Lagha Madha WRUA</li> <li>3. Tawakal WRUA</li> <li>4. Anaam WRUA</li> <li>5. Kotile Korisa WRUA</li> <li>6. Sharaha WRUA</li> <li>7. Khansa Hosle WRUA</li> <li>8. Gedilum WRUA</li> <li>9. Lagha Togwene WRUA</li> <li>10. Kasha WRUA</li> <li>11. Habarow WRUA</li> </ol> |
| 4                  | Wajir      | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adadi Jule Water and Sanitation Project</li> <li>2. Korija Water and Sanitation Project</li> <li>3. Riba Water and Sanitation Project</li> <li>4. Sabuli Water and Sanitation Project</li> </ol>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Buriya WRUA</li> </ol>  |
| 5                  | Mandera    | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lanqura Community Water Supply Project</li> </ol>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mujtama WRUA</li> </ol>   |

|   |              |  |  |
|---|--------------|--|--|
|   |              | 2. Sake Community Rural Water Supply Project   | 2. Dahan WRUA  |
| 6 | Marsabit     | 0  | 1. Bubisa WRUA<br>2. Shurr WRUA<br>3. Turbi WRUA<br>4. Wama WRUA |
| 7 | Isiolo       | 1. Godarupa Water & Sanitation Extension Project<br>2. Mogore Water & Sanitation Extension Project<br>3. Awarsitu Pipeline Extension Water Project | 1. Kipsing WRUA<br>2. Kuro Bisan Owo WRUA<br>3. Garfasa WRUA     |
| 8 | Turkana      | 1. Namoru Akwar Lokorkor Water Project<br>2. Kangirisae Water & Sanitation Extension Project<br>4. Lokichar Water & Sanitation Extension Project   | 1. Lorugum WRUA<br>2. Kochodin WRUA                              |
|   | <b>Total</b> | <b>26</b>  | <b>32</b>  |

#### Projects selection process

- a) Considering point (i) above, the following model was applied to establish the sample size

$$2/3 x + 1/2 y \leq n$$

Where:

X= total number of water and sanitation projects

Y= Total number of Water resources management project.

N=Sample size

- b) The sample size above was thereafter distributed proportionately between water/sanitation projects and water resources management projects.
- c) After determining the sample size for each county, consideration was taken to ensure both WRUA and conservancy implemented projects were proportionately sampled and a good number of DERP projects included.

#### Distribution of sample size per type of project

| No. | County       | Water and Sanitation Projects |             | WRM Projects   |             |                      |             |
|-----|--------------|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|
|     |              |                               |             | WRUA Projects  |             | Conservancy Projects |             |
|     |              | Total Projects                | Sample Size | Total Projects | Sample Size | Total Projects       | Sample Size |
| 1   | Tana River   | 6                             | 4           | 3              | 2           | 2                    | 1           |
| 2   | Lamu         | 5                             | 3           | 1              | 1           | 3                    | 1           |
| 3   | Garissa      | 3                             | 3           | 11             | 3           | 0                    | 0           |
| 4   | Wajir        | 4                             | 3           | 1              | 1           | 0                    | 0           |
| 5   | Mandera      | 2                             | 1           | 2              | 1           | 0                    | 0           |
| 6   | Marsabit     | 0                             | 0           | 4              | 2           | 0                    | 0           |
| 7   | Isiolo       | 3                             | 2           | 3              | 1           | 0                    | 0           |
| 8   | Turkana      | 3                             | 2           | 2              | 1           | 0                    | 0           |
|     | <b>Total</b> | <b>26</b>                     | <b>18</b>   | <b>27</b>      | <b>12</b>   | <b>5</b>             | <b>2</b>    |

## Sampled projects

| County       | GGEP-DERP Projects  |   |                        |
|--------------|---|---|------------------------|
|              | Water and Sanitation Projects   | WRM Projects  |                        |
|              | Project Selected  | Project Selected  | Total Projects/ County |
| Tana River   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rehabilitation of Geres water pan</li> <li>2. Nanighi water and sanitation project</li> <li>3. Kipao water and sanitation project</li> </ol>          | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kigaruni WRUA</li> <li>2. Lagha Tula WRUA</li> <li>3. Lower Tana Conservancy</li> </ol>                         | 6                      |
| Lamu         | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Poromoko Water and Sanitation project</li> <li>2. Pangani Water Project Phase 2</li> <li>3. Mkunumbi water project phase 2</li> </ol>                 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pate Marine Community Conservancy Project</li> <li>4. Hanshak Nyongoro Community Conservancy Project</li> </ol> | 5                      |
| Garissa      | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Harajab Water and Sanitation Project</li> <li>2. Libahlow Water and Sanitation Project</li> <li>3. Shebta-aad Water and Sanitation Project</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Habarow WRUA</li> <li>2. Tawakal WRUA</li> <li>3. Kasha WRUA</li> </ol>   | 6                      |
| Wajir        | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Koriya Water and Sanitation Project</li> <li>2. Riba Water and Sanitation Project</li> <li>3. Sabuli Water and Sanitation Project</li> </ol>          | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Buriya WRUA</li> </ol>  | 4                      |
| Mandera      | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lanqura Community Rural Water Supply Project</li> </ol>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mujtama WRUA</li> </ol>   | 2                      |
| Marsabit     | 0   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bubisa WRUA</li> <li>2. Turbi WRUA</li> </ol>   | 2                      |
| Isiolo       | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Godarupa Water &amp; Sanitation Extension Project</li> <li>2. Awarsitu Pipeline Extension Water Project</li> </ol>                                    | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kuro Bisan Owo WRUA</li> </ol>  | 3                      |
| Turkana      | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Namoru Akwar Lokorkor Water Project</li> <li>2. Lokichar Water &amp; Sanitation Extension Project</li> </ol>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lorugum WRUA</li> </ol>   | 3                      |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>17</b>   | <b>14</b>   | <b>31</b>              |

Summary: Total sample was 31 projects. This represented 53% of all GGEP-funded projects. Among the 31, 17 are Water and Sanitation (DERP 3) and 14 are Water Resources Management projects (Conservancies 3).

### 3.2 Sampling for Household Survey

We sampled a total of 422 households for quantitative data collection. The quantitative sample size was calculated using the Cochran Israel formula with an adjustment of 10% to take care of any possible design effect.



$$n \geq (Z^2 \cdot p \cdot q) / d^2$$

$$n \geq (1.96^2 \cdot 0.5 \cdot 0.5) / (0.05)^2 = 384.16$$

Adding 10% for design effect:  $n = 384 + (384 \times 10 / 100) = 384 + 38 = 422$

Where:

$n$  = desired sample size

$z$  = standard normal deviation at the required confidence level

$p$  = proportion of the target population or the estimated characteristics being measured

$q$  = the maximum prevalent error for the prevalent estimate  $\pm 0.05$

$d$  = the marginal error allowed ( $d=0.05$  since confidence limit is 95%)

The sample was allocated proportionately across counties using number of funded projects. Consequently, every project had approximately 15 household surveys. Households were sampled using stratified simple random sampling. The head of the household was surveyed.

## 4.0 Annex 4: Sustainability Index

As defined by WaterFund, sustainability index is a key quantitative performance measure to facilitate the assessment and monitoring of sustainability of investments in the Counties to support progress evaluation over time and the development of appropriate response measures. For the purposes of this assessment, sustainability was defined as the ability of an investment to realize the objectives within 5 years of its operation. This definition is purely based on outcomes and outputs of the investments.

### 4.1 Methodology

The projects were assessed and aggregated by counties. The assessment is based on the guideline created by WaterFund in 2016. The sustainability Index comprises four categories- the Functionality and Reliability of an investment, Revenue collection (ability to cover O&M), Age and Survival rate of an investment and the Functionality of an investment.

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| The function is specified as: | Where:  |
| $SI=f(FR, RC, AS, GC)$        | SI is the Sustainability Index<br>FR is the Functionality of the investment<br>RC is the Revenue Collection (ability to cover O&M)<br>AS is the Age and Survival (and operational) rate of an investment<br>GC is whether the investment is in Good Condition (and operational) |

### 4.2 Criteria for scoring

1. Revenue collection (ability to cover O&M) = (50%), the highest weight was given with the idea that without revenue collection, the investment does not have long term sustainability. However, considering the nature of GGEP investments, this criterion will focus on capability to cover O&M cost
2. Functionality, i.e., the operational status, is a key attribute to describe the status of the services and is given the weight of 25%.
3. The age and survival rate of the investment is given a weight of 15%.
4. The condition of an investment is given a smaller weight (10%) since the condition is, while important, not essential for the usability and sustainability of the facility.

### 4.3 Decision Criteria

The Sustainability Index score is between 0 - 100%, with 100% depicting a high sustainability rate of the investments.

## Sustainability Index Calculations

| COUNTY     | PROJECT                                       | Functionality | Ability to cover O&M Cost | Age and Survival Rate of the Investment | Good condition | Total |
|------------|---|---------------|---------------------------|---|----------------|-------|
| Turkana    | Namoru Akwar Lokorkor Water Project           | 22            | 43                        | 11                                      | 8              | 84    |
|            | Lokichar Water & Sanitation Extension Project | 20            | 44                        | 7                                       | 7              | 78    |
|            | Lorugum WRUA                                  | 19            | 45                        | 12                                      | 9              | 85    |
| Average    |   |               |                           |   |                | 82.3  |
| Garissa    | Harajab Water and Sanitation Project          | 12            | 31                        | 7                                       | 5              | 55    |
|            | Libahlow Water and Sanitation Project         | 17            | 39                        | 10                                      | 9              | 75    |
|            | Shebta-aad Water and Sanitation Project       | 18            | 38                        | 8                                       | 7              | 71    |
|            | Habarow WRUA                                  | 20            | 43                        | 10                                      | 9              | 82    |
|            | Tawakal WRUA                                  | 19            | 43                        | 9                                       | 9              | 80    |
|            | Kasha WRUA                                    | 20            | 43                        | 9                                       | 9              | 81    |
| Average    |   |               |                           |   |                | 74    |
| Wajir      | Korija Water and Sanitation Project           | 22            | 40                        | 9                                       | 8              | 79    |
|            | Riba Water and Sanitation Project             | 20            | 39                        | 10                                      | 8              | 77    |
|            | Sabuli Water and Sanitation Project           | 21            | 42                        | 10                                      | 8              | 81    |
| Average    |   |               |                           |   |                | 79    |
| Mandera    | Lanqura Community Rural Water Supply Project  | 19            | 37                        | 8                                       | 7              | 71    |
|            | Mujtama WRUA                                  | 21            | 43                        | 10                                      | 8              | 82    |
| Average    |   |               |                           |   |                | 76.5  |
| Tana River | Rehabilitation of Geresapan water             | 21            | 44                        | 11                                      | 8              | 84    |
|            | Nanighi water and sanitation project          | 22            | 43                        | 10                                      | 7              | 82    |
|            | Kipao water and sanitation project            | 22            | 44                        | 10                                      | 8              | 84    |
|            | Kigaruni WRUA                                 | 20            | 45                        | 13                                      | 8              | 86    |
|            | Lagha Tula WRUA                               | 21            | 46                        | 10                                      | 9              | 86    |
|            | Lower Tana Conservancy                        | 22            | 42                        | 9                                       | 8              | 81    |
| Average    |   |               |                           |   |                | 83.8  |

|          |  |    |    |    |   |      |
|----------|--|----|----|----|---|------|
| Lamu     | Poromoko Water and Sanitation project          | 22 | 40 | 10 | 7 | 79   |
|          | Pangani Water Project Phase 2                  | 17 | 36 | 8  | 7 | 68   |
|          | Mkunumbi water project phase 2                 | 19 | 38 | 8  | 7 | 72   |
|          | Pate Marine Community Conservancy Project      | 23 | 46 | 12 | 8 | 89   |
|          | Hanshak Nyongoro Community Conservancy Project | 21 | 46 | 11 | 8 | 86   |
| Average  |  |    |    |    |   | 78.8 |
| Isiolo   | Godarupa Water & Sanitation Extension Project  | 23 | 46 | 11 | 8 | 88   |
|          | Awarsitu Pipeline Extension Water Project      | 19 | 41 | 9  | 7 | 76   |
|          | Kuro Bisan Owo WRUA                            | 22 | 42 | 10 | 8 | 82   |
| Average  |  |    |    |    |   | 82   |
| Marsabit | Wama   | 20 | 42 | 10 | 8 | 80   |

## 5.0 Annex 5: Creditworthiness Index

Creditworthiness Index combines annual financial and operational data into a snapshot metric to estimate a WSP's creditworthiness<sup>1</sup>.

### 5.1 Methodology

The Creditworthiness Index methodology used to calculate the individual ratings was adjusted from the initial WSP/WASREB shadow rating methodology previously used. It relies solely on data from the financial statements and operating statistics as reported by the WSPs. Qualitative inputs (Management capacity, Human resources, Stakeholder support, Governance issues, Legislative & regulatory framework, and Strength of the economic Base) cannot be automated and are therefore not included in the Creditworthiness Index results. The index is calculated from 6 broad and weighted indicators that are tailored from the interviews with the WSPs and the county administration.

The scores were adopted from "African Water Utilities Regional Comparative Utility Creditworthiness Assessment Report: Individual credit assessment reports for seven African water utilities"

### 5.2 Scoring

Ranges of norms were established for each indicator, with scores of 0-4 allocated to each norm to align the rating with the Kenya business credit risk universe<sup>2</sup>. The Creditworthiness Index result is therefore an aggregation of the weighted scoring with a maximum score of 100. A score of 85-100 would depict a highest credit quality.

### 5.3 Decision Criteria

| Score    | Indicative Creditworthiness Level | Description   |
|----------|-----------------------------------|---|
| < 30     | No Rating Awarded                 | Indicative of substantial to exceptionally high risk of default.  |
| 31 to 40 | Lower -Creditworthy               | Indicates that material default risk is present, but a limited margin of safety remains. Financial commitments are currently being met; however, capacity for continued payment is vulnerable to deterioration in the business and economic environment. In a credit rating this definition is equivalent to a B rating.  |
| 41 to 50 | Low-Creditworthy                  | Indicates an elevated vulnerability to default risk, particularly in the event of adverse changes in business or economic conditions over time; however, business or financial flexibility exists which supports the servicing of financial commitments. In a credit rating this definition is equivalent to a BB rating. |
| 51 to 60 | Creditworthy                      | Indicates that expectations of default risk are currently low. Capacity for payment of financial commitments is considered adequate but adverse business or economic conditions are more likely to impair this capacity. In a credit rating this definition is equivalent to a BBB rating.                                |
| 61 to 70 | Creditworthy                      | Denotes expectations of low default risk. Capacity for  |

<sup>1</sup> Creditworthiness Index Report, 2015

<sup>2</sup> 2015 WASREB/World Bank

|          |                        |  |
|----------|------------------------|--|
|          |                        | payment of financial commitments is considered strong. Capacity may, nevertheless, be more vulnerable to adverse business or economic conditions than is the case for higher ratings. In a credit rating this definition is equivalent to an A rating.                           |
| 70 to 85 | Highly Creditworthy    | Denotes expectations of very low default risk. Very strong capacity for payment of financial commitments. Not significantly vulnerable to foreseeable events. In a credit rating this definition is equivalent to an AA rating.  |
| >80      | Very High creditworthy | Denotes the lowest expectation of default risk. Assigned only in cases of exceptionally strong capacity for payment of financial commitments. Highly unlikely to be adversely affected by foreseeable events. In a credit rating this definition is equivalent to an AAA rating. |

## Creditworthiness Indicators and Scoring

| Indicator                            | Definition   | Reason for inclusion  | Weighting in index (%)   | Scoring of Indicators   |     |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|-----|---|-----|----|-------|----------|----------|----------|-------|-----|
| Cost                                 | % Of Maintenance costs of total O&M costs                  | Indicates whether utility spends sufficiently on maintaining infrastructure | 10   | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>&gt;8%</td> <td>6-8%</td> <td>6-4%</td> <td>0-4%</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table>       | 4   | 3 | 2   | 1  | 0     | >8%      | 6-8%     | 6-4%     | 0-4%  | 0   |
|                                      | 4  | 3   | 2  | 1   | 0   |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
|                                      | >8%  | 6-8%  | 6-4%   | 0-4%  | 0   |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
| % Of energy costs of total O&M costs | Indicates whether is susceptible to changes in energy cost | 10  | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>&lt;10%</td> <td>10-15%</td> <td>15-20%</td> <td>20-25%</td> <td>&gt;20%</td> </tr> </table>         | 4   | 3   | 2 | 1   | 0  | <10%  | 10-15%   | 15-20%   | 20-25%   | >20%  |     |
| 4                                    | 3  | 2   | 1  | 0   |     |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
| <10%                                 | 10-15%   | 15-20%  | 20-25%   | >20%  |     |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
| % Of staff costs of total O&M costs  | Indicator of efficiency                                    | 10  | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>&lt;25%</td> <td>25-30%</td> <td>30-35%</td> <td>35-40%</td> <td>&gt;40%</td> </tr> </table>         | 4   | 3   | 2 | 1   | 0  | <25%  | 25-30%   | 30-35%   | 35-40%   | >40%  |     |
| 4                                    | 3  | 2   | 1  | 0   |     |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
| <25%                                 | 25-30%   | 30-35%  | 35-40%   | >40%  |     |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
| Revenue                              | % Difference between collected Revenue and expected Rev.   | Efficiency  | 10   | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>&gt;80%</td> <td>60-80%</td> <td>60-40%</td> <td>0-40%</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table> | 4   | 3 | 2   | 1  | 0     | >80%     | 60-80%   | 60-40%   | 0-40% | 0   |
|                                      | 4  | 3   | 2  | 1   | 0   |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
| >80%                                 | 60-80%   | 60-40%  | 0-40%  | 0   |     |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
| O&M Coverage (%Revenue of O&M Cost)  | Creditworthiness   | 10  | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>&gt;130%</td> <td>120-130%</td> <td>110-120%</td> <td>100-110%</td> <td>&lt;100%</td> </tr> </table> | 4   | 3   | 2 | 1   | 0  | >130% | 120-130% | 110-120% | 100-110% | <100% |     |
| 4                                    | 3  | 2   | 1  | 0   |     |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
| >130%                                | 120-130%   | 110-120%  | 100-110%   | <100%   |     |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
| Technical                            | % of people with water supply/population of the area       | Indicates size of future challenges   | 4  | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>100</td> <td>90-100</td> <td>80-90</td> <td>70-80</td> <td>&lt;70</td> </tr> </table> | 4   | 3 | 2   | 1  | 0     | 100      | 90-100   | 80-90    | 70-80 | <70 |
|                                      | 4  | 3   | 2  | 1   | 0   |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
|                                      | 100  | 90-100  | 80-90  | 70-80   | <70 |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
| % Estimation of NRW                  | Efficiency and credit quality                              | 4   | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>&lt;20%</td> <td>20-30%</td> <td>30-40%</td> <td>40-50%</td> <td>&gt;50%</td> </tr> </table>         | 4   | 3   | 2 | 1   | 0  | <20%  | 20-30%   | 30-40%   | 40-50%   | >50%  |     |
| 4                                    | 3  | 2   | 1  | 0   |     |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
| <20%                                 | 20-30%   | 30-40%  | 40-50%   | >50%  |     |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
| Number of staff/ 1000 people served  | Efficiency   | 4   | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>&lt;5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>8</td> <td>&gt;8</td> </tr> </table>                            | 4   | 3   | 2 | 1   | 0  | <5    | 6        | 7        | 8        | >8    |     |
| 4                                    | 3  | 2   | 1  | 0   |     |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
| <5                                   | 6  | 7   | 8  | >8  |     |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
| Governance                           | Availability of Management committee                       | Accountability  | 4  | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </table>  | 4   | 0 | Yes | No |       |          |          |          |       |     |
| 4                                    | 0  |   |  |   |     |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |
| Yes                                  | No   |   |  |   |     |   |     |    |       |          |          |          |       |     |

|               |   |   |        |  |  |  |  |  |   |   |   |   |   |               |                 |        |        |           |
|---------------|---|---|--------|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---------------|-----------------|--------|--------|-----------|
|               | Diversity of Management Committee (Gender, Youth, PWD)  | Inclusion   | 4      | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td colspan="4">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Diversified</td> <td colspan="4">Not Diversified</td> </tr> </table>  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 2 |   |   |   | Diversified   | Not Diversified |        |        |           |
| 4             | 2   |   |        |  |  |  |  |  |   |   |   |   |   |               |                 |        |        |           |
| Diversified   | Not Diversified   |   |        |  |  |  |  |  |   |   |   |   |   |               |                 |        |        |           |
| Systems       | Availability of Management systems e.g., Consumer records, financial management, HR, Stores & Investment plan | Efficiency  | 10     | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All 5 systems</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1 or none</td> </tr> </table>        |  |  |  |  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | All 5 systems | 4               | 3      | 2      | 1 or none |
| 4             | 3   | 2   | 1      | 0  |  |  |  |  |   |   |   |   |   |               |                 |        |        |           |
| All 5 systems | 4   | 3   | 2      | 1 or none  |  |  |  |  |   |   |   |   |   |               |                 |        |        |           |
| Liability     | % Total debt/ Revenue Collected   | Determine debt service ability of the utility   | 10     | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>&lt;25%</td> <td>25-30%</td> <td>30-35%</td> <td>35-40%</td> <td>&gt;40%</td> </tr> </table> |  |  |  |  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | <25%          | 25-30%          | 30-35% | 35-40% | >40%      |
| 4             | 3   | 2   | 1      | 0  |  |  |  |  |   |   |   |   |   |               |                 |        |        |           |
| <25%          | 25-30%  | 30-35%  | 35-40% | >40%   |  |  |  |  |   |   |   |   |   |               |                 |        |        |           |
|               | Grant Dependency<br>Proportion of O&M cost financed through grants  | Indicator of utility's' ability to cater for its costs and remain solvent without External assistance | 10     | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0-10%</td> <td>10-15%</td> <td>15-20%</td> <td>&gt;20</td> </tr> </table>         |  |  |  |  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0             | 0-10%           | 10-15% | 15-20% | >20       |
| 4             | 3   | 2   | 1      | 0  |  |  |  |  |   |   |   |   |   |               |                 |        |        |           |
| 0             | 0-10%   | 10-15%  | 15-20% | >20  |  |  |  |  |   |   |   |   |   |               |                 |        |        |           |

### Creditworthiness Index Data

|            |  | Annual Cost    |                  |             |            | Annual Revenue   |                   | Technical                   |                   |                   |              | Governance                           |  | Systems   | Liabilities |
|------------|--|----------------|------------------|-------------|------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|-------------|
|            |  | Total O&M Cost | Maintenance Cost | Energy Cost | Staff Cost | Expected Revenue | Collected Revenue | Population in coverage area | Population served | Estimation of NRW | No. of staff | Availability of management Committee | Composition of Management Comm. Yes/No | Availability of management systems (Financial, Consumer | Debts       |
| Lamu       |  |                |                  |             |            |                  |                   |                             |                   |                   |              |                                      |  |   |             |
| 1.         | Poromoko/ Pangani Water and Sanitation Project | 212,875        | 69,000           | 0           | 143,875    | 628,000          | 532,626           | 10,500                      | 5,500             | 6                 | 2            | Yes                                  | Yes                                    | Yes   | 45,160      |
| Tana River |  |                |                  |             |            |                  |                   |                             |                   |                   |              |                                      |  |   |             |
| 2.         | Nanighi Water and Sanitation Project           | 250,000        | 10,000           | 0           | 240,000    | 420,000          | 200,000           | 1,100                       | 1,100             | 10                | 15           | Yes                                  | Yes                                    | Yes   | -           |



|         |                                     | Annual Cost    |                  |             |            | Annual Revenue   |                   | Technical                   |                   |                   |              | Governance                           |  | Systems   | Liabilities |
|---------|-------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------|------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|-------------|
|         |                                     | Total O&M Cost | Maintenance Cost | Energy Cost | Staff Cost | Expected Revenue | Collected Revenue | Population in coverage area | Population served | Estimation of NRW | No. of staff | Availability of management Committee | Composition of Management Comm. Yes/No | Availability of management systems (Financial, Consumer | Debts       |
| 3.      | Kipao Water and Sanitation Project  | 430,000        | 10,000           | 0           | 420,000    | 540,000          | 300,000           | 7,000                       | 7,000             | 10                | 20           | Yes                                  | Yes                                    | Yes   | -           |
| Wajir   |                                     |                |                  |             |            |                  |                   |                             |                   |                   |              |                                      |  |   |             |
| 4.      | Korija Water and Sanitation Project | 2,320,000      | 300,000          | 1,300,000   | 720,000    | 5,559,000        | 3,239,000         | 2,000                       | 500               | 40                | 6            | Yes                                  | Yes                                    | Yes   | -           |
| 5.      | Riba Water and Sanitation Project   | 2,640,000      | 360,000          | 1,560,000   | 720,000    | 6,670,800        | 4,030,800         | 5,000                       | 1,200             | 30                | 8            | Yes                                  | Yes                                    | Yes   | -           |
| 6.      | Sabuli Water and Sanitation Project | 2,900,000      | 375,000          | 1,625,000   | 900,000    | 6,948,750        | 4,048,750         | 5,000                       | 1,800             | 30                | 8            | Yes                                  | Yes                                    | Yes   | -           |
| Turkana |                                     |                |                  |             |            |                  |                   |                             |                   |                   |              |                                      |  |   |             |
| 7..     | Lokichar Water & Sanitation Project | 2,015,640      | 334,200          | 600,000     | 1,081,440  | 4,512,960        | 3,604,800         | 33,153                      | 25,700            |                   |              | Yes                                  | Yes                                    | Yes   | 115,700     |

Indicator weighted scores and CWI

| Indicator                                      |                | Cost                                      |                                      |                                     | Revenue  |                                     | Technical  |                     |                                     | Governance                           |  | Systems   | Liability                       |  |      |
|--|----------------|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------|--|------|
| Project  |                | % Of Maintenance costs of total O&M costs | % Of energy costs of total O&M costs | % Of staff costs of total O&M costs | % Difference between collected Revenue and expected Rev. | O&M Coverage (%Revenue of O&M Cost) | % Of people with water supply/population of the area | % Estimation of NRW | Number of staff/ 1000 people served | Availability of Management committee | Diversity of Management Committee (Gender, Youth, PWD) | Availability of Management systems e.g., Consumer records, financial management, HR, Stores & Investment plan | % Total debt/ Revenue Collected | Grant Dependency, Proportion of O&M cost financed through grants | CWI  |
|  |                | Weight                                    | 10                                   | 10                                  | 10   | 10                                  | 10   | 4                   | 4                                   | 4                                    | 4  | 4   | 10                              | 10   | 10   |
| Poromoko/ Pangani Water and Sanitation Project |                | 32.4                                      | 0                                    | 67.6                                | 15.2   | 250.0                               | 52.4   | 6                   | 0.4                                 | Y                                    | Y  | Y   | 8.5                             | 0  |      |
|  | Score          | 4   | 4                                    | 0                                   | 4  | 4                                   | 0  | 4                   | 4                                   | 4                                    | 4  | 4   | 4                               | 4  |      |
|  | Weighted score | 10  | 10                                   | 0                                   | 10   | 10                                  | 0  | 4                   | 4                                   | 4                                    | 4  | 10  | 10                              | 10   | 86.0 |
| Nanighi water and sanitation project           |                | 4   | 0                                    | 96                                  | 47.6   | 80                                  | 100  | 10                  | 13.6                                | Y                                    | Y  | Y   | -                               | 20.0   |      |
|  | Score          | 1   | 4                                    | 0                                   | 2  | 0                                   | 4  | 4                   | 0                                   | 4                                    | 4  | 4   | 4                               | 0  |      |
|  | Weighted score | 2.5                                       | 10                                   | 0                                   | 5  | 0                                   | 4  | 4                   | 0                                   | 4                                    | 4  | 4   | 10                              | 0  | 53.5 |
| Kipao water and sanitation project             |                | 2.4                                       | 0                                    | 97.6                                | 55.6   | 69.8                                | 100  | 10                  | 2.8                                 | Y                                    | Y  | Y   | 0                               | 30.2   |      |
|  | Score          | 1   | 4                                    | 0                                   | 2  | 0                                   | 4  | 4                   | 4                                   | 4                                    | 4  | 4   | 4                               | 0  |      |
|  | Weighted score | 2.5                                       | 10                                   | 0                                   | 5  | 0                                   | 4  | 4                   | 4                                   | 4                                    | 4  | 10  | 10                              | 0  | 57.5 |
| Korija Water and Sanitation Project            |                | 12.9                                      | 56.0                                 | 31.1                                | 58.0   | 139.6                               | 25   | 40                  | 12                                  | Y                                    | Y  | Y   | 0                               | 0  |      |
|  | Score          | 4   | 0                                    | 2                                   | 2  | 4                                   | 0  | 1                   | 0                                   | 4                                    | 4  | 4   | 4                               | 4  |      |
|  | Weighted score | 10  | 0                                    | 5                                   | 5  | 10                                  | 0  | 1                   | 0                                   | 4                                    | 4  | 10  | 10                              | 10   | 69.0 |
| Riba Water and Sanitation Project              |                | 13.6                                      | 59.1                                 | 27.4                                | 60.4   | 152.7                               | 24   | 30                  | 6.7                                 | Y                                    | Y  | Y   | 0                               | 0  |      |
|  | Score          | 4   | 0                                    | 4                                   | 3  | 4                                   | 0  | 3                   | 3                                   | 4                                    | 4  | 4   | 4                               | 4  |      |
|  | Weighted score | 10  | 0                                    | 10                                  | 7.5  | 10                                  | 0  | 3                   | 3                                   | 4                                    | 4  | 10  | 10                              | 10   | 81.5 |
| Sabuli Water and Sanitation Project            |                | 12.9                                      | 56.0                                 | 31.1                                | 58.3   | 139.6                               | 36   | 30                  | 4.4                                 | Y                                    | Y  | Y   | 0                               | 0  |      |
|  | Score          | 4   | 0                                    | 2                                   | 2  | 4                                   | 0  | 3                   | 4                                   | 4                                    | 4  | 4   | 4                               | 4  |      |
|  | Weighted score | 10  | 0                                    | 5                                   | 5  | 10                                  | 0  | 3                   | 4                                   | 4                                    | 4  | 10  | 10                              | 10   | 75.0 |
| Lokichar Water & Sanitation Project            |                | 16.6                                      | 29.8                                 | 53.6                                | 79.9   | 178.8                               | 77.5   | 15                  | 0.4                                 | Y                                    | Y  | Y   | 3.2                             | 0  |      |
|  | Score          | 4   | 0                                    | 0                                   | 3  | 4                                   | 1  | 4                   | 4                                   | 4                                    | 4  | 4   | 4                               | 4  |      |
|  | Weighted score | 10  | 0                                    | 0                                   | 7.5  | 10                                  | 1  | 4                   | 4                                   | 4                                    | 4  | 10  | 10                              | 10   | 74.5 |

## 6.0 Annex 6: List of Documents Reviewed

1. Addendum to Development Engagement Document - Access to and Management of Water Resources (Water Sector Trust Fund – WSTF)
2. Annual Rural Harmonised Report; WaterFund, 2017/2018
3. Draft Mid-Term Review Report, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018
4. End of Project Report– Water and Livelihood Programme – Kenya, Water Sector Trust Fund.
5. Garissa County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP), 2018 – 2022
6. Geere, J.-A. and Cortobius, M. 2017. Who carries the weight of water? Fetching water in rural and urban areas and the implications for water security. *Water Alternatives* 10(2): 513-540
7. Inception Support to Water Sector Trust Fund – Water and Livelihood Programme – Kenya. Inception Report
8. Isiolo County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP), 2018 – 2022
9. Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan (KISEDIP), 2018 – 2022
10. Kenya Water Service Provider: Creditworthiness Index Report. A publication of the Water Services Regulatory Board in collaboration with the World Bank Water Practice, November 2015
11. Kenya Country Programme 2016–2020 Green Growth and Employment Thematic Programme — Access to and Management of Water Resources in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands Development Engagement Document
12. Kenya National Housing and Population Census, KNBS, 2019
13. Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Evaluation, Susan Croes
14. Kirkpatrick and Beyond: A review of Models of Training Evaluation, P Tamkin, J Yarnall and M Kerrin, 2002
15. Lamu County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP), 2018 – 2022
16. Mandera County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP), 2018 – 2022
17. Marsabit County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP), 2018 – 2022
18. Mati, B. M.; Muchiri, J. M.; Njenga, K.; Penning de Vries, F.; Merrey, D. J. 2005. Assessing water availability under pastoral livestock systems in drought prone Isiolo District, Kenya. Working Paper 106. Colombo, Sri Lanka: International Water Management Institute (IWMI)
19. OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use, 2019
20. Program Evaluation through Kirkpatrick's Framework, Omer Gokhan Ulum, July 2015
21. Sustainability Assessment of Rural Water Service Delivery Models: Findings of a multi-Country Review. The World Bank, August 2017
22. Tana River County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP), 2018 – 2022
23. The Water Act 2016
24. Turkana County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP), 2018 – 2022
25. Turkana County Water, Sanitation Services Sector Strategic Plan, 2017 – 2021
26. United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) Kenya Fact Sheet, August 2017
27. Wajir County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP), 2018 – 2022
28. Water Sector Trust: Fund Strategic Plan 2018 – 2022
29. Water Sector Trust Fund: County Engagement Strategy

## 7.0 Annex 7: List of Key Evaluation Participants

| NO. | NAME                     | DESIGNATION   | ORGANIZATION                       |
|-----|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| 1.  | Nancy Njenga             | Water Programmes  | DANIDA                             |
| 2.  | Willis Ombai             | Ag. Chief Executive Officer                                 | WATERFUND                          |
| 3.  | Eng. Rose Nyikuri        | Manager, Water Resources and Climate Change                 | WATERFUND                          |
| 4.  | Peter Koech              | Manager, Water and Sanitation                               | WATERFUND                          |
| 5.  | Elly Ochere              | Ag. Manager, P, R, M&E                                      | WATERFUND                          |
| 6.  | George Muhia             | Programmes' Technical Advisor                               | WATERFUND                          |
| 7.  | Violet Mucheni           | GGEP Programme Team Leader                                  | WATERFUND                          |
| 8.  | Nicodemus Onunga         | WLP Programme Coordinator                                   | WATERFUND                          |
| 9.  | Angeline Were            | Principal Finance Officer                                   | WATERFUND                          |
| 10. | Jackson Mwangi           | Snr. Community Engagement Officer                           | WRA                                |
| 11. | Wathome Stephen          | Programme Manager, Agriculture, Job creation and Resilience | Delegation of the EU to Kenya      |
| 12. | Lisa Andersson           | Snr. Programme Manager, Environment and Climate Change      | Embassy of Sweden                  |
| 13. | Hassan Yussuf Hassan     | Regional Director   | NRT- Coast                         |
| 14. | Abdikarim Garat Hassan   | Resident Engineer   | WATERFUND, Tana River              |
| 15. | Fredrick Thuva Kimera    | Ag. Commercial Manager                                      | TAWASCO                            |
| 16. | Salim Juma Makorani      | Technical Manager   | TAWASCO                            |
| 17. | Athman Ali Bureya        | Area Chief  | Mpeketoni                          |
| 18. | Hussein Roba             | Ward Administrator  | Mkumbini –Lamu West                |
| 19. | Benson Kariuki           | Chairman- LAKWA   | Lake Kenyatta Water Company        |
| 20. | William Wairegi          | Manager –LAKWA  | Lake Kenyatta Water Company        |
| 21. | Mwanahamisi Hadulo Jillo | Manager   | Tana Delta Conservancy             |
| 22. | Hamadi Dala Hiyesa       | Treasurer   | Tana Delta Conservancy             |
| 23. | Hussein Wayu             | Warden  | Tana Delta Conservancy             |
| 24. | Kenneth Wandugu          | Resident Engineer   | WATERFUND, Lamu                    |
| 25. | Abarufa Dido Abarufa     | Director Water Services                                     | Lamu County Government             |
| 26. | Athman Dumila            | County Public Health Officer                                | Lamu County Government             |
| 27. | Jacob Muweye Chidzipha   | Technical Manager   | LAWASCO                            |
| 28. | Amina Abdalla            | Officer-  | WRA- Lamu                          |
| 29. | Galamo S. Golo           | Area Chief, Kipao   | Lamu                               |
| 30. | Zainab Gure              | Resident Engineer   | WATERFUND, Garissa                 |
| 31. | Erick Odoyo              | CDO   | WRA, Garissa                       |
| 32. | Salma Hassan             | CDA   | WRA, Garissa                       |
| 33. | Fartum Noor              | CDA   | WRA, Garissa                       |
| 34. | Omar Hassan              | Technical Manager   | Garissa Water and Sewerage Company |
| 35. | Steven Mbogo             | Accountant  | Garissa Water and Sewerage Company |
| 36. | Farah Tube               | Resident Engineer   | WATERFUND, Wajir                   |
| 37. | Diyad Hujale             | CEC Water   | County Government of Wajir         |

|     |                         |   |   |
|-----|-------------------------|---|---|
| 38. | Ahmed Omar              | Technical Manager                             | Wajir Water and Sewerage Company              |
| 39. | Siyad Adow              | Finance Manager                               | Wajir Water and Sewerage Company              |
| 40. | Mohamed Hassan          | Resident Engineer                             | WATERFUND, Mandera                            |
| 41. | Hussein Mohamed Alio    | County Drought Coordinator                    | NDMA, Mandera                                 |
| 42. | Abdi Adan Abdile        | Deputy Director, Water Services               | County Government of Mandera                  |
| 43. | Abdikheir A. Suraw      | Assistant Director, Water Services            | County Government of Mandera                  |
| 44. | Hassan Ali              | PHO   | County Government of Mandera                  |
| 45. | Aliyare Mohamed         | Technical Service Manager                     | Mandera Water and Sewerage Company            |
| 46. | Abdirashid Bashey       | Area Chief, Lanqura                           | Mandera                                       |
| 47. | Ibrahim Ugas            | Area Chief, Kamor                             | Mandera                                       |
| 48. | Ibrahim Hassan Yusuf    | Chairman                                      | Lanqura Community Rural Water Project         |
| 49. | Mohamed Adan Billow     | Chairman                                      | Mujtama WRUA                                  |
| 50. | Abdilaahi Huka Sama     | Resident Engineer                             | WATERFUND, Marsabit/Isiolo                    |
| 51. | Parkolwa, H Mustafa     | County Drought Coordinator                    | NDMA, Marsabit                                |
| 52. | Benard Simba            | Licensing Officer                             | WRA, Marsabit                                 |
| 53. | Dickson K. Maitho       | Principal Superintendent of Water Engineering | County Government of Marsabit                 |
| 54. | Roba Golicha            | PHO   | County Government of Marsabit                 |
| 55. | Julius Kariju Ikirima   | Hydrogeologist/Operational Manager            | County Government of Marsabit                 |
| 56. | Yatani Barille          | Chairman                                      | Bubisa WRUA                                   |
| 57. | Juma Amin               | Chairman                                      | Turbi, WRUA                                   |
| 58. | Lordman Lekalkuli       | County Drought Coordinator                    | NDMA –Isiolo County                           |
| 59. | Bashir Jillo            | County Director-Water                         | County Govt. Isiolo                           |
| 60. | Victor Adaka            | Water Officer -Rural                          | County Government of Isiolo                   |
| 61. | Geoffrey Manene         | Head Of Planning & Design                     | County Govt. Isiolo                           |
| 62. | Diba Duba               | Sub-County Water Officer                      | County Govt. Isiolo                           |
| 63. | Abdullah Sora           | Managing Director                             | Isiolo Water and Sewerage Company             |
| 64. | Nura Banaya             | Finance Manager                               | Isiolo Water and Sewerage Company             |
| 65. | Catherine Mwendwa       | HR Manager                                    | Isiolo Water and Sewerage Company             |
| 66. | Jirm Diba               | Area Chief, Bubisa                            | Marsabit                                      |
| 67. | Herman Kiruaye          | Sub-Basin Area Coordinator                    | WRA, Lodwar                                   |
| 68. | Moses Natome            | CEO Water                                     | County Government of Turkana                  |
| 69. | Tito Ochieng            | Director Water                                | County Government of Turkana                  |
| 70. | Maiyo Elphas            | SCPHO   | County Government of Turkana, Turkana West    |
| 71. | Reuben Kibiego          | CWASH Coordinator                             | County Government of Turkana                  |
| 72. | Peter Mitunda           | PHO   | County Government of Turkana, Turkana Central |
| 73. | Patrick Eyapan Naboikut | Resident Monitor                              | WATERFUND, Turkana                            |

|     |                         |                   |                                     |
|-----|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 74. | Grishon Muhoro Ngige    | Resident Engineer | WATERFUND, Turkana                  |
| 75. | Philemon Erot           | Finance Officer   | Lokichar Water and Sewerage Company |
| 76. | Emmanuel Nachunen Epuur | Managing Director | Lokichar Water and Sewerage Company |
| 77. | Michael Etoot Lokuryan  | Chairman          | Lorogum WRUA                        |
| 78. | Josephat Jarso Roba     | Chairman          | Godarupa WATSAN project             |
| 79. | Galana M. Babusa        | Chairman          | Kiraguni WRUA                       |

## 8.0 Annex 8 Data Collection Tools

### 8.1 Household Survey, Water and Sanitation Projects



## End Term Evaluation for Green Growth & Employment Programme Household Survey

Good morning/afternoon. My name is..... I work with Advance Development Initiative (ADI). ADI has been contracted by WaterFund and DANIDA to conduct an End Term Evaluation of the just concluded GGEP/WLP programmes. This interview will take about 40 minutes of your time. Your household has been randomly selected. Your identity and responses will be treated with confidentiality. You are free to participate or opt out of this survey at any time, but we hope you will agree to answer the questions since your views are important.

Do you have any questions? (Interviewer responds to the questions raised without getting into the questionnaire content).

Do I have your permission to continue?  Yes  No (End the interview)

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Questionnaire Number: |  |
| Programme             | Green Growth and Employment Programme (GGEP) |
| Project Name          |  |
| County                |  |

### Section A: Socio-demographic characteristics

| S/No | Questions                               | Category     | Mark Response |
|------|---|--------------|---------------|
| 1    | Sex of respondent (Observation)         | Male         |               |
|      |   | Female       |               |
| 2    | How old were you on your last birthday? | 18-35        |               |
|      |   | 36-50        |               |
|      |   | 51 and above |               |
| 3    |   | None         |               |

|  |  |                         |  |
|--|--|-------------------------|--|
|  | What is the highest level of school you completed? | Primary                 |  |
|  |  | Secondary               |  |
|  |  | Post-secondary/Tertiary |  |
|  |  | College/university      |  |

## Section B: Access to Water

| S/No | Questions   | Category   | Mark Response |
|------|---|--|---------------|
| 1    | What is the <b>main</b> source of domestic drinking water for members of your household?                                  | Public tap/standpipe   |               |
|      |   | Handpumps/boreholes  |               |
|      |   | Unprotected hand-dug well  |               |
|      |   | Water seller/kiosks  |               |
|      |   | Piped connection to house (or neighbour's house)                   |               |
|      |   | Surface water (lake, pond, dam, river)                             |               |
|      |   | Rainwater collection   |               |
|      |   | Other (please specify):  |               |
| 2    | What is the average distance to your nearest water source?  | In Kilometres  |               |
|      |   | Water is available on premises                                     |               |
| 3    | How long does it take to fetch water?   | Specify Number of Minutes  |               |
|      |   | Water is available on premises                                     |               |
| 4    | Do you collect enough water to meet all your households' needs – <b>NOT</b> for animal use, agriculture, gardening, etc.? | Yes ( <b>If yes skip to Question 6</b> )                           |               |
|      |   | No   |               |
| 5    | If not, why?  | There are water shortages  |               |
|      |   | Water is too far   |               |
|      |   | It is too dangerous to get water                                   |               |
|      |   | Can't afford to buy enough   |               |
|      |   | Waiting time at the water point is too long                        |               |
|      |   | Don't have enough storage containers                               |               |
|      |   | limitation of volume of water that can be collected at water point |               |
|      |   | Don't know   |               |
| 6    | Is water supply from the Main source constantly/always available?   | Yes  |               |
|      |   | No   |               |
| 7    | Did you drink water directly from the river or canal (or any other source of surface water) within the last 7 days?       | Yes  |               |
|      |   | No   |               |
|      |   | Don't know   |               |
| 8    | Do you pay for your drinking water?   | Yes  |               |
|      |   | No ( <b>If no, skip to question 10</b> )                           |               |
|      |   | Don't know   |               |
| 9    | If yes, how much?   | Per 20 Liter Jerrican  |               |
| 10   | Do you pay for water services for non-drinking and sanitation use?  | Yes  |               |
|      |   | No ( <b>If no, skip to question 12</b> )                           |               |
|      |   | Don't know   |               |



|    |  |                       |  |
|----|--|-----------------------|--|
| 11 | If yes, how much?  | Per 20 Liter Jerrican |  |
| 12 | Are you satisfied with your water situation?                           | Yes                   |  |
|    |  | No                    |  |
| 13 | To what extent do you feel the Project has addressed your water needs? | Larger extent         |  |
|    |  | Less extent           |  |
|    |  | Not responsible       |  |

### Section C: Sanitation and Hygiene

| S/No           | Questions   | Category                               | Mark Response |
|----------------|---|--|---------------|
| 1              | Where do you and your household members (excluding children under 5) usually go to defecate?              | Household latrine                      |               |
|                |   | Communal latrine                       |               |
|                |   | Open defecation                        |               |
|                |   | Plastic bag                            |               |
|                |   | Bucket Toilet                          |               |
|                |   | Other, Specify                         |               |
| 2              | How do you dispose infants waste (children under-5)?  | No infant in the household             |               |
|                |   | Child used toilet/latrine              |               |
|                |   | Put/rinsed into toilet or latrine      |               |
|                |   | Put/rinsed into drain or ditch         |               |
|                |   | Thrown into garbage/shamba/bush        |               |
|                |   | Buried                                 |               |
|                |   | Left in the open                       |               |
| Other, Specify |   |  |               |
| 4              | If communal latrine, how many households, including this one, share this facility?                        | State Number                           |               |
| 5              | Does this latrine provide adequate privacy for you and your household members? (Mark all correct answers) | Yes                                    |               |
|                |   | No                                     |               |
|                |   | No latrine                             |               |
|                |   | Don't know                             |               |
| 6              | If not, why?  | Infrastructure/door is poor or damaged |               |
|                |   | Lock missing/not working               |               |
|                |   | Too close to the house                 |               |
|                |   | Others, specify                        |               |
| 7              | How satisfied are you with the place where your family defecate?  | Very unsatisfied                       |               |
|                |   | Somewhat unsatisfied                   |               |
|                |   | No opinion                             |               |
|                |   | Somewhat satisfied                     |               |
|                |   | Very satisfied                         |               |
| 8              | Can you use this facility at all hours of the day and night?  | Yes                                    |               |
|                |   | No                                     |               |
|                |   | No latrine                             |               |
|                |   | Don't know                             |               |
| 10             | How frequent are diarrhoea cases among children less than 5 years of age?                                 | Very frequent                          |               |
|                |   | Less frequent                          |               |
|                |   | Rare                                   |               |
| 11             | How frequent are diarrhoea cases among persons above 5 years of age?                                      | Very frequent                          |               |
|                |   | Less frequent                          |               |
|                |   | Rare                                   |               |

|    |   |                    |  |
|----|---|--------------------|--|
| 12 | Was it possible to wash your hands with soap after the last time you went to the toilet at/near home? | YES                |  |
|    |   | NO                 |  |
| 13 | If NO, why?   | No water available |  |
|    |   | No soap available  |  |
|    |   | Don't see the need |  |
| 14 | To what extent do you feel the Project has addressed your sanitation and hygiene needs?               | Larger extent      |  |
|    |   | Less extent        |  |
|    |   | Not responsible    |  |

## Section D: Livelihoods

| S/No            | Questions   | Category   | Mark Response |
|-----------------|---|--|---------------|
| 1               | Is your household engaged in agriculture (crops production, small animals, or livestock)?   | Yes  |               |
|                 |   | No   |               |
|                 |   | Don't know   |               |
| 2               | Do you or your household actively grow food for commercial or consumption purposes? (Select one)  | Yes, for commercial purposes only                  |               |
|                 |   | Yes, for consumption purposes only                 |               |
|                 |   | Yes, for both consumption and commercial purposes  |               |
|                 |   | Other, specify                                     |               |
| 3               | What are the primary crops you grow? ( <b>Select all that apply</b> )   | Maize  |               |
|                 |   | Legumes  |               |
|                 |   | Cassava  |               |
|                 |   | Sweet potato                                       |               |
|                 |   | Potato   |               |
|                 |   | Cereals  |               |
|                 |   | Fruits   |               |
|                 |   | Vegetables   |               |
|                 |   | Forage crops                                       |               |
|                 |   | Banana/plantain                                    |               |
| Others, specify |   |  |               |
| 4               | What is the source of water for your farming?   | Rainwater  |               |
|                 |   | Water pan  |               |
|                 |   | Dug well   |               |
|                 |   | Borehole   |               |
|                 |   | Piped water potable supply system                  |               |
|                 |   | River  |               |
|                 |   | Sand dam   |               |
|                 |   | Irrigation canal                                   |               |
| Other, specify  |   |  |               |
| 5               | Do you undertake any activities to protect your water source?   | Yes  |               |
|                 |   | No (skip to question 11)                           |               |
|                 |   | Don't know   |               |
| 6               | If YES, which ones?   | Provide names                                      |               |
| 7               | What new agricultural practices have you adopted in crop and livestock production in the last 5 years? ( <b>Select all that apply</b> ) | I have not made any improvements                   |               |
|                 |   | I have improved water conservation and utilization |               |
|                 |   | I have improved on crop selection                  |               |
|                 |   | I have improved soil fertility                     |               |
|                 |   | I have established a garden                        |               |

|    |  |   |  |
|----|--|---|--|
|    |  | I have improved on selection of animals                 |  |
|    |  | I have improved housing for my livestock                |  |
|    |  | I have improved on the quality of animal feed and water |  |
|    |  | New / improved vegetable                                |  |
|    |  | Other, specify  |  |
| 8  | What is the source(s) of water for watering your livestock?<br>(Select all that apply)       | Rainwater   |  |
|    |  | Dug well  |  |
|    |  | Water pan   |  |
|    |  | Borehole  |  |
|    |  | Piped water potable supply system                       |  |
|    |  | River   |  |
|    |  | Sand dam  |  |
|    |  | Irrigation canal  |  |
|    |  | Other, specify  |  |
| 9  | How reliable is the water supply for your animals?   | Very reliable   |  |
|    |  | Reliable  |  |
|    |  | Fai   |  |
|    |  | Unreliable  |  |
|    |  | Very unreliable   |  |
| 10 | What is your primary problem or challenge that you face when raising livestock? (Select one) | Water   |  |
|    |  | Grazing land/Fodder                                     |  |
|    |  | Disease   |  |
|    |  | Lack of skills / training (herding, husbandry, etc.)    |  |
|    |  | Access to Market / No Market                            |  |
|    |  | Access to Inputs (vet support, etc)                     |  |
|    |  | Access to finance                                       |  |
|    |  | Other, specify  |  |
| 11 | Looking at the last 5 years, has your farm produce increased. (Both crops and livestock)     | Yes   |  |
|    |  | No  |  |
|    |  | Same  |  |
|    |  | Don't know  |  |
| 12 | If YES, to what extent do you think the project is responsible                               | Greater extent  |  |
|    |  | Little extent   |  |
|    |  | Non   |  |
| 13 | How has the programme improved your living standards? <b>(Multiple response)</b>             | Increased Household income                              |  |
|    |  | Increased access to education                           |  |
|    |  | Increased access to food                                |  |
|    |  | Better housing  |  |
|    |  | Improved health   |  |
|    |  | New employment Opportunities                            |  |
|    |  | Others specify  |  |

**Thank you very much for taking part in this Survey**

## 8.2 Household Survey, WRM Projects

### Section A: Socio-demographic characteristics

| S/No | Questions  | Category                | Mark Response |
|------|--|-------------------------|---------------|
| 1    | Sex of respondent (Observation)                    | Male                    |               |
|      |  | Female                  |               |
| 2    | How old were you on your last birthday?            | 18-35                   |               |
|      |  | 36-50                   |               |
|      |  | 51 and above            |               |
| 3    | What is the highest level of school you completed? | None                    |               |
|      |  | Primary                 |               |
|      |  | Secondary               |               |
|      |  | Post-secondary/Tertiary |               |
|      |  | College/university      |               |

### Section B: Sustainable and Community-based Management of Water Resources

| S/No | Questions  | Category  | Mark Response |
|------|--|---|---------------|
| 1    | Do you belong to a Water Resources Users Association (WRUA)?   | Yes   |               |
|      |  | No  |               |
| 2    | For how many years have you been a member of the WRUA?   | Less than 1 year  |               |
|      |  | 2-3 years   |               |
|      |  | 3-5 years   |               |
|      |  | Over 5 years  |               |
| 3    | Does the WRUA carry out community sensitization meetings to create awareness on soil, rangeland conservation and water resources management? | Yes   |               |
|      |  | No  |               |
| 4    | If yes, how many have been done within the last 1 year?  | Number of times   |               |
| 5    | Has the WRUA done or participated in activities aimed at soil, rangeland, and water conservation within the community?                       | Yes   |               |
|      |  | No  |               |
| 6    | If yes, which ones?  | Riverbank protection (fencing, riparian pegging, tree planting)   |               |
|      |  | Construction of water storage and conservation infrastructure e.g., sand dams and water pans among other activities |               |
|      |  | Regulation of water use and equitable distribution through bulk metering  |               |
|      |  | Activities along sub-catchments to protect against illegal abstractions of water and other destructive practices    |               |
|      |  | Others, specify   |               |
| 7    | How have these activities helped to reduce rangeland and water resource conflicts in the sub basin?  | Availability of enough water  |               |
|      |  | Provision of foddors for livestock  |               |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | Promotion of alternatives livelihood activities |  |
|  |  | Others, specify                                 |  |

### Section C: Livelihoods

| S/No           | Questions  | Category  | Mark Response |
|----------------|--|---|---------------|
| 1              | Is your household engaged in agriculture (crops production, small animals, or livestock)?                                      | Yes   |               |
|                |  | No  |               |
|                |  | Don't know  |               |
| 2              | What are the primary crops you grow? (Select all that apply)   | Maize   |               |
|                |  | Legumes   |               |
|                |  | Cassava   |               |
|                |  | Sweet potato  |               |
|                |  | Potato  |               |
|                |  | Cereals   |               |
|                |  | Fruits  |               |
|                |  | Vegetables  |               |
|                |  | Forage crops  |               |
|                |  | Banana/plantain   |               |
|                |  | Others, specify   |               |
| 3              | What is the source of water for your farming?  | Rainwater   |               |
|                |  | Water pan   |               |
|                |  | Dug well  |               |
|                |  | Borehole  |               |
|                |  | Piped water potable supply system                       |               |
|                |  | River   |               |
|                |  | Sand dam  |               |
|                |  | Irrigation canal  |               |
| Other, specify |  |   |               |
| 4              | Do you undertake any activities to protect your water source?  | Yes   |               |
|                |  | No (skip to question 11)                                |               |
|                |  | Don't know  |               |
| 5              | If YES, which ones?  | Provide names   |               |
| 6              | What new agricultural practices have you adopted in crop and livestock production in the last 4 years? (Select all that apply) | I have not made any improvements                        |               |
|                |  | I have improved water conservation and utilization      |               |
|                |  | I have improved on crop selection                       |               |
|                |  | I have improved soil fertility                          |               |
|                |  | I have established a garden                             |               |
|                |  | I have improved on selection of animals                 |               |
|                |  | I have improved housing for my livestock                |               |
|                |  | I have improved on the quality of animal feed and water |               |
|                |  | New / improved vegetable                                |               |
|                |  | Other, specify  |               |

|                |   |  |  |
|----------------|---|--|--|
| 7              | What is the source(s) of water for watering your livestock?<br><b>(Select all that apply)</b> | Rainwater  |  |
|                |   | Water pan  |  |
|                |   | Dug well   |  |
|                |   | Borehole   |  |
|                |   | Piped water potable supply system                    |  |
|                |   | River  |  |
|                |   | Sand dam   |  |
|                |   | Irrigation canal                                     |  |
|                |   | Other, specify                                       |  |
| 8              | How reliable is the water supply for your animals?  | Very reliable  |  |
|                |   | Reliable   |  |
|                |   | Fai  |  |
|                |   | Unreliable   |  |
|                |   | Very unreliable                                      |  |
| 9              | What is your primary problem or challenge that you face when raising livestock? (Select one)  | Water  |  |
|                |   | Grazing land/Fodder                                  |  |
|                |   | Disease  |  |
|                |   | Lack of skills / training (herding, husbandry, etc.) |  |
|                |   | Access to Market / No Market                         |  |
|                |   | Access to Inputs (vet support, etc)                  |  |
|                |   | Access to finance                                    |  |
|                |   | Other, specify                                       |  |
| 10             | Looking at the last 5 years, has your farm produce increased. (Both crops and livestock)      | Yes  |  |
|                |   | No   |  |
|                |   | Same   |  |
|                |   | Don't know   |  |
| 11             | If YES, to what extent do you think the project is responsible                                | Greater extent                                       |  |
|                |   | Little extent  |  |
|                |   | None   |  |
| 12             | How has the programme improved your living standards? <b>(Multiple response)</b>              | Increased Household income                           |  |
|                |   | Increased access to education                        |  |
|                |   | Increased access to food                             |  |
|                |   | Better housing                                       |  |
|                |   | Improved health                                      |  |
|                |   | New employment Opportunities                         |  |
| Others specify |   |  |  |

## 8.3 Key Informant Interview Guides

### 1. County Government (Public Health, Water, Sanitation and Environment and Natural Resources Departments)

- i. How is the Water situation in terms of Water coverage, Water quality and households' access?
- ii. How is the Sanitation situation in terms of access to improved sanitation, OD, CLTS?
- iii. What are the major priorities of the County government? Is water, sanitation, and water resources management among them? (Prob programme relevance to these priorities)
- iv. What data or statistics on water or sanitation or hygiene does the county have and how does it use it? (How frequent is this data collected, validated, and disseminated)
- v. Which county legislations exists that govern water, sanitation, and hygiene issues in the County? and how are they enforced? (Probe if and how it enables private sector involvement)
- vi. Are there County annual public financial commitments to water commensurate with meeting needs/ targets?
- vii. What is spent per capita on water separately and sanitation separately by the County – Capex (3-year average)? Capex only e.g., on toilet/latrines development, CLTS, wastewater treatment works, water infrastructure, water treatment, advocacy, and hygiene promotion.
- viii. Are there procedures and processes applied on a regular basis to monitor water and sanitation access and the quality of services in the county and is the information disseminated?
- ix. Does the County have plans for expanding water or sanitation services? What are the county plans?
- x. Was your department involved in the design and implementation of the GGEP/WLP project? If yes, (Probe involvement of department and beneficiaries and community needs at the design stage)
- xi. How did the intervention address the County needs? (Probe gaps existing after implementation)
- xii. Who are the WASH actors in the county and how does the county collaborate with them?
- xiii. Which other interventions related to water, sanitation and environment were being carried out in the same area by the County Government or other development partners? (Probe for coherence between GGEP/WLP and these interventions in terms of interlinkage, complementarity, harmonization)
- xiv. How did WATERFUND's intervention relate in terms of coordination and reporting/sharing lessons with other interventions?
- xv. What are the major achievements of the GGEP/WLP project? (Probe positive and negative impacts including unintended)
- xvi. How was the coordination of partners during this project? How would you have liked the coordination to be done better?
- xvii. Are the results accomplished by the GGEP and WLP programmes likely to be sustainable? (Probe local ownership and likelihood for continued operation or benefits)
- xviii. How did the programme incorporate Environment, Social and Governance (ESG) issues? Probe a) Environmental responsibility through compliance with all relevant environmental laws and regulations b) Social responsibility through labor relations, human rights, diversity, and inclusion and, c) Governance: compliance, ethics, controls, and procedures
- xix. Have you piloted a new water and sanitation PPCP funded project within the last 5 years? (Probe finance leveraged by the piloted PPCP models and lessons learned)
- xx. What could concretely be recommended to ensure sustainability of the action and linkages with other programmes?
- xxi. What would have been done better during the implementation of the project to make it more beneficial or sustainable? Probe about involvement of the most vulnerable and persons with disabilities.

## 2. Implementing Agents (WRUA, WUA, CBO, WSP's)

- i. What were the glaring needs of the communities that were being addressed by this programme?
- ii. How were the beneficiaries' engaged in the design and implementation of the project? (Probe on youths, women, pastoralists, refugees, opinion leaders, and marginalized groups' involvement)
- iii. Has there been an effective coordination mechanism established between WATERFUND and other stakeholders involved in service delivery to the communities?
- iv. Has the support contributed to the development of a sustainable community-based management of water resources structures/system?
- v. Which activities showed greater relevance for the different groups of beneficiaries? Why?
- vi. How did WATERFUND's intervention relate in terms of coordination and reporting/sharing lessons with other interventions?
- vii. Have the programmes efficiently used resources e.g., local expertise, time, and funds? Is or was there potential for resources to be used more efficiently?
- viii. How well did the partnership and management arrangements work and how did they develop over time?
- ix. How well did the financial systems work to support project delivery?
- x. Did your organization receive any specific trainings? (Probe for type of training, relevance, and satisfaction)
- xi. Has your organization demonstrated improved capacity and organizational performance? Explain. (To what extent is this attributed to the training above)
- xii. What unforeseen outcomes were caused by or contributed to by the intervention, and why did these occur? How were these addressed?
- xiii. Do partners (WRUAs/WUAs/CBOs) have the financial capacity to maintain the programme and/or its outputs/outcomes after programme termination? (Probe for capacity, skills, revenue, and expenditure)
- xiv. Are the results accomplished by the GGEP and WLP programmes likely to be sustainable? (Probe local ownership and likelihood for continued operation or benefits)
- xv. How did the programme incorporate Environment, Social and Governance (ESG) issues? Probe a) Environmental responsibility through compliance with all relevant environmental laws and regulations b) Social responsibility through labor relations, human rights, diversity, and inclusion and, c) Governance: compliance, ethics, controls, and procedures
- xvi. How has the programme context changed throughout the implementation of GGEP/WLP programmes? (Probe a) contextual risk (security and conflict, droughts), b) programmematic risks (Uncoordinated developments, unclear devolution mandates) and c) institutional risks (capacity, planning and funding) and adaptation
- xvii. Was the programme innovative and/or what are the main lessons learned?
- xviii. How was the green growth characteristics of resilience (adaptation and mitigation) mainstreamed in the projects?
- xix. How was the green growth characteristics of resource efficiency using the 7Rs namely: reduce, reuse, recycle, rethink, redesign, refuse and recreate mainstreamed in the projects

## 3. Other Development partners (Red Cross, NRT, Finland, Sweden, EU, and IFAD)

- i. What are the key activities carried out under water and sanitation provision? What is the role of the organization in WASH in the County?



- ii. How/ what is your collaboration with County and other actors?
- iii. Does the policy, legislative and regulatory framework enable private sector investment in water supply and sanitation?
- iv. What are the Key innovations or improvement of the technology introduced in the County in terms of water and sanitation provision?
- v. What are the key opportunities in this area in terms of water and sanitation provision?
- vi. What are the challenges experienced in water and sanitation in the County and mitigating strategies?
- vii. What are your future WASH expansion plans and strategies?
- viii. Have you piloted a new water and sanitation PPCP funded project within the last 5 years? (Probe finance leveraged by the piloted PPCP models and lessons learned),
- ix. How did your organization collaborate with GGEP/WLP project implementers?
- x. What are some of the lessons learnt or best practices in WASH? (Probe sustainability)

#### 4. WATERFUND Managers

- i. Has the programme been relevant to WATERFUND priorities/ strategic objectives?
- ii. What was the overall approach and how is it related to the theory of change?
- iii. How did WATERFUND's intervention relate in terms of coordination and reporting/sharing lessons with other interventions?
- iv. To what extent have the relevant National Ministries and County Departments been involved in the information sharing and value adding?
- v. Has there been an effective coordination mechanism established between WATERFUND and other stakeholders involved in service delivery to the communities?
- vi. How have the GGEP and WLP projects addressed cross cutting issues e.g., GESI
- vii. To what extent have measures been taken during planning and implementation to ensure efficient utilization of funding, staff, time, and other resources without compromising on the attainment of quality results? Are measures in place to ensure resources are used appropriately?
- viii. Did programme activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions if any?
- ix. How well did the partnership and management arrangements work and how did they develop over time?
- x. How were local implementing partners involved in project management and how effective was this and what have the benefits or difficulties been with this involvement? Input delivery, synergy among stakeholders etc.
- xi. Has the programme identified a new way of working that could be shared with others? If so, how was the programme innovative and/or what are the main lessons learned.
- xii. Is WATERFUND using MIS to map and manage water and sanitation supported investments? (Probe for availability of MIS and effective use)
- xiii. Have you piloted a new water and sanitation PPCP funded project within the last 5 years? (Probe finance leveraged by the piloted PPCP models and lessons learned),
- xiv. How has the programme context changed throughout the implementation of GGEP/WLP programmes? (Probe a) contextual risk (security and conflict, droughts), b) programmematic risks (Uncoordinated developments, unclear devolution mandates) and c) institutional risks (capacity, planning and funding) and adaptation
- xv. How does WATERFUND shift to strategic partnership and collaboration with NGO's and private sector to design and finance bigger projects enhanced the success of the programme?
- xvi. How has the partnership with DANIDA in GGEP/WLP improved your capacity in programme management (Identification, implementation, and monitoring)?

- xvii. Are the results accomplished by the GGEP and WLP projects likely to be sustainable? (Probe local ownership, involvement of other development partners and mechanisms put in place)
- xviii. What was the project's overall impact and how does this compare with what was expected?
- xix. How was the green growth characteristics addressed in the project (low carbon emission, resilience, and social inclusion)?
- xx. What could concretely be recommended to ensure sustainability of the action and linkages with other programmes including partnerships, design, and implementation?

#### 5. County Resident Monitors/Engineers

- i. What were the glaring needs of the communities that were being addressed by this programme?
- ii. How were the beneficiaries' involved in programme design and implantation? (Probe for GESI, youths, pastoralists, refugees, and other vulnerable groups)
- iii. To what extent is there a sense of local ownership of the programme?
- iv. To what extent was the overall approach adopted by WSFT to address the identified needs in the intervention areas for both the WRUAs/WUAs/CBOs/Conservancies and the communities achieved?
- v. Which activities showed greater relevance for the different groups of beneficiaries? Why?
- vi. Were the activities in the intervention areas well enough coordinated among themselves and with other actors to prevent duplications and avoid gaps?
- vii. Which other interventions related to water, sanitation and environment were being carried out in the same area by the County Government or other development partners? (Probe for coherence between GGEP/WLP and these interventions in terms of interlinkage, complementarity, harmonization)
- viii. What transferable skills (communication, facilitation, networking, expanding social networks and enhancing their interpersonal capacity and leadership) were developed among the participants?
- ix. How often did WATERFUND and partners report and share progress reports with the County Departments?
- x. Has the project supported partners in their ability/capacity and engagement in water related planning and advocacy initiatives with Government, INGOs and donors?
- xi. What were the specific needs of vulnerable groups linked to this project? How did the project address these needs?
- xii. Are the results accomplished by the GGEP and WLP projects likely to be sustainable? (Probe local ownership, involvement of other development partners and mechanisms put in place)
- xiii. How did the programme incorporate Environment, Social and Governance (ESG) issues? Probe a) Environmental responsibility through compliance with all relevant environmental laws and regulations b) Social responsibility through labor relations, human rights, diversity, and inclusion and, c) Governance: compliance, ethics, controls, and procedures
- xiv. Have you piloted a new water and sanitation PPCP funded project within the last 5 years? (Probe finance leveraged by the piloted PPCP models and lessons learned),
- xv. How has the programme context changed throughout the implementation of GGEP/WLP programmes? (Probe a) contextual risk (security and conflict, droughts), b) programmematic risks (Uncoordinated developments, unclear devolution mandates) and c) institutional risks (capacity, planning and funding) and adaptation

- xvi. What was the project's overall impact and how does this compare with what was expected?
- xvii. How was the green growth characteristics addressed in the project (low carbon emission, resilience, and social inclusion)?
- xviii. What could concretely be recommended to ensure sustainability of the action and linkages with other programmes including partnerships, design, and implementation?

## 6. Water Services Boards or Water Services Regulatory Board (WASREB)

- i. Mandate of the Board generally? And specifically in terms of water supply, water resource management and sanitation?
- ii. What are the Statistics of the 8 Counties (Turkana, Wajir, Isiolo, Marsabit, Mandera, Tana River, Lamu and Garissa) in terms of water access or sanitation access and how does their water utilities perform under annual reporting?
- iii. What are the investment plan and key sanitation options promoted by WASREB in these counties?
- iv. Are there annual public financial commitments to water and sanitation infrastructure by these counties' governments?
- v. What are the Key opportunities in terms of water and sanitation investment, management in these Counties? What are the challenges experienced by the Board in meeting its objectives in these Counties and mitigating strategies?
- vi. What are your future and strategies for the Board in terms of Water and sanitation in these counties?
- vii. What aspects of GGEP/WLP projects does the board know? What are the achievements of these projects in relation to WASREB's/Boards interests?
- viii. What would have been done better during the design implementation of the project to make it more beneficial or sustainable? Probe about coordination and partnerships

## 7. Water Resources Authority

- i. What is the Mandate of WRA in terms of water access in the Country?
- ii. What data or statistics on water or sanitation or hygiene does WRA have and how does it use it? Where and how is this data collected or accessed? Probe on frequency
- iii. Who are the key partners working with WRA in the ASAL regions?
- iv. How are the WRUAs registered, supported, regulated, and monitored? Probe on how many exists especially in the 8 counties.
- v. What capacity gaps exists among the WRUAs that hinder effective water resources management?
- vi. What are the major challenges faced by the institution in water resources management in the 8 Counties and how does the institution handle the challenges?
- vii. Which are the key plans and strategies by the institution to improve their output?
- viii. What are some of the mechanisms that should be put in place to ensure sustainability of water resources management projects?

## 8. DANIDA

- i. Which are the key areas of interest that DANIDA has funded WaterFund in ASAL programme?
- ii. Why did DANIDA decide to fund the GGEP/WLP programme? What were the donor's expectations?
- iii. What are the mechanisms the donor has put in place for effective reporting and monitoring of the project implementation, outputs, and outcomes desired?
- iv. What are the key areas of interest in terms of programme design, implementation, and evaluation for the donor?
- v. How has the reporting and consultations between DANIDA and WaterFund for effective implementation of the GGEP/WLP projects?
- vi. How has the programme context changed throughout the implementation of GGEP/WLP programmes? (Probe a) contextual risk (security and conflict, droughts), b) programmematic risks (Uncoordinated developments, unclear devolution mandates) and c) institutional risks (capacity, planning and funding) and adaptation
- vii. Why did the donor agree to re-allocation of funds meant for building capacity of the counties to enact water and sanitation legislation and how will this affect sustainability of the GGEP/WLP project gains?

## 9. Local Administration (Chiefs, Ward administrator)

- i. What are the water sources that exists in this location/ward? Probe on level of water access by HHs.
- ii. What are the challenges the ward/location face in terms of water access?
- iii. Were you part of the GGEP/WLP project? If yes, how were you involved in the project?
- iv. Can you say the project benefited your people? If yes how? And how many households benefitted?
- v. What were the glaring needs of the communities that were being addressed by this programme?
- vi. How were the beneficiaries' involved in programme design and implementation?
- vii. To what extent is there a sense of local ownership of the programme?
- viii. What would have been done better during the implementation of the project to make it more beneficial or sustainable? Probe about involvement of the most vulnerable and persons with disabilities.
- ix. How does your people participate in water resources conservation?
- x. How does your office work with WASH Implementers?
- xi. What types of sanitation facilities are used by the residents of this area? Probe on level of access, ODF villages etc.
- xii. Which partners support WASH activities or projects in the area? What have they done so far in the last 3 years?
- xiii. What are the challenges the ward/location face in terms of water and sanitation access and hygiene promotion?

10. National Government (Ministry of Water and Sanitation/Ministry of Health and Devolution (ASAL)

- i. What is the current situation in the Country in terms of water coverage, water deficit and water access/Sanitation coverage?
- ii. How different is the situation in the ASALs part of the Country in terms of water/sanitation?
- iii. Does the National government have plans of improving access to water/sanitation in these ASAL region? If yes, what are the plans and strategies?
- iv. What is the Mandate of the Ministry/department in terms of water/sanitation access in the Counties?
- v. Have you piloted a new water and sanitation PPCP funded project within the last 5 years? (Probe finance leveraged by the piloted PPCP models and lessons learned),
- vi. What are the institutional/organization capacity gaps that hinder effective implementation of water/sanitation plans in the counties?
- vii. What data or statistics on water or sanitation or hygiene does the ministry get from the Counties? How is this data collected? How is it used?

11. Water and Sewerage Companies

- i. How is the Water situation in terms of Water coverage, Water quality and households' access?
- ii. How is the Sanitation situation in terms of access to improved sanitation, OD, CLTS?
- iii. Does the Company provide services to the project area? Explain, are there plans for expanding water or sanitation services in the area
- iv. How does the utility/service provider collaborate with water and sanitation actors, donors, etc.?
- v. What are the challenges faced in terms of water provision, sanitation provision and coping mechanisms?
- vi. How did WATERFUND's intervention relate in terms of coordination and reporting/sharing lessons with other interventions?
- vii. Have you piloted a new water and sanitation PPCP funded project within the last 5 years? (Probe finance leveraged by the piloted PPCP models and lessons learned),
- viii. Has there been an effective coordination mechanism established between WATERFUND and other stakeholders involved in service delivery to the communities?
- ix. Which other interventions related to water, sanitation and environment were being carried out in the same area by the County Government or other development partners? (Probe for coherence between GGEP/WLP and these interventions in terms of interlinkage, complementarity, harmonization)
- x. How was the coordination of partners during this project? How would you have liked the coordination to be done better?

12. Private Sector WASH actors

- i. What is the role of private sector in the provision of water and sanitation in the counties?

- ii. Does the policy, legislative and regulatory framework enable private sector investment in water and sanitation? *If yes, how-describe?*
- iii. Which county legislations exists that govern water, sanitation, and hygiene issues in the County? and how are they enforced?
- iv. What is the major achievement of the private sector in the county in terms of research, development and improving access to water and sanitation in the County?
- v. What would you as the private sector want improved to enhance your efforts in meeting the water/sanitation gaps? Probe in terms of National/County government support.
- vi. What are the future and strategies for water and sanitation by your company for this county?
- vii. How much has been invested in water and sanitation provision by the private sector? How much is planned for in the next 5 years?
- viii. How did your organization collaborate with GGEP/WLP project implementers?
- ix. What are the major achievements of the GGEP/WLP project?
  - x. What gaps still exist that the programme did not exhaustively address?
  - xi. Has the programme been relevant to the needs of the intended beneficiaries (i.e., individuals and communities in the targeted areas)?
  - xii. Have you piloted a new water and sanitation PPCP funded project within the last 5 years? (Probe finance leveraged by the piloted PPCP models and lessons learned),
  - xiii. Which other interventions related to water, sanitation and environment were being carried out in the same area by the County Government or other development partners? (Probe for coherence between GGEP/WLP and these interventions in terms of interlinkage, complementarity, harmonization)
  - xiv. How was the coordination of partners during this project? How would you have liked the coordination to be done better?
  - xv. What could concretely be recommended to ensure sustainability of the action and linkages with other programmes?
  - xvi. What would have been done better during the implementation of the project to make it more beneficial or sustainable? Probe about involvement of the most vulnerable and persons with disabilities.

### 8.3 Focus Group Discussion Guides

#### 1. Community members (Beneficiaries)

- i. What kind of livelihood activities do men and women carry out in this area to provide them with income?
- ii. Where do households get water that they use from and how far away are these points? What is the cost of water in the area?
- iii. How frequent is water available from each source during the day or days in a week?
- iv. What do you think are the key challenges faced in water and sanitation access in these areas?
- v. What roles do women play or need to play in ensuring access to safe water and adequate sanitation?

- vi. What are the common Hygiene practices exhibited in this area? (Probe on use of toilets, hand washing, personal and environmental hygiene, menstrual hygiene, and OD)
- vii. Which organizations and institutions are involved in provision of water, sanitation, and hygiene education in the area?
- viii. Do you know about GGEP/WLP projects in the area? How were the locals involved in the project? (Probe GESI)
- ix. How has the community benefitted the locals? (Probe for increased access to sanitation, water, livelihood, and employment opportunities)
- x. Which communication platform do communities access information on water, sanitation, and hygiene promotion?
- xi. What are the challenges and Barriers to participating in key decision making in relation to WASH facilities and services? (Probe by gender, disability, youth, and other vulnerable groups)
- xii. What could be done better and by who to improve water and sanitation access to the people in this area?

## 2. WRUAs and Conservancies Members

- i. When was the WRUAs/WUAs/CBOs/Conservancies established?
- ii. How many members are registered and how many are active?
- iii. What is the name and area of the catchment area the WRUA oversees?
- iv. Who are the water resource users, riparian landowners, and other stakeholders in your sub-catchment area?
- v. What are your functions as a WRUAs/WUAs/CBOs/Conservancies?
- vi. Does the WRUA have an updated SCMP?
- vii. How long has the Sub-Catchment Management Plan been implemented?
- viii. What has been the achievements so far?
- ix. How was the WRUAs/WUAs/CBOs/Conservancies selected for GGEP/WLP project?
- x. What activities did the WRUAs/WUAs/CBOs/Conservancies implement?
- xi. What are the achievements of the WRUAs/WUAs/CBOs/Conservancies based on the implementation of the WaterFund GGEP/WLP project?
- xii. What were the glaring needs of the communities that were being addressed by this programme?
- xiii. How were the beneficiaries' involved in programme design? (Probe GESI and other cross cutting issues)
- xiv. To what extent is there a sense of local ownership of the programme?
- xv. What were the major outputs and were they attained?
- xvi. To what extent was the overall approach adopted by WSFT to address the identified needs in the intervention areas for both the WRUAs/WUAs/CBOs/Conservancies and the communities achieved?
- xvii. Which activities showed greater relevance for the different groups of beneficiaries? Why?
- xviii. What were the major challenges during implementation? How were they addressed?

- xix. What would have been done better during the implementation of the project to make it more beneficial or sustainable? Probe about involvement of the most vulnerable and persons with disabilities.

### 3. Other Data to be collected from Water Projects/Utilities

| Key Area   | Unit                    | Unit              | Unit            |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Water coverage                                       | Area in km <sup>2</sup> | Population served | Locations/wards |
| Drinking water quality                               | Bacteriological         | Chemical analysis | Frequency       |
| Hours of water supply                                | In 24                   | Days in a week    | Dry and Wet     |
| Personnel Expenditure as Percentage of O+M Costs, %  | Monthly                 | Annually          |                 |
| O+M coverage Cost                                    | Monthly                 | Annually          |                 |
| Revenue Collection Efficiency, %                     | Last 3 months           | Last 12 Months    | Last 3 years    |
| Non-Revenue Water, %                                 | Last 3 months           | Last 12 Months    | Last 3 years    |
| Staff Productivity (Staff per 1000 Connections), No. |                         |                   |                 |
| Metering Ratio, %                                    |                         |                   |                 |

#### Water

Get data or information on the following indicators:

##### Water Coverage

1. What is the Water Supply Scheme/Service Provider's coverage area km<sup>2</sup>, names of locations e.t.c?
2. What is the total population in your area of coverage/service area? (Please provide gender segregated data)
3. How much of the population are you currently serving? (Map out the service areas clearly indicating the level of services and the underserved and the unserved populations, probe and find out the reasons for the variances and service distribution)
4. What are the existing service levels in service and what percentage of the population is served by each level? (To include, Individual connections, yard taps, kiosks and others)
5. Are there any other public or private service providers in your area of service? If yes, please list. Assess their legal status.

##### Water Quality

1. What are the sources for your supply?
2. Is the water treated before distribution?
3. What is the residual chlorine?
4. What are the current intervals for residual chlorine tests?
5. What are the other water quality parameters does the utility test for? (Physical, Bacteriological and Chemical)

##### Water availability/Hours of supply.

1. Do you have a water rationing programme?
2. How many days is water available in a week?
3. On the days that water is available, how many hours is it available per day? Probe on the existing factor that would be affecting/determining the hours of supply. Look into demand vs supply)

##### Operations and Maintenance cost coverage

1. What is the total operating revenue?
2. What is the total operating revenue?



3. What is the operation and maintenance coverage costs?

**Revenue collection efficiency**

1. What is the total water billing amount?
2. What is the total collect of revenue? (Carry out a monthly/ annual analysis and trends of revenue collection)
3. Asses the collection efficiency of the utility and any other existing service provider.

**Non-Revenue Water (NRW)**

1. What is your current NRW? (Important to assess historical trends over a defined period mostly over one year)
2. How much of this can be attributed to commercial losses?
3. How much can be attributed to physical losses?

**Metering ratio of the existing supply**

1. What I the total number of meters in your area of supply?
2. How many of these are active?
3. How many of these are not active? If yes, find out the reasons for inactive meters.
4. Establish the current metering ration with the service providers and find out the trend over a defined period.

**Governance structures and their effectiveness.**

***Utility Oversight and Supervision***

1. Do you have a Board of Directors? If yes what is the composition and qualifications of the BoD?
2. How often do they meet and what is their role?
3. What are the existing information and control systems and how does this influence decision- making process of the service provider?
4. Assess whether the utility is complying to the set financial rules and regulations.
5. Carry out an analysis of the exiting Human Resources and the Utilities Organogram and identify any capacity gaps.
6. Assess the level of participation/engagement of the users the local community in the decision making and other relevant processes

**Assessment of the Utilities Capacity**

1. Assess the organogram
2. Asses Strategic Plan
3. Carry out a Capacity Assessment.
4. Identification of the existing gaps.

**Monitoring and Evaluation/Knowledge Management.**

1. Is there a monitoring system in the utility?
2. What type of data does the utility collect?

## 9.0 Annex 9: Evaluation Team

The following five consultants participated in the Evaluation as shown below.

|     | Consultants Name    | Position             | Key roles in the evaluation   |
|-----|---------------------|----------------------|---|
| K-1 | Benard Oronje       | Lead Expert<br>M&E   | Lead designing the evaluation plan including conceptualizing the study, literature review, training of research assistants, and preparation of reports and, overall management of the assignment  |
| K-2 | Francis Wadegu      | Environmentalist     | Lead the designing of data collection instruments and data collection of water, sanitation and climate change resilience and adaptation components of the evaluation including analysis and reporting                                   |
| K-3 | Lilian Omondi (PhD) | Sociologist          | Conducting socio-economic analysis including formulation of evaluation questions, data collection tools and conducting FGD  |
| K-3 | Denis Masika (PhD)  | WRM Expert           | Lead assessment of integrated water resources management and planning including livelihood and climate proofing   |
| K-4 | Joyce Nyaboga       | Governance<br>Expert | Lead the integration of governance considerations into the evaluation e.g., compliance, administrative support, institutional structures, legal frameworks, relevant policies, management and water sanitation and resources management |
| N-1 | Nelson Nyunja       | Field coordinator    | Mobilization of field study participants, field study planning, data collection and data analysis   |