2022

End Term Evaluation of Water and Livelihood Programme

ANNEXURES

AUGUST, 2022

Table of Contents

1.0 Annex 1: WLP Evaluation Design Matrix

Project	GGEP_WLP 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? *Analysis of the causal link Appropriateness concept and design to the needs of the targeted beneficiaries.*	• Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant primary stakeholders.	• Review of programme documents
				  ○ Baseline survey report
				  ○ County reports
				  ○ Project progress reports
				  ○ GGEP/WLP proposal
				• Interview with primary stakeholders
				• Household surveys

		1.2 To what extent are the intervention objectives relevant to WATERFUND, DANIDA, County and National Government policies and strategic objectives?	• Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and DANIDA/WATERFUND/County/priorities • Coherence with existing County and National legal framework	• Document reviews • Interview with WATERFUND/DANIDA/County/National Government Staff
		1.3 Is the project internally coherent in its design?	• Evidence of interlinkage within objective hierarchy (Programme logic)	• Document review (ToC, Results framework) • Interviews with Key WATERFUND/DANIDA staff

Coherence	How compatible is the programme with other interventions within the counties?	2.1 What are the synergies and interlinkages between the intervention and other interventions carried out by DANIDA/WaterFund/IP 2.2 How consistent is the intervention with other actors' interventions in the same context (ASALs')	• Harmonization between WLP and other county-based interventions and previous programmes by DANIDA/WaterFund • Evidence of interlinkage within objective hierarchy (Programme logic) •	• Document review (ToC, Results framework) • Interviews with Key WaterFund/DANIDA and IP staff
Effectiveness	To what extent have the expected outputs of the intervention been achieved?	Output 1: Turkana County capacity and engagement in water related planning enhanced 3.1 Is Turkana County effectively using water and sanitation data for planning and performing their regulatory functions? 3.2 Does Turkana County have an effective water sector legislative and policy formulation framework to support planning and implementation? 3.3 To what extent is Turkana County involved in planning and implementation of integrated water and natural resources management?	• Evidence of updated database on water and sanitation • Turkana County using the database for planning and regulatory functions • Evidence of effective county water sector policies and legislations • Turkana County effectively utilizing existing water sector policy and legislation to support planning and decision making • Turkana County capacity to engage in water and natural resources management	• Interview with county staff • Review county policies and planning documents • Review of programme documents e.g., Midterm and end of programme report

		Output 2: Water and sanitation need of Turkana West Refugee camps and host community addressed including livelihood 3.4 Has the number of households with water services increased within refugee and host community? 3.5 Has the number of households with sanitation services increased within refugee and host community? 3.6 Has the intervention improved water and sanitation services? 3.7 Has the intervention increased livelihood opportunities?	• % Increase in number of households accessing water services • % Increase in number of households accessing sanitation services • % Of households in both host community and refugee camps reporting satisfaction with the water and/or sanitation services • % Of households engaged in new livelihood activities	• Household survey • Interview with implementing partners • FGD with primary stakeholders • Observation
		Output 3: Sustainable and community-based management of water resources and rangeland improved 3.8 Has the intervention improved Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM)?	• Increase in geographic area with improved planning for water resources including range management in Turkana West • Progress in implementation of sub-catchment or other management plans for Tarach River Basin • New catchment protection activities implemented by CBNRM • % Increase in total water storage capacity	• Interview with CBNRM organizations and IP • Documentation Review • Observation
		Output 4: Capacity of Implementing Partners (IP) (WRUA, CBO, and WU/WSP, CSO and NGO) improved	• Effectiveness of capacity building to implementing partners • % Of trained IP with improved capacity for addressing and managing water,	• Kirkpatrick model • Interview with CBNRM/WUA/WSP/NGO organizations and other IP

		3.9 Has the capacity of implementing partners improved?	sanitation and water resources including range in integrated manner • % Number of IP reporting improved service provision • Evidence of improved services • Credit worthiness index of the projects funded	• HH Surveys • Documentation Review (Audited Accounts)
		Output 5: Strengthened Institutional Performance of WATERFUND 3.10 How has the intervention impacted WATERFUND project management practice? 3.11 Has the intervention improved WATERFUND efficiency?	• Evidence of operational Management Information System (MIS) • Effective use of MIS to map and manage water and sanitation supported investments • Improved capacity of WATERFUND to identify, implement, and monitor • Proportion of questioned costs funded through the DED against total WATERFUND investments	• Interviews with WATERFUND • Review of financial documents
Efficiency	How efficient was the programme?	4.1 Was project implementation as cost effective as budgeted? 4.2 Has the intervention been implemented within the scheduled time? 4.3 Could financial resources have been used more efficiently (Value-for-money)? 4.4 To what extent did the programme implementation utilize existing expertise 4.5 To what extent have regulatory, administrative, time,	• % Variation of planned vs actual project costs • Timeliness and adequacy of implementation • Value for money • Existing and outsourced skills • Measures put in place to mitigate delays and cost overruns	• Analysis of management tools used to optimise efficiency and monitor progress. • Review of documents used to monitor the efficiency and budget monitoring, e.g., updated unit prices and costs. • Interview with project staff and implementing partners • CBA

		other resources and procedures contributed to or hindered the achievement of output		
Impact	How effective have the project strategies and approaches in contributing to ***Increased access to water and livelihood opportunities in refugee-host and other vulnerable communities, through enhanced water resources management and investments in Turkana West?***	5.1 To what extent has improvement in WASH and floods control improved health of refugees and host community? 5.2 Has the intervention reduced inequality in access to water, sanitation services and distribution of other resources and living standards? 5.3 Has improvement in Natural Resources Management reduced competition to natural resources? 5.4 How has the livelihood opportunities improved living standards of refugees, host community and other vulnerable communities?	• % Reduction in cholera and OD cases • Proportion of refugees and host community reporting equal access to services • Fairly distributed resources between the communities and between water and sanitation • Reduced intercommunal conflict • proportion of refugees and host community reporting increased access to fodder • Improved access to education, food, housing, and healthcare • Increase in household income • Evidence of unintended consequences (positive or negative) attributable to the WLP intervention.	• HH Survey • Interview with IP, County staff • Documentation Review • Observation • FGD with primary stakeholders

Sustainability	What is the likelihood that results will continue once Programme funding and assistance has ended?	5.1 How sustainable are the intervention results from a social-political and climatic point of view? 5.2 How sustainable are the intervention results from an economic and/or financial perspective? 5.3 How sustainable are the intervention results from an institutional point of view?	• Existence of enabling conditions e.g., wide-spread stakeholder buy-in • % Of facilities funded through the engagement that are climate proofed • Environmental and social considerations incorporated into the WLP's contributions to long-term improvements and sustainability. • Ability to cover O&M costs • 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 • 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. • To what extent is there a sense of local ownership of the programme?	• Review of project financial records • Interviews with WUA, WSP and CBNRM Staff • Interview Key IP • Sustainability index,
	What is the likelihood that the programme can be up scaled and/or replicated	6.1 Can the programme be up scaled or replicated?	• Existence of conditions that support scale-up efforts e.g., lessons / best practices are being captured and shared • Effectiveness of the programme design/ implementation strategies and/or mechanisms to realize successful replication or up scaling	• Interviews with WUA, WSP and CBNRM and IP Staff • Interview with key partners
Cross-cutting issues	What are the key crosscutting issues that	Context 7.1 To what extent has the programme adapted to its **context?**	• Extent to which the programme context has changed: **contextual risk** (security and conflict, droughts), **programmematic risks** (uncoordinated developments, unclear devolution	• Interviews with Key SH • Document review

	considered in the programme?		mandates) and **institutional risks** (capacity, planning and funding • Mechanisms and/or strategies in place to mitigate or respond to changing implementation context • Evidence demonstrating enabling/hindering factors that contributed most to the achievement/ failure of expected outcomes	
		GESI 7.2 How has the **GESI** issue been considered throughout the programme? *Equity will be expanded to review a broader social differentiation (gender, ethnicity, socio-economic background, disability, youth, and other vulnerable groups)*	The extent to which: • GESI is reflected in participation at formulation/design, implementation and distribution of costs and benefits • GESI issues are considered in programme management. • Gender relations and equality are likely to be affected by the intervention • Approach and success of gender mainstreaming in the water sector	• Interviews with Key SH • Document review • FGD with primary stakeholders • Observation
		Partnerships 7.3 To what extent did partnerships and stakeholder cooperation, affect the achievement of results?	• Evidence of quality collaboration between partners • The degree to which partners have been involved in planning and implementation.	• Interviews with partners •

		Environment, Social and Governance (ESG) 7.4 What are some of the potential ESG risks and opportunities in WLP investments?	• Environmental responsibility through compliance with all relevant environmental laws, standards, and regulations • Social responsibility through labour relations, human rights, diversity, and inclusion • Governance: compliance, ethics, controls, and procedures	• Interview with Key stakeholders • ESG Scoring • FGD with primary stakeholders • Observation
		M&E 7.5 To what extent were the results of the intervention influenced by Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Learning (MERL) mechanisms?	• Existence of MERL framework • M&E information is used for decision making to improve programme performance	• Interview with Key stakeholders
		Innovation and learning 7.6 Does the intervention provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future? 7.7 Has the intervention identified a new way of working that could be shared with others?	• Lessons learned from project implementation • Novel methods/strategies • Strengths and weaknesses in maximizing leveraging in water sector	• Interview with WATERFUND/DANIDA/County and Beneficiaries • FGD with primary stakeholders • Case study (Document success stories)
	How effective has the intervention strategy/ mechanism been in achieving	7.8 To what extent has an integrated approach to refugee settlement improved perception and relations between refugees and host community?	• Reduced tension and conflict between refugees and host community • Improvement in programme management and delivery • Improved community capacity to manage their own environment.	• HH survey • Interviews with IP

	expected results?	7.9 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? 7.10 To what extent did investment in broader catchment planning for sustained impact improve water resources management? 7.11 Did investment in rangeland approach improve livestock production?	• Reduced effects of water scarcity, flash floods and drought • Reduced loss of livestock • Reduced intercommunal conflicts	

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 Kalobeyei 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

2.0. 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

6.0. 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.

7.0. 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'.

8.0. 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.

9.0. 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 filed 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

The consultants utilized a two-stage sampling process. First, projects were sampled purposively after in-depth discussions with Implementing Partners to understand scope of projects implemented across all thematic project areas e.g., water, sanitation, water resources management, livelihood, and hygiene promotion. Secondly, participants for household surveys were sampled systematically using stratified random sampling. A total sample of 152 households calculated using the Cochran Israel formula with an adjustment of 10% to take care of any possible design effect, and adjusted *P*=0.1 due to reduced variability was utilized to arrive at the appropriate samples size.

Table 1: Sampling formula

$n \geq (Z\text{^}2.p.q)/d\text{^}2$ $n \geq (\ 〚1.96〛\text{^}2\ x0.1x0.5)/\ 〚0.05〛\text{^}2\ =138.2$ Adding 10% for design effect: n = 139 + (139 x 10/100) = 139 + 14 = 152 Sample size (n) ≥ 152	*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 ±0.05* *d= the marginal error allowed (d=0.05 since confidence limit is 95%)*

This sample size was then distributed proportionately among implementing partners (areas). A total of 15 household surveys were carried out within the sampled projects areas.

WLP PROJECTS, TURKANA COUNTY			
Ward	**Implementing partner and Project name**	**Project thematic area**	**Activity**
Lopur	**Action Africa Help International Project:** Enhancing Livelihoods through Water Supply and Sanitation (ELIWAS) improvement Project	Water Supply	1. Drilling and equipping of Lopuski borehole; equipping with solar system; fencing of borehole area; installation of 48CM steel elevated tank; 7000m pipeline extension, construction of 2 No. water kiosks and construction of 2 No. animal troughs 2. Rehabilitation of 8 shallow wells- equipping with hand pumps and construction of aprons for domestic and small scheme agriculture water supply; support with portable solar pumping kits to 5 farmers groups in same shallow wells area for crop farming in 15-acre farm; fencing of 15-acre farm. 3. Rehabilitation of additional 2 shallow wells in Choro farm
		Sanitation and hygiene Promotion	1. Community total sanitation (CLTS) activities to 22 villages in Lopur and 8 villages in Kakuma. 2. Supply of excavation tools for latrine construction on sharing; lofty tanks handwashing kits to schools 3. Construction of 6 No. 4 door latrines in 3 schools with bio digester component 4. Construction of 3 bio digester toilets in Markets for biogas production; hygiene and sanitation campaigns in schools and community.
		Water resources management	1. Construction of 50,000 m3 earth dam at Pelekech with offtake and infiltration system for access; fencing dam area 2. Establishment of 20-acre woodlots and fencing the lots; construction of 60 trapezoidal bunds with cash for work approach, the same will work on woodlots with zaypits 3. Training farmers on the use of propopis for animal feed supplement and biogas production. 4. Supply of Galla he goats to 3 farmers groups for cross breeding to improve local breeds for higher income: support to pasture reseeding and hay bailing with hay/seed store construction
Kalobeyei		Water Supply	1. Rehabilitation of Natira 1 borehole, rehabilitation of Lokora water supply; 2 km pipeline extension, 50CM elevated steel tank, trough, and water Kiosk

			2. Undertake rehabilitation of boreholes with hand pump and construction of cattle troughs including fencing in the grazing zones of Natiira and Nalapatwi in Kalobeyei ward 3. Rehabilitation of red cross borehole water supply; 50CM elevated steel tank; 1.5 km pipeline extension, 1 No. Water kiosk, water trough
		Sanitation and hygiene Promotion	1. Construction of 2 No. 4-door VIP Latrines for 132 children (67B, 65G) at Natiira Primary School 2. Construction of 4No. 4-door VIP Latrines for 534 children (280B, 254G) at Lokwanya Primary School 3. Construction of 4No. 4-door VIP Latrines for 799 children (427B, 372G) at St.Kizito Primary School 4. Undertake hygiene promotion in 3 schools in Kalobeyei ward (St Kizito, Lokwanya and Natira Primary Schools)
		Water resources management	1. Promote multiple use of water by supporting Women Economic Empowerment through horticultural farming using shade nets of 30m by 8m for Lokora village 2. Excavation of 1 No. 30,000CM water pans with off take, cattle trough and fencing for the grazing zones Epitiwosin, Community level engagement meetings for Epitiwosin 3. Water Pan Catchment protection (10Km by 20km conservation area using the local resources committee and existing county policies 4. Piloting Tse Tse fly control with low-cost control measures with Traps in the pastoral areas
Songot	**AMREF Health Africa Project:** Turkana West Water, Sanitation and Livelihood (TWASWALI) project	Water Supply	1. Napeikar: borehole improvement/rehabilitation, 8 km Napeikar borehole to Nakururum pipeline extension (village and school and dispensary): Installation of 48CM steel elevated tank, Construction of 2No. Standard Water kiosks with 5CM overhead tanks, construction of school and dispensary tap stands, installation of plastic Storage tanks of 10CM for the two institutions and construction of 2No. Animal troughs 2. Nakulumei: drilled and capped borehole equipping (1 No. targeted after preliminary tests): Installation of solar pumping system, 5km pipeline extension, installation of steel elevated tank of 54CM; construction of 2 No. water kiosks with overhead storage of 5CM; construction of 2 No. animal troughs and fencing of borehole compound.
		Sanitation and hygiene Promotion	1. Construction of 6 No. 4 door VIP latrines in 3 schools 2. Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) and hygiene promotion in 14 Villages and schools.

		Water resources management	1. Excavation of 50,000 CM Kochomin Earth dam with offtake system for animal and domestic access 2. Excavation of 30,000 CM Naremieto water pan with offtake system for domestic and livestock access 3. Establishment of 4 natural resource management committees working with Kenya Forest Service 4. Livelihood empowerment support of 4 committees (for boreholes water pan/dam above) for bee keeping project and tree planting around water points developed.
Kalobeyei and Lokichogio	**World Vision Kenya Project:** Turkana West Water, Sanitation and Environmental Management (TWASEMA) project	Water Supply	1. Kalobeyei/Kangura water supply: Rehabilitation (Solarization) of Kalobeyei borehole for Kangura village supply; 3 km HDPE PN12 pipeline extension to Kangura village; installation of 108CM steel elevated tank; construction of 2No. Water kiosk with 5 CM overhead tank; Construction of 2 No. standard cattle troughs 2. Kalobeyei Refugee settlement water supply: 15,200m pipeline extension to 80 units (1120 households); installation of 4No. 100CM steel elevated tanks; construction of 80 yard taps.Lokichoggio town water supply: Hydraulic modelling of Lokichoggio town supply; Rehabilitation of 3 boreholes (Akoros I, Epool and ICRC) and solarization; 7.5 km pipeline extension for rising main and distribution network; Construction of 4No. Water kiosks with 5CM overhead tanks; installation of 2 No. 50m3 Steel elevated tanks and Rehabilitation of 4 No. boreholes and equipping with hand pumps, construction of aprons with animal troughs in the grazing zones of; Lochoreamoni, Natumamon I, Natumamon II and Iria.
		Sanitation and hygiene Promotion	1. Construction of Ecosan toilets (UDDT) for 5 blocks (40 households) 2. Sub grant local organization in Kalobeyei ward to undertake Community Led Total Sanitation, Sanitation marketing and hygiene promotion at household level on performance-based approach. Construction of 4 No. 4-door VIP Latrines in 2 schools; Construction of 2No. 8-door latrines with septic system in Lokichoggio mixed secondary; Construction 3No. 4 door VIP Latrines for Lokichogio Girls 3. Undertake Community Led Total Sanitation, Sanitation marketing and hygiene promotion at household level on performance-based approach; Hygiene promotion in schools.
		Water resources management	1. Undertaking Desilting and expansion/construction of Kanamesek WaterPan of capacity not less than 30,000 CM with offtake system and fencing

			2. Excavation of 2No. 30,000CM water pans with offtake, cattle trough and fencing for the grazing zones (Kaawoi and Nakeruman). 3. Support Women Economic Empowerment through horticultural farming using shadenets of 30m to 8m for Kangura Borehole system (2 No.) and Lokichogio town Water supply system (2 No.)
Kakuma Refugee- Host and host community	**NRC:** WASH improvements for refugees and host community	Water Supply	1. Drilling and equipping of 3 No. boreholes; solarization of three drilled boreholes to increase production 2. 8km Pipeline extension to overhaul existing and integration to new supply; Construction of 6 No. power houses; Rehabilitate and repaint 4 No. leaking elevated steel tanks (EST) 3. Repair and rehabilitation of 50 tap stands. 4. Water quality/aquifer monitoring; Hydraulic modelling of Kakuma camp water supply.
		Sanitation and hygiene Promotion	1. Production and distribution of 1000 latrine slabs for household latrines construction; Lining of 400 latrine pits in flood prone areas; Construction of 50 disability friendly latrines; Construction of 5 No. 4 door school latrines; Construction of 15 Urine diverting dry toilets (UDDT) latrines; Decommissioning of 50 communal latrines 2. Hygiene and sanitation promotion including Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) campaigns in Kakuma refugee camp and host community
		Water resources management	1. Planting of seedlings around borehole compounds and Climate proofing of 4 No. boreholes with construction of gabions and aprons
Kakuma Town Water Supply and Public sanitation project	**OXFAM Project:** Support for sustainable and resilient WASH services for Kakuma town	Water Supply	1. Hydraulic modelling for Kakuma town water supply 2. Drill and equip 2 No. new boreholes to boost production. 3. Solarization of 3 No. boreholes (2 No. new boreholes and 1 No. rehabilitated (broken down windmill -BH5 or capped borehole at Nakwangat); 4. Construct 3 No. new Steel elevated tanks each of capacity of 200M3; Construct 1 No. masonry tank reservoir 200m3. 5. Overhaul of 14km pipeline extension for rising main and distribution network for Kakuma water supply; Construction of six smart water kiosks within Kakuma town. 6. Establishment of Kakuma water company in line with County water and national government legislations with engagement of third-party partner for capacity building of the company

			7. Komudei dispensary pipeline extension
		Sanitation and hygiene Promotion	1. Sanitation Construction of 1 No. public Bio-sanitation facility and 2. Construction of incinerator in Kakuma health facility
		Water resources management	1. Registration of 2 No WRUAs; development and adoption of sub-catchment management plans

The following projects were sampled after in-depth discussion with the implementing partners for further visits and household survey.

	Projects	**Implementing Partner**
1.	Nariemento Water Project	World Vision Kenya
2.	Kangura Shadenets	World Vision Kenya
3.	Ebenezer Green Farmers Group	World Vision Kenya
4.	Lokichogio WSP	World Vision Kenya
5.	AAR Japan	NRC
6.	Block 15 Community, Kakuma refugee Camp, Zone 1	NRC
7.	Constuction of Biosan Facilty, Kakuma	OXFARM
8.	Nadapal Smart Water Kiosk	OXFARM
9.	Lomesekin	AMREF
10.	Napeikar Borehole	AMREF
11.	Choro Farm	AAHI
12.	Lokora Water Supply Project	AAHI

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 FR is the Functionality of the investment RC is the Revenue Collection (ability to cover O&M) AS is the Age and Survival (and operational) rate of an investment 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

	PROJECT	Functionality	Ability to cover O&M Cost	Age and Survival Rate of the Investment	Good condition	Total
A	**Water**					
1	Drill and equip 3 New boreholes: 12m3/hour (Borehole 18), 72m3/hour (borehole 5B) and 31m3/hour (borehole 4E). Solarisation of the three boreholes BH 4E- 15KW, BH5 -30KW, BH 18- 4KW	21	41	13	8	83
2	Construction and rehabilitation of 6 power control houses (Kukuma 1 camp in, zone 1, zone 3, zone 4 and zone 5 (BH 4E), Kakuma 2 GSU zone, Kakuma 3 BH 18)	19	46	13	8	86
3	8km Pipeline rehabilitation and extension for existing and new borehole water supplies within camp	18	46	12	8	84
4	4 No. 1000 m3 Elevated Steel tank rehabilitation at HongKong , fuji, reception and Booster 5	19	46	14	9	88
5	Rehabilitation of 50NOS tapstands at Kakuma 3 and Kakuma 2	16	46	10	7	79
6	Kalobeyei refugee settlement water project	17	45	12	8	82
7	Kakuma Town Water supply project	16	45	9	6	76
8	Loitakori Water Supply project	16	44	9	6	75
9	Napeikar Water supply project	17	44	8	7	76
10	Nakulumei Water project	17	44	8	6	75
11	Lokichogio Water Supply project	18	41	7	8	74
12	Kangura Water supply project	18	42	7	8	75
13	Lokorawater supply , kalobeyei.	15	39	8	7	69
14	Red Cross Water supply Project	17	44	8	8	77
15	Lopuski water supply project	21	42	8	8	79

	PROJECT	Functionality	Ability to cover O&M Cost	Age and Survival Rate of the Investment	Good condition	Total
16	Rehabilitation of 10 choro farm shallow wells	16	47	8	8	79
					Average	**78.56**
B	**Sanitation**					
1	VIP Latrines: Construction of 6 No. 4 door VIP latrines in 3 schools;	20	46	11	7	84
2	Construction of 7 blocks of 4 door VIP latrines in 2 schools (Lokichoggio), Construction of 2 blocks of 4 door septic latrines in one school	19	45	11	8	83
3	Construction of 20 UDDTs at Kalobeyei refugee settlement	10	23	10	8	51
4	1000 slabs casting and distribution for Household latrines	15	48	13	9	85
5	Construction of 50 disability friendly latrines at Kakuma 1, 2, 3 and 4	20	46	12	7	85
6	Latrine pit lining of 400 Latrines within the Camp	23	47	7	7	84
7	Construction of 5 No 4 door VIP latrines at schools 2 No. at Vision Secondary School and one No. each for Hope, Turkwel and Gilo Primary Schools	20	46	11	7	84
8	Construction of 15 No. UDDT latrines in hard soil formations	13	38	10	8	69
9	Construction of latrines 6 No. 4 door VIP/biodigester latrines in Lochore Edome, Lopur and Namon primary schools.	15	40	10	8	73
10	Construction and equipping of the incinerator at the Kakuma Sub-County Hospital incinerator	18	45	12	9	84
11	Construct a Bio-sanitation facility to improve access to sanitation in a public space	20	46	13	7	86
					Average	**78.91**
C	**Water resources management**					

	PROJECT	Functionality	Ability to cover O&M Cost	Age and Survival Rate of the Investment	Good condition	Total
1	Protection of 4 boreholes under threat of being washed away with aprons and gabions and tree planting in the catchment areas of the boreholes (BH 9, 10,11 &15)	23	44	13	9	89
2	Rehabilitation of boreholes with hand pump and construction of cattle troughs including fencing in the grazing zones of Lochoreamoni, Natumamon I, Natumamon II and Iria in Lokichogio ward	21	43	12	8	84
3	Undertake Desilting and expansion of Kanamesek Water Pan to 30,000 CM with offtake and fencing	23	47	14	9	93
4	Excavation of 1 No. 30,000CM water pans with offtake, cattle trough and fencing for the grazing zones at Kaawoi	19	41	10	6	76
5	Excavation of 1 No. 30,000CM water pans with offtake, cattle trough and fencing for the grazing zones at Nakeruman.	23	46	14	9	92
6	Excavation of 1 No. 30,000CM water pan with offtake, cattle trough and fencing for the grazing zones (Epitiwosin)	23	46	14	8	91
7	Construction of 50,000CM Kangiteseroi water pan	23	47	14	8	92
8	Establishment of 3 No. 20 acre woodlots at Namon, Nakuguro and Napeichom	16	46	14	9	85
9	Cash for construction of 3 NO. 10 arces each trapezodial bunds and farming at lochoreadome, Lopuski and Namon	17	39	9	6	71
10	Excavation of 1 No. 30,000CM water pan with offtake, cattle trough and fencing for the grazing zones (Naremieto)	16	42	12	8	78
11	Excavation of 50,000 CM Kochomin Earth dam with offtake system for animal and domestic access	18	43	12	8	81

	PROJECT	Functionality	Ability to cover O&M Cost	Age and Survival Rate of the Investment	Good condition	Total
12	4No. community water supplies. Establishment of 4 natural resource management committees working with Kenya forest service; Livelihood empowerment support of 4 committees (for boreholes water pan/dam above) for bee keeping project and tree planting around water points developed.	18	43	13	8	82
					Average	**84.50**
E	**Livelihood Interventions**					
1	Provision of 2 No. shade nets to Ebenezar Women group (Lokichoggio)	21	38	9	9	77
2	Provision of 2 No. shade nets to Kangura women group	19	38	9	9	75
3	Establishment of the 3 No. communal green biodigetsers at three enterprises in Kakuma camp, shade, Santos and Youngstar hotels	17	42	12	8	79
4	Distribution of 9 He Galla goat for breed improvement and suppply to 3 farmers groups within Lopur	14	32	6	7	59
5	Establishment of 2 hay stores linked to support pasture/feed production and Lopuski and Lopur	22	41	9	9	81
6	Purchase and supply of 5 No. portable Solar pumps for water extraction to choro farmers	21	46	9	9	85
7	Fencing a 15-acre of the community garden using concrete poles and chainlink	23	43	7	9	82
8	Purchase of initial start up kit (drought tolerant seeds; Amaranth, Cow peas,Sorghum and Spinach,tools) and Dicotomus Earth	21	38	9	8	76
9	Piloting Tsetse fly control with low cost control measures with Traps in the pastoral areas at Lokichoggio and Kalobeyei	14	32	7	6	59
					Avarage	**74.78**

5.0 Annex 5: Creditworthiness Index

Creditworthiness Index combines annual financial and operational data into a snapshot metric to estimate a WSP's creditworthiness[1].

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[2]. 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.

[1] Creditworthiness Index Report, 2015
[2] 2015 WASREB/World Bank

61 to 70	Creditworthy	Denotes expectations of low default risk. Capacity for 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	4: >8% | 3: 6-8% | 2: 6-4% | 1: 0-4% | 0: 0
	% Of energy costs of total O&M costs	Indicates whether is susceptible to changes in energy cost	10	4: <10% | 3: 10-15% | 2: 15-20% | 1: 20-25% | 0: >20%
	% Of staff costs of total O&M costs	Indicator of efficiency	10	4: <25% | 3: 25-30% | 2: 30-35% | 1: 35-40% | 0: >40%
Revenue	% Difference between collected Revenue and expected Rev.	Efficiency	10	4: >80% | 3: 60-80% | 2: 60-40% | 1: 0-40% | 0: 0
	O&M Coverage (%Revenue of O&M Cost)	Creditworthiness	10	4: >130% | 3: 120-130% | 2: 110-120% | 1: 100-110% | 0: <100%
Technical	% of people with water supply/population of the area	Indicates size of future challenges	4	4: 100 | 3: 90-100 | 2: 80-90 | 1: 70-80 | 0: <70
	% Estimation of NRW	Efficiency and credit quality	4	4: <20% | 3: 20-30% | 2: 30-40% | 1: 40-50% | 0: >50%
	Number of staff/ 1000 people served	Efficiency	4	4: <5 | 3: 6 | 2: 7 | 1: 8 | 0: >8
Governance	Availability of Management committee	Accountability	4	4: Yes | 0: No

	Diversity of Management Committee (Gender, Youth, PWD)	Inclusion	4	4: Diversified; 2: Not Diversified
Systems	Availability of Management systems e.g., Consumer records, financial management, HR, Stores & Investment plan	Efficiency	10	4: All 5 systems; 3: 4; 2: 3; 1: 2; 0: 1 or none
Liability	% Total debt/ Revenue Collected	Determine debt service ability of the utility	10	4: <25%; 3: 25-30%; 2: 30-35%; 1: 35-40%; 0: >40%
	Grant Dependency 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	4: 0; 3: 0-10%; 2: 10-15%; 1: 15-20%; 0: >20

Creditworthiness Index Data

	Annual Cost				Annual Revenue		Technical				Governance		Systems	liabilities	
County	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	Avalability of Management Committee	Composition of Management Comm..Yes/No if diversified (Men,Women,PWD)	Avalability of management systems (Financial, consumer record) YES/NO	Debts	Grant
Kakuma Town Water supply project	9,360,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	4,560,000	18,000,000	10,800,000	140,000	15,395	17%	29	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	0
Lokichogio Water Supply project	3,060,000	900,000	720,000	1,440,000	12,000,000	1,560,000	52,000	10,980	13%	23	Yes	3 W, 7 M	Yes	N/A	1,500,000

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	
Kakuma Town Water Supply Project		25.6	25.6	48.7	60.0	115.4	11.0	17.0	1.9	Yes	Yes	4.0	No debt	0.0	
	Score	4	0	0	3	2	0	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	
	Weighted score	10	0	0	7.5	5	0	4	4	4	3	7.5	10	10	65.0
Lokichogio Water Supply Project		29.4	23.5	47.1	13.0	51.0	21.1	13.0	2.3	Yes	Yes	4.0	No debt	50.0	
	Score	4	0	0	1	0	0	4	4	4	3	5	10	0	
	Weighted score	10	0	0	2.5	0	0	4	4	4	3	5	10	0	42.5
														Average	**53.75**

1.0 Annex 6: List of Documents Reviewed

1. Addendum to Development Engagement Document - Access to and Management of Water Resources (Water Sector Trust Fund – WATERFUND)
2. Annual Rural Harmonised Report; WaterFund, 2017/2018
3. Draft Mid-Term Review Report, December 17th, 2018
4. End of Project Report– Water and Livelihood Programme – Kenya, Water Sector Trust Fund.
5. Inception Support to Water Sector Trust Fund – Water and Livelihood Programme – Kenya. Inception Report
6. Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan (KISEDP), 2018 – 2022
7. 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
8. 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
9. Kenya National Housing and Population Census, KNBS,2019
10. Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Evaluation, Susan Croes
11. Kirk Patrick and Beyond:A review of Models of Training Evaluation, P Tamkin, J Yarnall and M Kerrin, 2002
12. OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use, 2019
13. Programme Evaluation through Kirkpatrick's Framework, Omer Gokhan Ulum, July 2015
14. Sustainability Assessment of Rural Water Service Delivery Models: Findings of a multi-Country Review. The World Bank, August 2017
15. The Sustainable Development Goals for Water and Sanitation Services Interpreting the Targets and Indicator, Colette Génevaux (pS-Eau) 2018. www.pseau.org/en/agenda-2030
16. The Water Act 2016
17. Turkana County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP), 2018 – 2022
18. Turkana County Water, Sanitation Services Sector Strategic Plan, 2017 – 2021
19. United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) Kenya Fact Sheet, August 2017
20. Water Sector Trust: Fund Strategic Plan 2018 – 2022
21. 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.	Angeline Were	Principal Finance Officer	WATERFUND
7.	George Muhia	Programmes' Technical Advisor	WATERFUND
8.	Violet Mucheni	GGEP Programme Team Leader	WATERFUND
9.	Nicodemus Onunga	WLP Programme Coordinator	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.	Adama Zongo	Senior Programme Officer	UNHCR, Kakuma
14.	Eng. Oscar Nabiswa	Assistant WASH Officer	UNHCR, Kakuma
15.	Moses Natome	CEO Water	County Government of Turkana
16.	Tito Ochieng	Director Water	County Government of Turkana
17.	Maiyo Elphas	SCPHO	County Government of Turkana, Turkana West
18.	Reuben Kibiego	CWASH Coordinator	County Government of Turkana
19.	Peter Mitunda	PHO	County Government of Turkana, Turkana Central
20.	Emmanuel Echapan	Sub County Water Officer	Count Government Turkana, Turkana West
21.	James Loseny	Sub County Administrator	County Government of Turkana
22.	Patrick Eyapan Naboikut	County Resident Monitors	WATERFUND, Turkana
23.	Faustin Ochunga	Programme Social Scientist	WATERFUND
24.	Herman Kiruaye	Sub Basin Area Coordinator	Water Resources Authority, Lodwar
25.	Eric Mathenge	Project Coordinator	AAHI
26.	Agnes Lokoro	Agribusiness Officer	AAHI
27.	James Ayacko	Project Engineer	AMREF
28.	Joan Mwiti	WASH Officer,	NRC, Kakuma
29.	Bundu Mohamed	Area Manager Kakuma	NRC
30.	Eng. Francis Magondu PHE	Resident Engineer	OXFARM

31.	Kennedy Ayua	Project Engineer	World Vision, Kenya
32.	Ayantu Bizune	Owner	Biodigester project
33.	Abdulaziz Lugazo	Chairman	Choro farm farmers' cooperative
34.	Lydia Nakwamur	Chairperson	Ebenezer Green Farmers Women Group
35.	Lomotei Yongoma	Chairlady	Kangura Women Group
36.	Jeremiah Ekoel	Chairman	Lokichogio WSP
37.	Moses Kavita	Deputy Head Teacher	Lokichogio AIC Girls Primary School
38.	Rev. Fr. Linus Musumba	Chairman	Lokora Water Project, Kalobeyei
39.	Ekusi Johnson	Community Leader	Nadapal Smart Water Kiosk
40.	Jonas Epas	Assistant Chief, Lokudule S. Loaction. Songot	Napeikar Project
41.	Lukas Epong' Ekai	Chairman	Narameto Water Pan
42.	John Ekai Epure	Secretary	Narameto Water Pan

8.0 Annex 8 Data Collection Tools

8.1 Household Survey, Water and Sanitation Projects

ADVANCE DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE
Development and Management Consultants

End Term Evaluation for Water & Livelihood Sub-Programme (WLP)

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	Water & Livelihood Sub-Programme (WLP)
Project Name	
Ward	

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: Access to Water

S/No	Questions	Category	Mark Response
1	What is the **main** 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 – **NOT** for animal use, agriculture, gardening, etc.?	Yes **(If yes skip to Question 6)**	
		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	
		Other (Specify)	
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 (**If no, skip to question 10**)	
		Don't know	
9	If yes, how much?	Per 20 Liter Jerrican	
10		Yes	

	Do you pay for water services for non-drinking and sanitation use?	No (**If no, skip to question 12**)	
		Don't know	
11	If yes, how much?	Per 20 Liter Jerrican	
12	Do you feel you have equal access to water services?	YES	
		NO	
		Don't Know	
13	If no, why?	Specify	
14	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	
3	If communal latrine, how many households, including this one, share this facility?	State Number	
4	Does this latrine provide adequate privacy for you and your household members? (Mark all correct answers)	Yes	
		No	
		No latrine	
		Don't know	
5	If not, why?	Infrastructure/door is poor or damaged	
		Lock missing/not working	
		Too close to the house	
		Others, specify	
6	How satisfied are you with the place where your family defecate?	Very unsatisfied	
		Somewhat unsatisfied	
		No opinion	
		Somewhat satisfied	
		Very satisfied	
7	Can you use this facility at all hours of the day and night?	Yes	
		No	

		No latrine	
		Don't know	
8	How frequent are diarrhoea cases among children less than 5 years of age?	Very frequent	
		Less frequent	
		Rare	
9	How frequent are diarrhoea cases among persons above 5 years of age?	Very frequent	
		Less frequent	
		Rare	
10	Was it possible to wash your hands with soap after the last time you went to the toilet at/near home?	YES	
		NO	
11	If NO why?	No water available	
		No soap available	
		Don't see the need	
12	Do you feel you have equal access to Sanitation services?	YES	
		NO	
		Don't Know	
13	If no, why?	Specify	
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	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	
		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 6)**	
		Don't know	
5	If YES, which ones?	Specify:	
6	What is the source(s) of water for watering your livestock? (Select all that apply)	Rainwater	
		Dug well	
		Borehole	
		Piped water potable supply system	
		River	
		Sand dam	
		Irrigation canal	
		Other, specify	
7	How reliable is the water supply for your animals?	Very reliable	
		Reliable	
		Fai	
		Unreliable	
		Very unreliable	
8	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	
9	Have you been engaged in **NEW** livelihood activities because of the WLP project?	Yes	
		No	
10	If yes, what new livelihood activities have you engaged in? **(Select all that apply)**	Crop farming	
		Livestock (Pastoralism)	
		Livestock (Rangeland)	
		Employment	
		Others, specify	
11	What new agricultural practices have you adopted in crop and livestock production because of WLP project? **(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	
12	Looking at the last 5 years, has your farm produce increased. (Both crops and livestock)	Yes	
		No	
		Same	
		Don't know	
13	If YES, to what extent do you think the WLP project is responsible	Larger extent	
		Less extent	
		Not responsible	
14	How has the programme improved your living standards? **(Multiple response)**	Increased Household income	
		Increased access to education	
		Increased access to food	
		Better housing	
		Improved heath	
		New employment Opportunities	
		Others, specify	

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	
4	What is the status of the Household	Refugee	
		Community member	

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	Yes	
		No	

	conservation and water resources management?		
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 fodders for livestock	
		Promotion of alternatives livelihood activities	
		Others, specify	
8	Are there intercommunal conflicts?	Yes	
		No	
9	If yes, what are some of the causes? **(Multiple response)**	Water scarcity	
		Access to fodder	
		Banditry	
		Others, specify	
10	To what extent has the WLP Project reduced these conflicts?	Larger extent	
		Less extent	
		Not responsible	
11	What is the relationship between host community and refugees?	Poor	
		Good	
12	If poor, what are some of the causes of strained relationship?	Specify:	
13	To what extent has the WLP project improved the relationship between refugees and host community	Greater extent	
		Little extent	
		None	
14	What do you think the project has done to improve this relationship?	Specify:	

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	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	
		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?	Specify:	
6	What is the source(s) of water for watering your livestock? (Select all that apply)	Rainwater	
		Dug well	
		Borehole	
		Piped water potable supply system	
		River	
		Sand dam	
		Irrigation canal	
		Other, specify	
7	How reliable is the water supply for your animals?	Very reliable	
		Reliable	
		Fai	
		Unreliable	
		Very unreliable	
8	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	
9	Have you been engaged in **NEW** livelihood activities because of the WLP project?	Yes	
		No	
10	If yes, what new livelihood activities have you engaged in? **(Select all that apply)**	Crop farming	
		Livestock (Pastoralism)	
		Livestock (Rangeland)	
		Employment	
		Others, specify	
13	What new agricultural practices have you adopted in crop and livestock production because of WLP project? **(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	
14	Looking at the last 5 years, has your farm produce increased. (Both crops and livestock)	Yes	
		No	
		Same	
		Don't know	
15	If YES, to what extent do you think the WLP project is responsible	Larger extent	
		Less extent	
		Not responsible	
16	How has the programme improved your living standards? **(Multiple response)**	Increased Household income	
		Increased access to education	
		Increased access to food	
		Better housing	
		Improved heath	
		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 WLP ? 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 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 WLP? (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 WLP programme 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. What could concretely be recommended to ensure sustainability of the action and linkages with other programmes?

xx. 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 Partners (Action Africa Help International, AMREF, NRC, OXFAM, World Vision Kenya)

a) How was the organization selected for partnership in the WLP ?
b) What were the glaring needs of the communities that were being addressed by this programme?
c) 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)
d) Has there been an effective coordination mechanism established between WATERFUND and other stakeholders involved in service delivery to the communities?
e) Has your organization demonstrated improved capacity and organizational performance? Explain.
f) Has the support contributed to the development of a sustainable community-based management of water resources structures/system?
g) Which activities showed greater relevance for the different groups of beneficiaries? Why?
h) How did WATERFUND's intervention relate in terms of coordination and reporting/sharing lessons with other interventions?
i) Have the programmes efficiently used resources? Is or was there potential for resources to be used more efficiently?
j) How well did the partnership and management arrangements work and how did they develop over time?
k) How well did the financial systems work to support project delivery?
l) What unforeseen outcomes were caused by or contributed to by the intervention, and why did these occur? How were these addressed?
m) Do partners (WRUAs/WUAs/CBOs) have the financial capacity to maintain the programme and/or its outputs/outcomes?
n) 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
o) How has the programme context changed throughout the implementation of WLP? (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
p) How has the WLP programme addressed inequality in access to water and sanitation between host community and refugees?
q) Was the programme innovative and/or what are the main lessons learned.
r) How possible is it for the continuation of the impact achieved and of the delivery mechanisms following the withdrawal of donor support? What are the prospects for the benefits of the project being sustained after the funding stops?

s) To what extent has an integrated approach to refugee settlement improved perception and relations between refugees and host community? (Probe reduced conflict and tension)
t) 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?
u) To what extent did investment in broader catchment planning for sustained impact improve water resources management?
v) Did investment in rangeland approach improve livestock production? Explain
w) How was the green growth characteristics of resilience (adaptation and mitigation) mainstreamed in the projects?
x) 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 WLP 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?

1. WRUAs 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.

2. Other Data to be collected from Water Projects/Utilities

Key Area	**Unit**	**Unit**	**Unit**
Water coverage	Area in km2	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^2, 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: WLP Financial Utilization

		Implementing Partner					Sub total
		AAHI	Amref	Oxfam	NRC	World Vision	
Project Budget		90,482,748.74	66,720,925.00	90,279,503.00	76,401,000.00	140,000,000.01	463,884,176.75
Payment category	Programme costs	76,177,326.00	57,657,051.00	76,992,137.17	66,714,333.00	110,512,349.80	388,053,196.97
	Community awareness, survey, and design costs	680,000.00	3,870,189.00	3,068,942.47	90,641.70	3,445,542.32	11,155,315.49
	O&M costs	83,650.00	574,666.00	0.00	535,820.00	1,540,000.00	2,734,136.00
	Monitoring and Evaluation	221,700.00	506,314.00	2,164,288.60	202,570.00	1,496,964.08	4,591,836.68
	Capacity building	494,000.00	893,186.00	256,929.40	305,050.00	2,689,401.24	4,638,566.64
	Project branding, launch and commissioning	320,000.00	427,780.00	855,804.22	730,702.90	1,840,860.10	4,175,147.22
	Administration costs (includes IR)	9,228,324.00	2,791,740.00	6,548,846.13	7,640,741.99	18,474,882.47	44,684,534.59
	Applicable taxes	60,000.00	0.00	0.00	181,140.00	0.00	241,140.00
Total spent		87,265,000.00	66,720,925.00	89,886,947.99	76,401,000.00	140,000,000.10	460,273,873.09
Balance		3,217,748.74	0.00	392,555.01	0.00	0.00	3,610,303.75

10.0 Annex 10: 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 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 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