

Spearhead	Organisation	Reporting Period	
Water	Netherlands Embassy Nairobi, Kenya	1st January - 31st December 2012	
Activity Number	Implementing Organisations	Implementing channel	Actual expenditure 2012
16360	AWF	NGO	343.862
16406	ACC	NGO	415.490
22948	LWF	NGO	461.000
23716	ACC	NGO	795.569
23856	AWF	NGO	2.052.569
24214	LWF	NGO	696.899
24402	NRT	NGO	200.000
24981	WWF Kenya	NGO	0
16967	UNICEF	multilateraal	4.099.690
22949	WWF Kenya	NGO	308.314
24048	VEI	bedrijf	788.106
24695	VEI	bedrijf	0
24816	GOAL	NGO	0

Result Area 2	Improved catchment area management and safe deltas					
<p>Result Question 2.1a: To what extent has the development and implementation of plans for sustainable growth and water security (incl. good governance) progressed in your programme's target area?</p>	<p>The adoption of the new Constitution in 2010 has resulted in a period of uncertainty for catchment area management in Kenya. Important water sector reforms were laid down in the Water Act, 2002. The new Constitution requires a revision of the existing Water Act of 2002. However, the existing Water Act was not amended before the elections and its revision will not be finalized before 2014. The envisaged creation of 6 River Basin Authorities cannot be completed until the Water Act is revised; River Basin Management Plans will have to be formulated. However, the delay in revision of the Water Act will not the creation and empowerment of 1200 Water Resources User Associations (ONGOING SINCE 2008), consisting of stakeholders, including women. In fact these Associations fit in very well in the envisaged devolution process. In 2012 progress was made at local level as new Water Resources User Associations (WRUAs) were created and sub-catchment management plans of such Associations were approved and funded. A weak point in the past has been the lack of inter-ministerial collaboration to address watershed management and restoration of the upland catchments. The creation of a Ministry for Environment, Water and Natural Resources in May 2013 offers an excellent possibility to improve on this. In 2012 no progress can be reported for the forest cover, which constitutionally should be 10% of all land, but is still declining and currently stands at 6.1% only.</p>					
	Base line (year)	Target (2015)	Result (2012)	Result (2013)	Result (2014)	Source
<i>Indicator 1 : Number of river basin plans approved and operational</i>	0	8	0			<i>Ministry of Water and Irrigatio: Annual Water Sector Review Report 2011/12, February 201.</i>
<i>Indicator 2 : Number of sub-catchment management plans approved and operational</i>	0(2008)	1200	107			<i>Water Services Trust Fund: Rural Window Progress Report 2nd Quarter FY 2012/12: 1st October - 31st December 2012</i>
<i>Indicator 3 : Number of Water Resources User Associations operational</i>	0(2008)	1200	450			<i>Ministry of Water and Irrigatio: Annual Water Sector Review Report 2011/12, February 201.</i>
<i>Indicator 4 : Water storage in m3 per capita</i>	5 m3/cap (2010)	16 m3/cap	5 m3/cap			<i>Ministry of Water and Irrigatio: Annual Water Sector Review Report 2011/12, February 201.</i>
<i>Indicator 5 : Forest cover (in % of total area)</i>	6.5% (1990)	10% (constitution)	6.1% (2010)			UNSTATS MDG indicators

Result Area 2	Improved catchment area management and safe deltas					
Result Question 2.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result	<p>The intervention of the Embassy in Nairobi focuses on four areas: (i) two catchments emanating from the Mau Forest, characterized by rapid economic development and the need to conserve biodiversity and relatively high rainfall (Lake Naivasha catchment and Mara River catchment) and (ii) two landscapes in the so-called Arid and Semi-Arid Lands or ASALs (the Laikipia-Samburu-Marsabit landscape and the South Rift Valley landscape). Activities will lead to improved management of water and other natural resources (including biodiversity) in the intervention areas and improved resilience of pastoralist communities. In the Mau Forest catchments this will lead to continued economic development while ensuring the biodiversity and ecological values in the catchments. In the semi-arid areas the activities will lead to reduced conflicts over resources and reduced human-wildlife conflict and increased income to pastoralist communities from a wide range of alternative income sources. In doing so, programmes increase resilience and provide local population with adaptation strategies for the effects of climate change. In 2012, an Integrated Water Resources Management Action Plan was formulated for the Lake Naivasha catchment. The Action Plan will be instrumental in establishing sustainable water management in the area. In the semi-arid areas the number of conflicts in the intervention areas remained manageable. However poaching increased significantly in 2012, with 385 elephants killed in the intervention area of the Embassy (which is about 3 times the size of the Netherlands). This process is driven by external factors and even more prevalent in areas without conservation interventions.</p>					
	Base line (year)	Target (2015)	Result (2012)	Result (2013)	Result (2014)	Source
<i>Indicator 1 : # of farmers in Lake Naivasha basin involved in downstream - upstream payment for environmental services that are implementing sustainable land use practices</i>	565 (2011)	3000	785			project reports
<i>Indicator 2 : Water Allocation Plan Lake Naivasha gazetted or amendment(s) gazetted</i>	0	2	0			Kenya Gazette
<i>Indicator 3 : Area under conservation management in semi-arid project area (in ha)</i>	3.253.863 (2012)	3.300.000	3.253.863			Project progress reports
<i>Indicator 4: # of elephants killed by poaching in the semi-arid project area</i>	385 (2012)	0	385			Project progress reports
<i>Indicator 5: Number of officially recorded incidents as a consequence of natural resource conflicts in the semi-arid project area</i>	254 (2012)	50	254			project reports
<i>Indicator 6: Amount of income generated in non-livestock livelihoods in the semi-arid project area (in Kenya shillings)</i>	324.045.000 (2012)	600.000.000	324.045.000			project reports
<i>Indicator 6: # of Dutch parties involved with implementation of the programme</i>	0 (2010)	10	4			project reports

Result Area 2	Improved catchment area management and safe deltas					
Result Question 2.1c: What evidence do you have to support this?	In the semi arid areas of the Laikipia-Samburu-Marsabit and Rift Valley landscapes, new programmes started mid 2012. Baseline data have only now been established. In the Mau Forest landscape, the programme for the Lake Naivasha catchment was formulated. As the formulation involves all stakeholders, this has been time consuming. The final programme, with financial contributions of all stakeholders will start in January 2013. The Mara River catchment was selected as a second catchment. Funding for the Mara catchment will be done towards a Public Private Partnership. A tender to award the available fund as a subsidy will be launched in 2013.					
	Base line (year)	Target (2015)	Result (2012)	Result (2013)	Result (2014)	Source
<i>Indicator 1: Average water use efficiency for agriculture and horticulture in Naivasha area: average crop yield in tonnes of produce per ha per year</i>	n.a.	to be determined	n.a.			Project reports
<i>Indicator 2: Area under conservation (watershed forests & riparian land) in Naivasha</i>	120 ha (2011)	44,500 ha	701 ha			WWF reports
Assessment of achievement of results, Netherlands contribution	B					
A. Achievements exceed what was planned	Basis/explanation for the assessment: The Dutch contribution for this result area in 2012 was directed toward the semi-arid areas. The programmes for the Mau Forest area were developed in 2012, after approval of the MASP, and will start yielding results in 2013.					
B. Achievements are in line with what was planned						
C. Achievements are below what was planned						
D. Achievements are far below what was planned						
Implications for planning						
The Programmes in the Mau Forest catchments will start in 2013. The programmes in the Arid and Semi Arid Lands have seen a funding gap, as proposals were only submitted after the approval of the MASP and appraisal took some months. These programmes started mid 2012 and are on track.						

Result Area 3	Access to Safe Drinking Water and Sanitation					
<p>Result Question 3.1a: How many people (men and women) obtained sustainable access to safe drinking water supply and/or improved sanitation facilities, and to what extent has governance improved in your target area?</p>	<p>The adoption of the new Constitution in 2010 has resulted in a period of uncertainty for the Kenyan drinking water sector that will continue until 2013 or 2014. Water sector performance improved significantly following the water sector reforms laid down in the Water Act, 2002. The new Constitution includes a Bill of Rights that guarantees all Kenyans the right to safe drinking water and adequate sanitation. However, the existing Water Act was not amended before the elections and crucial elements of the reform (such as ring-fencing water financing) risk being lost. The delay in the revision of the Water Act also introduces uncertainties regarding the future of the institutional set-up. The new Water Act will likely be enacted in 2014 or 2015. Despite the uncertainties, the government and donors continued investment in providing access to safe drinking water and sanitation in 2012 by investing in rural and urban areas. Good progress is being made in the rural areas, with support from the Netherlands. However, although the number of households in urban areas with access to drinking water and sanitation has increased considerably over the past years, the rapid urbanization has resulted in a decline of the proportion of the urban population with access to drinking water and sanitation.</p>					
	Base line (year)	Target (2015)	Result (2012)	Result (2013)	Result (2014)	Source
<p><i>Indicator 1: Proportion of the urban population using improved drinking water sources</i></p>	92% (1990)	98%	83% (2011)			WHO / UNICEF JMP
<p><i>Indicator 2: Proportion of the rural population using improved drinking water sources</i></p>	33% (1990)	66%	54% (2011)			WHO / UNICEF JMP
<p><i>Indicator 3: Proportion of the urban population using an improved sanitation facility</i></p>	26% (1990)	63%	31% (2011)			WHO / UNICEF JMP
<p><i>Indicator 4: Proportion of the rural population using an improved sanitation facility</i></p>	24% (1990)	62%	29% (2011)			WHO / UNICEF JMP
<p>Result Question 3.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?</p>	<p>The interventions according to the MASP of the Embassy in Nairobi focus on three areas: (i) rural water and sanitation through the UNICEF Kenya WASH programme 22 counties (since 2008); (ii) support two Water Operator Partnership Programmes (WOPs) between Dutch drinking water companies and Kenyan urban water service providers in Naivasha (since June 2012) and Mombasa (since December 2012); (iii) support to the development of private sector solutions for sanitation in slums (January 2013). Private sector involvement is strongly supported, also in sanitation. In the rural UNICEF programme, focus is on increasing access to water and sanitation as well as improving sustainability of new and existing water points. In the Water Operator Partnership programmes, professionalization of water utilities is an important goal. In these urban centres expansion of services is expected after the existing systems are managed in a more business-like manner (see also performance question 3.2, below).</p>					
	Base line (year)	Target (2015)	Result (2012)	Result (2013)	Result (2014)	Source
<p><i>Indicator 1 : Number of people with access to sustainable and safe drinking water in rural areas</i></p>	0,43 million additional (2010)	1,6 million additional	0,96 million additional			project progress reports
<p><i>Indicator 2 : Number of people with access to acceptable sanitation in rural areas</i></p>	0,48 million additional (2010)	2,8 million additional	1,21 million additional			project progress reports
<p><i>Indicator 3 : additional number of people with access to sustainable and safe drinking water in urban areas of Naivasha and Mombasa</i></p>	0 (2010)	144.000	0			project progress reports
<p><i>Indicator 4 : additional number of people with access to acceptable sanitation in urban areas of Naivasha and Mombasa</i></p>	0 (2010)	38.000 (2016)	0			project progress reports

Result Area 3	Access to Safe Drinking Water and Sanitation
Result Question 3.1c: What evidence do you have to support this?	<p>In 2012 (January - July), the rural WASH programme by UNICEF has funded access to clean water in 488 communities. Improved access to sanitation was realized by promoting the Community Led Total Sanitation approach in 773 villages. The Water Operator Partnership by Vitens Evides in Naivasha started in 2012 and has not yet yielded results. The Partnership in Mombasa is expected to start in November 2012. A PPP initiative to involve private sector in providing sanitation services on a commercial basis in Mukuru slum (Nairobi) will start in January 2013.</p>

Result Area 3	Access to Safe Drinking Water and Sanitation					
	Base line (year)	Target (2015)	Result (2012)	Result (2013)	Result (2014)	Source
<i>Indicator 1 : Number of villages declared open defaecation free (ODF) annually</i>	500	1000	773			Government and project reports
<i>Indicator 2 : # of completed projects providing water to communities annually</i>	0 (2007)	350	488			reports
<i>Indicator 3: Sanitation coverage informal settlements Naivasha</i>	<10%	50	<10%			project progress reports
Result Question 3.2a: To what extent have water- and system management aspects and a more professional approach to that been applied in your (WASH) target area?	<p>Since the enactment of the Water Act 2002, Kenya has adopted urban water provision and sewerage by independent, commercially operating Water Service Providers. Water companies are registered under the Company Act and use water fees to do finance Operation and Maintenance. A number of water service providers has succeeded in becoming more professional, but many are still ineffective. Non Revenue Water (water that is produced but is not generating revenue) and service hours are still below the standards set by the regulator. Kenyan Water Sector Regulator collects information on the commercialized approaches of Water Service Providers and publishes annual reports with information on the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of all urban and some rural Water Service Providers (IMPACT report, see http://www.wasreb.go.ke/). The objective of the publication is to create transparent information on the effectiveness of the Water companies. For two indicators, i.e. %-age of Non Revenue Water and Hours of water provision / day the national trend has been stagnant or negative according to the last available data (2010). Data for 2012 are not yet available. In rural areas, water supply and sanitation are considered community-led. In rural sanitation, the so-called Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) approach, targeting all stakeholders at community level to take responsibility for sanitation in the village has been adopted by the Ministry of Public Health and is implemented successfully in almost the entire country. In small and medium urban areas (with small networks) and in rural areas (hand pumps), water supply does not lead to water management problems. In large towns and cities it may. Focus is mainly on improving management and reducing non-revenue water, as improvement of water efficiency in water providers will reduce the water footprint of the water provision services.</p>					
	Base line (year)	Target (2015)	Result (2012)	Result (2013)	Result (2014)	Source
<i>Indicator 1 : Average Non Revenue Water of Kenyan Water Service Providers (national average)</i>	43% (2009)	25%	45% (2011)			Regulator annual report
<i>Indicator 2 : Average number of hours / day of water provision in urban service areas (national average)</i>	15 (2009)	20 hrs/day	13 (2011)			Regulator annual report
<i>Indicator 3 : # of Open Defecation Free villages country-wide</i>	0 (2009)	6.600	1.838			Ministry of Public Health

Result Area 3	Access to Safe Drinking Water and Sanitation					
Result Question 3.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?	The interventions according to the MASP of the Embassy in Nairobi focus on three areas: (i) rural water and sanitation through the UNICEF Kenya WASH programme 22 counties (since 2008); (ii) support two Water Operator Partnership Programmes (WOPs) between Dutch drinking water companies and Kenyan urban water service providers in Naivasha (since June 2012) and Mombasa (since December 2012); (iii) support to the development of private sector solutions for sanitation in slums (January 2013). Ad (i): In the UNICEF programme the Embassy has actively lobbied UNICEF to incorporate mechanisms that improve the sustainability of the interventions, a.o. by involving the private sector. This includes training of local (private) mechanics that may provide services to communities when pumps break down. Regarding sanitation, the Community Led Total Sanitation approach is implemented without subsidies to infrastructure. Rural households are induced to finance their own sanitation facilities on site, with considerable success. Ad (ii): In the Water Operator Partnerships the main attention is towards improving the financial institutional economic, technical and social aspects of the water service providers. The Partnerships are starting up and first results are expected in 2013.					
	Base line (year)	Target (2015)	Result (2012)	Result (2013)	Result (2014)	Source
<i>Indicator 1 : Non Revenue Water in Naivasha</i>	50% (2011)	33%	50% (2011)			Regulator annual report
<i>Indicator 2 : Non Revenue Water in Mombasa</i>	42% (2011)	25%	42% (2011)			Regulator annual report
<i>Indicator 3 : Average number of hours / day of water provision in Naivasha</i>	2 hrs/ day (2011)	12 hrs / day (2016)	2 hrs/ day (2011)			Regulator annual report
<i>Indicator 4 : Average number of hours / day of water provision in Mombasa</i>	8 hrs / day (2010)	16 hrs / day (2016)	8 hrs/day (2011)			Regulator annual report
<i>Indicator 5 : Number of villages in UNICEF intervention area declared Open Defecation Free annually</i>	500	1000	773			UNICEF report
Question 3.2c: What evidence do you have to support this?	In 2012, the Water Operator Partnerships between Dutch and Kenyan water utilities will start up. In August 2012 no results had been achieved yet.					
	Baseline (year)	Objective (2015)	Result (2012)	(Result) 2013	(Result) 2014	Source
<i>Indicator 1 : Customer satisfaction measured in Naivasha and Mombasa</i>	no	yes	Naivasha			Project reports
<i>Indicator 2: Customer satisfaction In Naivasha and Mombasa (scale 1-10)</i>	not measured	>6.5	4.36 (Naivasha)			Project reports
Assessment of achievement of results, Netherlands contribution	B					
A. Achievements exceed what was planned	Basis/explanation for the assessment: The UNICEF project did not achieve its targets for rural water supply, but reached targets for sanitation. Reasons are the accumulated delays of previous years, which led to targets that were clearly too high. Achievements exceeded those in previous years though. The Water Operator Partnerships are starting up in 2012, in July for Naivasha and in December for Mombasa. The reporting date is too early to achieve results for these programmes.					
B. Achievements are in line with what was planned						
C. Achievements are below what was planned						
D. Achievements are far below what was planned						
Implications for planning						

Result Area 3

Access to Safe Drinking Water and Sanitation

The Water Operation Partnerships in Naivasha and Mombasa are starting up in the second half of 2012 and the sanitation pilot in Mukuru slum will start in January 2013. These programmes will be monitored closely in the start-up phase. Regular field visits to the UNICEF programme will continue to ensure that the increased speed of implementation is maintained in 2013.