



Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken

Water



Organisation		Date			Reporting period			
Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Nairobi, Kenya		June 2016			2015			
Activity Number	Name	2015 Actual expenditure	Implemented by Name organisation	Channel	Result area Result area	Rto marker Mitigation/Adaptation	Significant/principal	Gender marker Significant/principal
16967	UNICEF WaSH	0	UNICEF	Multilateral organisation	Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH)	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
24048	Vitens Naivasha	402.819	Vitens Evides International	Research institute and companies	Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH)	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
24816	GOAL Sanitation	114.139	GOAL	NGO	Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH)	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
25657	Vitens Mombasa	1.038.375	Vitens Evides International	Research institute and companies	Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH)	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
26579	KIFFWA	510.550	Netherlands Water Partnership	PPP or network	Trade and development cooperation	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
24981	WWF IWRAP Naivasha	591.969	WWF-Kenya	NGO	Improved river basin management and safe deltas	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
25451	Sustainable Water Management Mara	1.639.000	UNESCO-IHE	Research institute and companies	Improved river basin management and safe deltas	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
28334	SWA	0		[...]	Efficient water use in agriculture	Adaptation	Significant	Significant

Result Area 1	Efficient water use in agriculture
----------------------	---

Result question 1a: To what extent has the ratio between crop yield and water use been improved in a sustainable manner in the target area of your programme ('more crop per drop')?	Against a backdrop of good weather and abundant rainfall in 2015, the agriculture sector recorded growing production. However according to 2016 Economic Survey Report, while production has continued to increase, growth has decelerated in the last few years. Moreover, the yield level remained stable indicating an increased acreage. Support activities to agriculture which include extension services and training have also been experiencing a decrease since 2013 from 0.5% to -1.4%. Nevertheless the Government has been increasing expenditure on irrigation development. From 2016 onwards the yield and water productivity will be determined with the use of remote sensing.
---	---

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Agricultural yields of maize crop in kg per hectare	1584 kg/ha	No national target	1736.6 kg/ha	1692.2 kg/ha	1660.2 kg/ha			FAOstat
Indicator 2: Water productivity: crop yield per unit of water (kg/m³)	0.288 kg/m³	No national target	0.316 kg/m³	0.308 kg/m³	0.302 kg/m³			FAOstat
Indicator 3: Crops cultivation (% growth)	5.5 %	15%	7.5 %	17.8 %	13.5 %	12.3 %		2016 Economic Survey Report
Indicator 4: Support activities to agriculture (% growth)	1.5 %	1%	2.3 %	0.5 %	-1.40%	0%		2016 Economic Survey Report
Indicator 5: Government expenditure on irrigation development (Ksh Million)	N/A	2290 (2016/2017)	542.2 (2011/12)	90.6 (2012/13)	139.0 (2013/14)	157.2 (2014/15)	2190.9 (2015/16)	2016 Economic Survey Report

Result question 1.b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?	In the second half of 2015 the embassy embarked on developing a 'Smart Water for Agriculture' project. A scoping study was undertaken on the basis of which a call for concept notes was made which resulted in 9 responses. SNV was selected out of these 9 to develop a full project proposal which was received in November 2015. The intention of this project is to promote water efficient agricultural practices among the SME farmers. This project will commence implementation in 2016.
---	---

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Increased water productivity (kg/m³)	0	Increase water productivity by 20% for 20,000 SME farmers	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		SWA appraisal memorandum

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result Area 1	Efficient water use in agriculture
---	---

Assess achieved results compared to planning:	B. Results achieved as planned
---	--------------------------------

Reasons for result achieved:	SWA programme has started. Field outcomes are expected in the coming years.
------------------------------	---

Implications for planning:	SWA programme has started. Field outcomes are expected in the coming years.
----------------------------	---

Result Area 2		Improved river basin management and safe deltas						
Result question 2.1a: To what extent has there been progress in the development and implementation of plans for sustainable growth and water safety (incl. good governance) in the target area of your programme?		All water resources are vested in and held by the national government in trust for the people of Kenya. The Constitution of Kenya classifies all water resources, including territorial sea, as public land. Water resources management functions are implemented at both the national and county levels. The Kenyan water ministry has been in the process of drafting a new water policy and bill to align the water sector to the new Constitution of Kenya 2010. This Water Policy and Bill proposes that Water Resources Management Authority (WRMA) has the national regulatory function for water resources management while the Basin Water Resources Committees be responsible for the implementation of water resource management activities at basin level. It is expected that this change will make WRMA more focused and efficient. At the same time the Basin committees will be expected to work in close cooperation with respective counties and Water Resources Users Associations at sub basin level. Important progress was made with regards to the adoption of this drafted Water Policy and Bill: in 2015 the Bill was approved and passed by the National Assembly after going through the 3rd reading. The Bill was then forwarded to the Senate for further scrutiny since it touched on mandates of the County Governments. Pending enactment, the sector continues to operate under the old Water Act 2002 and Policy.						
Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Number of river basin plans approved and operational	0 (2005)	6 revised plans	6	6	6	6 (based on the 6 defined major drainage systems - these are all undergoing revision and alignment to the new constitution)		2016 Annual Water Sector Review Report
Indicator 2: Number of sub-catchment management plans approved and operational	0 (2008)	1271	107	234	320	348		2016 Annual Water Sector Review Report (cumulative)
Indicator 3: Number of Water Resources Users Associations operational	0 (2008)	1271	450	499	571	599		2016 Annual Water Sector Review Report (cumulative)
Indicator 4: Water storage in m3 per capita	8 (2008)	16	5	4.3	4.6	5.0		Water Ministry medium term plan (2013-2017) (cumulative)

Result question 2.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?		<p>The interventions of the Embassy in Nairobi focused on four geographical areas: (i) two catchments - Lake Naivasha catchment and Mara River catchment and (ii) two landscapes in the so-called Semi-Arid Lands (the Laikipia-Samburu-Marsabit landscape and the South Rift Valley landscape). Activities in the two water catchments were initiated and formulated in 2012. For Lake Naivasha the initiative started in 2013 and for the Mara River in 2014. Results in 2015 are for both the catchment areas. In these catchment areas we see continued economic development while biodiversity and ecological values in the catchments are protected. Activities in the semi-arid lands started around mid 2012, after which a baseline was established. Activities are leading to improved management of water resources and other natural resources (including biodiversity) and improved resilience of pastoralist communities. In the semi-arid areas the activities lead to reduced wildlife crime, for instance in 2015 number of elephant poached in the project area reduced from 76 to 56. In doing so, programmes increase resilience and provide local population with adaptation strategies from the effects of climate change.</p> <p>In 2015 both lake Naivasha catchment and the Mara river basin successfully completed rehabilitation and replacement of the planned water resource hydro-met monitoring networks for efficient and effective operations and monitoring of both surface and groundwater. A self assessment tool developed and improved was used by all 12 Water Resources Users Associations in the Naivasha catchment for purposes of identifying solutions to improve their governance. In addition the water resources management authority and the Water Resources User Associations (WRUAs) in the Lake Naivasha area have developed robust ICT structures to collect water abstraction fees and data analysis. Data collection has commenced and is ongoing. Abstraction surveys and reserve flows were carried out in the Mara River basin that will contribute to the development of the water allocation plan of the catchment to be made available in 2016.</p> <p>Gender is continuously being integrated in the water resources interventions. During the WRUA capacity assessment in the lake Naivasha catchment, the male to female ratio was 3:2. However chairpersons are all male with women being more commonly elected to serve as secretaries or treasurers. The women in the Mara river basin were trained in the business of keeping bees and now 2 women have established bee keeping enterprises. In the Mara river basin community scouts program women are involved in forest protection. Presently this intervention is being piloted and has three women scouts.</p>						
Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Number of river basins / delta's with water allocation / flow management / coastal defense plans that are ecologically and socio-economically sustainable	0(2003)	2		1	1	1		2015 Progress reports
Indicator 2: Number of people (male/female) targeted in the Dutch water management projects (targetted catchment stakeholders)	0(2012)	1.397.500	0	747.500	1.397.500	1.397.500		Project proposals (cumulative over project period)
Indicator 3: Number of farmers involved in downstream-upstream catchment conservation measures	0(2012)	4.000			1752	2.925		2015 Progress reports (cumulative data)
Indicator 4: Area under conservation management in semi-arid project (in ha)	3.253.863(2012)	3.300.000	3.253.863	2.819.885	3.306.020	1.319.320		Project progress reports

Result question 2.2a: To what extent has transboundary and collective river basin management been improved in the target area of your programme?

Kenya's shared water resources accounts for over 50% of the country's renewable surface water resources. Kenya shares surface and groundwater with all its neighbours, this includes 10 international trans-boundary river basins and lake basins. The government has over the past years been developing its Transboundary Water Policy. By the end of 2014 the policy was approved by the Attorney General (AG) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (MFA). Kenya is presently finalising the signing of bilateral MoUs with the neighbouring countries (Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Uganda). Kenya has been taking part in negotiations around the Nile basin, and is in the process of ratifying the Nile Corporative Framework Agreement. Kenya and Ethiopia in collaboration with UNEP have initiated a regional project on the sustainable management of Lake Turkana and its River Basins. The project document has been signed by the two countries (and by UNEP in 2015). The Embassy actively lobbied for the involvement of the Netherlands Commission on Impact Assessment in this project.

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Number of bilateral transboundary MoUs	0(2008)	5	drafting ongoing	1 MoU signed (Between Kenya and Tanzania - Jipe,Chala,Umba)	2 MoUs awaiting Ministerial signature (Kenya/Tanzania- Mara, and Kenya/Uganda-Malaba,Sio)	2 MoU signed between(Kenya/Tanzania-Mara, and Kenya/Uganda-Malaba,Sio)		Ministry of Water and Irrigation
Indicator 2: Kenyan Transboundary Waters Policy in place	0(2008)	1	Drafting	Final draft prepared after consultations	Final draft approved by AG and MFA end 2014	Approved by Cabinet		Ministry of Water and Irrigation Annual Review Report

Result question 2.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?

Since June 2014, the Embassy-funded Mau Mara Serengeti (MaMaSe) Sustainable Water Initiative by UNESCO-IHE has been implementing activities in the Mara River Basin with the aim of improving water safety and security in the Mara River Basin (MRB) in support of structural poverty reduction, sustainable economic growth, and conservation of the basin, forest and rangeland ecosystems. The MaMaSe initiative activities are focused on the Kenyan side, however the Mara is a transboundary river basin and water development in Kenya may have significant impacts on downstream users and ecosystems in Tanzania. Therefore special attentions has been placed on collaboration with partners and projects pursuing complementary goals in Tanzania. In 2015 two complementary projects funded by the MacArthur Foundation were launched in the Tanzanian Mara and MaMaSe has ties to both. The Serengeti – Lake Victoria (SELVA) Sustainable Water Initiative is somewhat modelled after MaMaSe and seeks to address water security challenges to ecosystems and human populations in the Tanzania Mara River Basin. Similarly, the "Sustainable Use of Critical Wetlands in Lake Victoria Basin" project is carrying out capacity development activities among wetland communities and generating knowledge for improved wetland management. An especially important development in 2015 was the signing of a MOU between Kenya and Tanzania on Joint Water Resources Management of the Transboundary Mara River Basin. This MOU includes the establishment of a Joint Technical Committee (JTC) to coordinate the cross border cooperation. Mamase is invited to present its work at the first meeting of the JTC.

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result Area 2	Improved river basin management and safe deltas
Assess achieved results compared to planning:	B. Results achieved as planned
Reasons for result achieved:	2015 was the 3rd year of the lake Naivasha IWRAP initiative and 2nd year of the Mara River basin MaMaSe initiative. Especially the IWRAP initiative has some delays and experience staff transfers which included one on the management level. Replacement and orientation of new staff to the initiative have been carried out and the delays adequately explained. The Mara River Basin project has picked up pace.
Implications for planning:	Project implementation is generally on track. Where there has been reported delays the project implementing partners have indicated clear fast-tracking actions to be undertaken in 2016 and this is closely being monitored particularly for IWRAP which is in its last implementation year.

Result Area 3**Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH)**

Result question 3.1a: How many people (male/female) have gained sustainable access to an improved water source or improved sanitary facility and to what extent has governance been improved on this topic in the target area of your programme?

The 2010 Constitution of Kenya devolved water supply and sanitation services provision to the county level. In the Bill of Rights of the Constitution, all Kenyans are guaranteed the right to safe drinking water and adequate sanitation. By end of 2015 the new revised Water Bill and draft Water Policy had not yet been enacted and gazetted. In 2015 the Water Bill was approved by the National Assembly and forwarded to the Senate. It is still awaiting approval of the Senate before it is enacted to law. The delay in the enactment/gazetment of the Water Bill and draft policy created unclarity regarding the future of the institutional set-up for service provision at the county level. The sector is therefore operating under the old legal framework of water Act 2002, which has caused occasional conflicts between the roles of counties and water services boards with regard to provision of water services and infrastructure development. Some of these conflicts have been experienced especially in the area of investment planning and project implementation. In the meantime the county government has 100% ownership of the water utilities. Despite the conflicts, the government and donors continued to invest in providing access to safe drinking water and sanitation in 2015 in rural and urban areas.

In 2015 urban water coverage was reported at 54% whereas rural water coverage was at 49%. The national sanitation coverage decreased by 1.6% to 66.9% whereas national sewerage coverage increased by 0.8% to 10.2%. Investment in sewerage has been very low over the years and that accounts for the increasing need to adopt low cost appropriate technologies with low per capita investment costs.

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Percentage of people (urban/rural, male/female, from vulnerable groups) reached with sustainable access to and use of improved sanitation facilities		70%		65%	68%	66.7%		2016 Annual Water Sector Review Report 2014/2015
Indicator 2: Percentage of people (urban/rural, male/female, from vulnerable groups) reached with sustainable access to and use improved water sources facilities		58%		53%	55%	56%		2016 Annual Water Sector Review Report 2014/2015
Indicator 3: Percentage of people (urban/rural, male/female, from vulnerable groups) that have received hygiene training and social marketing programs								
Indicator 4: Number of Open Defecation Free villages country-wide	0 (2009)	73.000	1.838	3.886	16.817	53.492		Ministry of Health/UNICEF

Result question 3.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?

The interventions of the Embassy in 2015 focused on (i) support to two Water Operator Partnership Programmes (WOPs) between Dutch drinking water companies and Kenyan urban water service providers in Naivasha and Mombasa; and (ii) support to the development of private sector solutions for sanitation in slums through implementation of the sanitation improvement through market strategies project. 2015 was the final implementation year of the sanitation marketing programme. The rural water and sanitation through the UNICEF Kenya WASH programme came to an end in 2014 and no further expenditures were made on it in 2015.

The sanitation marketing programme had installed upto 189 Fresh Life Toilets (FLT) against the target 175, in Mukuru kwa njenga slum in Nairobi. The same programme was able to reach through hygiene promotion and sanitation marketing initiatives 110% of the targetted population (i.e 198,106/180,000). In addition, under the same programme, the voucher system aimed to provide the poorest families with access to the FLT was issued to 1,658 persons who comprised 745 femal, 632 male and 281 under 5 years. For both Water Operator Partnerships (Naivasha and (Mombasa), 2015 was spent on implementing interventions both on technical and management aspects. In both Naivasha and Mombasa, the interventions involved improving access to water and sanitation in the urban low income areas - in Naivasha 10 low income areas and in Mombasa 7 low income areas. In both WOPs 102,198 additional people in the slums/low income areas were reached with access to water and improved sanitation facilities. In Naivasha the number of sewer connections increased by 1% which reflects on the increased customer satisfaction survey as a result of strengthened communication and feedback measures. The Mombasa WOP commenced on a component of school WaSH where 30 schools will be targetted in the first phase with WaSH facilities. By end of 2015 work was ongoing at 3 primary schools targetting 923 girls and 1051 boys.

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Number of people (urban /rural, male/female) reached with sustainable access to, and using, improved sanitation facilities through central programmes								
Indicator 2: Number of people (urban/rural, male/female) reached with sustainable access to, and using, improved water sources through central programmes								
Indicator 3: Number of people (urban/rural, male/female) reached with hygiene education and social marketing programmes through central programmes								
Indicator 4: Number of communities/schools declared open defecation free (ODF) through central programmes								
Indicator 5: Number of people with access to sustainable and safe drinking water in urban low income areas of Naivasha				37.108	44.000	57.000		2015 Project progress report (cumulative data)
Indicator 6: Additional people with access to sustainable and safe drinking water in urban low income areas of Mombasa						9.869		2015 Project progress report (cumulative data)
Indicator 7: Additional number of people with access to acceptable sanitation in urban areas of Naivasha				15.634	128.000	130.000		Project Progress Report (cumulative data)
Indicator 8: Additional number of people with access to acceptable sanitation in urban low income areas of Mombasa								Project Progress Report (not cumulative data)

Result question 3.2a: To what extent have water management aspects and a more business oriented way of working been applied in your WASH programmes?

In line with the 2010 Constitution, the County Governments took over ownership of all the existing water utilities in line with devolution. Since the enactment of the Water Act 2002, Kenyan water services provision of urban water supply and sewerage has been by independent, commercially operating Water Service Providers, registered under the Company Act and use water tariffs to finance their Operation and Maintenance. A new Water Bill and Policy has been drafted aligned to the 2010 Constitution of Kenya. Once enacted into law the new Water Act will repeal the Water Act 2002. A number of water service providers have succeeded in becoming more professional, but many, especially the small companies are still ineffective, and not commercially viable and thus clustering efforts have been ongoing. Current water loss reduction - Non Revenue Water and service hours are still below the standards set by the Kenya Water Service Regulatory Board. WASREB is considered to be effective and a key player in the (success of the) water sector reform. WASREB 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. In 2015 the WASREB added an indicator on the water utilities' credit worthiness index. For two indicators, notable %age of Non Revenue Water and Hours of water provision / day, the national trend has been stagnant or marginally positive according to the last available data (2013).

In rural areas, water supply and sanitation are mostly community-led. In rural sanitation, the so-called Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) approach, targeting 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. Regarding sanitation, the Community Led Total Sanitation approach is implemented without subsidies to infrastructure. Rural households are now participating in financing their own sanitation facilities on site.

Some of the key challenges are in regard to the development of rural water supply, missing sector data for rural areas, keeping pace with the demands for water services in urban areas, poor performance of many utilities, high levels of NRW-above 40% in many utilities. Therefore in both urban and rural water supply and sanitation/sewerage services the focus is mainly on improving operation and management and reducing non-revenue water, as improvement of efficiency by providers will reduce the footprint of the water provision services and make them more economically sustainable.

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Percentage of water produced by water utilities that does not generate revenue (Non Revenue Water)	43% (2009)	25%	45% (2011)	57% (2012)	55%	to be published July 2015		Water Services Regulator annual IMPACT report
Indicator 2: Average number of hours / day of water provision in urban service areas (national average)	15 (2009)	20	13 (2011)	15 (2012)	17(2013)	to be published July 2015		Water Services Regulator annual IMPACT report
Indicator 3: Percentage of water revenues used for Operation and Maintenance by urban Water Service Providers	133% (2010)	150%	118% (2011) - revised figure	105% (2012):	104% (2013)	to be published July 2015		Water Services Regulator annual IMPACT report

Result question 3.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?

For the Water Operator Partnerships supported by the embassy their intervention is towards strengthening the financial, institutional, environmental, technical and social aspects of the water services (water supply and sanitation). As a measure to enhance effective water management for increased income generation the water operators have a particular attention to addressing water loss reduction by providing technical expertise on managing Non Revenue Water which has implications on revenue generation and investment capabilities of the water utilities. In 2015 Mombasa focused on preparations to handover the 7 pilot District Metering Areas (DMAs) to the water utility's respective business units in readiness to upscaling the NRW management approach to the rest of Mombasa. In Naivasha effort was focused on the 1 established DMA to ensure total buy-in and support from the water utility management and thereafter upscaling to other pilot areas.

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Non Revenue Water in Naivasha town	50% (2011)	33%	50% (2011)	No data (2012)	44%	44%		2015 Project progress report
Indicator 2: Non Revenue Water (NRW) in Mombasa town	42% (2011)	15%	42% (2011)	47% (2012)	50%	20% (5 DMAs)		2015 Project progress report
Indicator 3: Average number of hours / day of water provision in Naivasha	2 hrs/ day (2011)	12 hrs/ day (2016)	2 hrs/ day (2011)	6 hrs/day (2012)	6hrs/day	12hrs/day		2015 Project progress report
Indicator 4: Average number of hours / day of water provision in Mombasa	8 hrs / day (2010)	16 hrs / day (2016)	8 hrs / day (2011)	6 hrs/day (2012)	6hrs/ 3-4 days per week	6hrs		2015 Project progress report

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result Area 3	Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH)
Assess achieved results compared to planning:	B. Results achieved as planned
Reasons for result achieved:	The WOP partnerships carried on with implementation of interventions. Naivasha experienced a change in the water utility management, a management that is eager to bring about a change in the company. Mombasa similarly had a change in the water utility management. There has been closer involvement of the Mombasa county government (charged with the mandate to ensure adequate water provision in its jurisdiction) which is keen to see reforms and the establishment of a revamped water utility. Preparations of the implementation of the collaboration with the World Bank started and a proposal for the extension was received in 2015.
Implications for planning:	For the Water Partnerships it is expected that in 2016 more progress will be realised. The NRW is one of the main focus areas of the WOP. Interventions on NRW are therefore expected to be upscaled. Especially in Mombasa, where the WOP project has entered into an MoU with World Bank and the County government to expand the NRW interventions. Counties Governments are keen to see that water service provision is improved in their county - this has been the case in Mombasa county. In the case of Naivasha, the new Managing Director is determined to see a turnaround in the utility in order to improve management of the company.

Result Area 4	Trade and development cooperation
Result question 4.1a: How has the added value (knowledge, expertise, products and services) of the Dutch water sector been deployed in the preparation and implementation of programmes in the water sector?	Increasingly, many of the Dutch funding instruments, including the embassy funding, are moving towards a more trade driven collaboration in development cooperation, and less of aid driven collaboration. Much of the Dutch funding is now meant for Public-Private Partnership (PPP). The Kenyan water sector now benefits from the added value, from several of these Dutch PPPs, in the areas of non-revenue water, financial management, technologies for efficient waste management, among other areas. The 2015 CSO Water and Sanitation Performance Report for Kenya that was carried out on 65 CSOs in the country indicated Dutch funding as the biggest second to DFID.

Result question 4.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?	The embassy is supporting projects in water services provision and water resources management where Dutch added value through knowledge transfer is being realised. The Lake Naivasha integrated water resources management project, The Mau Mara Sustainable Water Initiative, the Water Operator Partnerships (WOPs) in the Naivasha and Mombasa water companies are such projects. The WOPs in particular significantly contribute towards improving the financial, institutional, environmental, technical and social aspects of the water services (water supply and sanitation). The same applies to the IWRM projects, which facilitate the transfer of knowledge and expertise through capacity building interventions to the local stakeholders. In 2015 16 Dutch partners were actively involved in the embassy supported water programs: 6 Private Sector (Mara Farming, Aquanet, HSBC bank, 3 consultants), 3 NGO's (SNV, WGC, NWP), 3 Knowledge Institutes (WUR, ITC, UNESCO-IHE, 1 Water Company (Vitens) and 3 Water Authorities (Stichtse Rijnlanden, Noorderzijlvest, Waterschap Brabantse Delta)
--	--

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Number of Dutch water sector actors directly involved in preparation and implementation of Dutch funded programmes (by companies, NGOs, Knowledge institutions)	0 (2010)	10	4	7	12 (3 PS, 2 NGO, 3 KI, 1 WC, 3 WA)	16 (6PC, 3NGO, 3KI, 1 WC, 3 WA)		

Result question 4.2a: What are the results of the transition to a more trade related relationship in the water sector?	It should be noted that the transition to more trade related relationship in the water sector is not a Kenyan policy priority. Being a Dutch priority, the information contained here is linked only to Dutch aid and trade. The Embassy lacks a complete overview of all the Dutch actors in the water sector in Kenya by end of 2015.
---	--

Result question 4.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this result?	In 2015 the Embassy formalised the Kenya Innovative Finance Facility for Water (KIFFWA) which will be a co-developer, providing opportunity for bringing in Dutch expertise and technology on water interventions and bring developed projects to a financial close. The Netherlands Business Hub was also launched in 2015 with a specific water component to it, with the intention to more structurally inform on market opportunities in the water sector.
--	--

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Indicator 1: Number of existing strategic Dutch investments in the water sector in which the embassy has had a brokerage, advisory or programmatic role.	0(2012)		1	3	5	Not available		

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result Area 4	Trade and development cooperation
Assess achieved results compared to planning:	B. Results achieved as planned
Reasons for result achieved:	The joint agenda of Trade and Development Cooperation in Kenya has led to an increased interest by Dutch water actors to seek investment opportunities in the Kenyan water sector. However, most of these actors are also depending on Dutch Government funding instruments to facilitate this.
Implications for planning:	The establishment of the Netherlands Business Hub and commencement of the KIFFWA project will give momentum to a more trade related relationship and increased Dutch added value in the water sector. More specifically the Netherlands Business Hub will explore a mechanism of having an overview of Dutch investor in the water sector in Kenya.