

**REPORT ANNEXES**

ANNEX I: EVALUATION STATEMENT OF WORK ..... 1

ANNEX II: EVALUATION METHODS AND LIMITATIONS ..... 7

ANNEX III: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS..... 10

    KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE – MWA STAFF ..... 10

    KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE – IMPLEMENTING PARTNER: STRATEGIC LEVEL  
    (INCLUDING PRIVATE SECTOR)..... 17

    KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE – IMPLEMENTING PARTNER: IMPLEMENTATION  
    (COUNTY/TECHNICAL) LEVEL (INCLUDING PRIVATE SECTOR)..... 20

    KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE – COUNTY GOVERNMENT: STRATEGIC LEVEL.. 26

    KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE – COUNTY GOVERNMENT: IMPLEMENTATION  
    (TECHNICAL) LEVEL ..... 30

    KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE – NATIONAL-LEVEL STAKEHOLDERS ..... 36

ANNEX IV: DATA SOURCES ..... 40

    LIST OF KEY INFORMANTS ..... 40

    BACKGROUND DOCUMENTATION..... 42

    REFERENCES FROM INITIAL FINDINGS REPORT/DESK REVIEW ..... 45

ANNEX V: DISCLOSURE OF ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST ..... 48

# ANNEX I: EVALUATION STATEMENT OF WORK

## STATEMENT OF WORK

### End-Term Performance Evaluation of Kenya Resilient Arid Lands Partnership for Integrated Development (RAPID)

#### I. BACKGROUND

Kenya Resilient Arid Lands Partnership for Integrated Development (Kenya RAPID) is a five-year \$ 35.5 million public private partnership/Global development alliance program that is funded by USAID, Swiss Development Corporation (SDC), Private Sector Partners and Millennium Water Alliance (MWA) members, whose implementation is coordinated by the MWA. The first of its kind in the arid lands, Kenya RAPID program brings together public and private sector institutions and communities, to increase access to water and sanitation for people and water for livestock and to rebuild a healthy rangeland-management ecosystem. The program combines the assets and experience of development actors and private and public institutions by leveraging their capital and investments, innovation and access to markets – to address the complex problems in WASH sector that culminates to inadequate water access and poor governance of natural resources in the ASALs. The goal of the program is to ensure that sustainable and resilient livelihoods for communities in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands is achieved. The program has 3 strategic objective areas that form the pillars around which the program theory of change is anchored:

- SO1: A responsive and accountable governance framework is in place and operational at county government level that ensures sustainable provision of water and pasture;
- SO2: Replicable and scalable business models for sustainable WASH and livestock service delivery have been developed and operationalized; and
- SO3: Communities have increased access to sustainable WASH services and improved rangeland management.

Kenya RAPID works in five ASAL counties: Garissa, Wajir, Isiolo, Marsabit and Turkana targeting to reach a total of 450,000 rural Kenyans. The MWA in collaboration with four of its members in Kenya - CARE, Catholic Relief services (CRS), Food for the hungry (FH) and World vision (WV) and the private sector partners including Aqua for All, The Coca-Cola Africa Foundation (TCCAF), The KCB Foundation, The Vitol Foundation, IBM Research Africa, SweetSense, Davis & Shirliff, and Acacia Water are implementing Kenya RAPID. This program is part of larger USAID resilience efforts in Northern Arid lands to sequence, layer and integrate emergency relief efforts with long term development programs. The Kenya RAPID program collaborates closely with county governments in all its work.

#### 2. STATEMENT OF WORK

##### 2.1 EVALUATION PURPOSE

The primary purpose of the evaluation is to assess the activity's design and implementation, in order to inform the design and implementation of future WASH, nutrition, livestock and rangeland management activities in the ASALs undertaken by all RAPID partners. It will also provide learning on how innovative partnership approaches can sustainably support Kenya on its journey to self-reliance and resilience.

The primary audiences for the evaluation report will be USAID/KEA's Office of Economic Growth and Integration (OEGI), the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), the Kenya RAPID partners, and the government of Kenya. It may also inform the policies and approaches of other partners working in these sectors in the ASALs. To a lesser degree, the evaluation findings may be used by USAID/Washington technical staff to inform global efforts in the WASH sector.

## 2.2 DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION PLAN

USAID/KEA, SDC and MWA will disseminate the report widely to relevant stakeholders, and it will also be made publicly available to other interested parties on [globalwaters.org](http://globalwaters.org) and USAID's Development Exchange Clearinghouse (DEC). Copies of the final report will be shared with key government stakeholders at the national and county levels. It is expected that a findings validation workshop will be held with all partners following data collection activities in order to begin socializing and disseminating the evaluation findings. The findings will be used by each of the relevant audiences to influence current and future activities.

## 2.3 KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation questions will target improved understanding of both the strategic and technical approach undertaken with RAPID:

### *Strategic*

1. To what extent is the design of Kenya RAPID appropriate to the context in the ASALs? And which approaches were not well suited to this context? Are the assumptions and theory of change valid?

In particular, there were innovative features of the RAPID design that the evaluation team should consider in determining whether RAPID effectively responded to beneficiary needs and priorities:

- RAPID worked across many levels, ranging from direct engagement with households, to systems-level work with the government and private sector
  - RAPID combined WASH, livestock, nutrition and rangeland management interventions within one activity
  - RAPID focused on utilizing market-based approaches to achieve its goals
2. To what extent did bringing all these diverse partners together within the Global Development Alliance (GDA) structure result in broader impacts than would otherwise be achieved?
    - What were the resource implications of this type of partnership?
    - What kind of strategic decisions were undertaken by the steering committee, and how effective was this model for partnership governance?

### *Technical*

1. To what extent was RAPID able to establish sustainable, replicable and scalable business models?
  - Were there any spillover effects or results achieved through private sector engagement?
  - Were the business models identified appropriate to the ASAL context?

2. How effective was the facilitative, governance-focused approach under RAPID?
  - Were changes in county government capacity and commitment achieved?
  - To what extent was RAPID successful in improving community level governance?

#### *Cross-Cutting Considerations*

Throughout the above questions, the evaluation team should consider:

- **Gender:** Issues related to gender cut across all Kenya RAPID program components and across the evaluation questions. The evaluation team should seek to address gender considerations across all evaluation questions, in particular, whether achievements were equitable across gender and whether the program was successful in empowering women.
- **Resilience:** Kenya RAPID is part of USAID's larger efforts to address recurrent shocks and stressors in the ASALS. Throughout the evaluation questions, the evaluation team should seek to consider how the program's achievements are contributing to building resilience among the target population.
- **Conflict sensitivity:** The evaluation team should consider any issues related to conflict in the ASALs in responding to the questions. Any results related to how the program contributed to the prevention or mitigation of violence should be included.

## 2.4 METHODOLOGY

This will be a performance evaluation. The evaluation team is expected to propose an evaluation methodology and analysis tools that guarantees the highest degree of rigor so as to ensure credible findings and recommendations. The proposed methodology will be reviewed by USAID, SDC and RAPID partners. A mixed method approach is highly recommended with the following key data gathering techniques:

**Desk review:** The evaluation team will undertake a detailed desk review to inform the evaluation of the project. The review will cover all the relevant project documents and reports (e.g. quarterly and annual reports, workplans, monitoring data), which will be provided by RAPID. The review will also cover relevant government of Kenya national and county government documents, relevant donor funded programs and published WASH literature.

**Key Informant Interviews:** The Evaluation Team will conduct interviews with USAID/KEA team, SDC, relevant Government of Kenya (national and county) staff, RAPID partner staff, private sector, beneficiary communities members, and others as appropriate. A list of proposed interviewees will be submitted with the inception report. The final list of interviewees shall be agreed upon in consultation with USAID, SDC and RAPID team.

**Focus Group Discussions:** The Evaluation Team may also consider carrying out Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) to obtain the required data from project beneficiaries where applicable. The groups shall be constituted in consultation with the RAPID team.

**Site Visits:** To further compliment information generated through key informant interviews and desk review, field visits shall be carried out. The Evaluation Team is expected to come up with a suitable sampling methodology to identify the locations or organizations to be visited within five selected counties within the project area. In selecting the various locations for site visits, the Evaluation Team should ensure all the project components and/or sectors are catered for, the varying contexts are appropriately sampled, and that the logistics and cost involved with the different sites are put into consideration.

Prior to the start of data collection, the evaluation team will develop and present, for USAID/KEA, SDC and RAPID review and approval, a data collection and analysis plan that details how data will be collected, transcribed and analyzed, including what procedures will be used to analyze qualitative data from interviews.

## 2.5 OPERATING CONSTRAINTS

The onset of rainy season may constrain the ability to travel in the field. The evaluation team should also be cognizant of any security issues in the RAPID counties and plan site visits accordingly. Additional information can be provided by USAID and RAPID about specific travel considerations as the data collection plan is being finalized.

## 2.6 PARTICIPATION

USAID/KEA, SDC and RAPID partners will all participate in this evaluation by providing input into the SOW, evaluation methodology and deliverables. USAID/KEA, will coordinate inputs from all partners and be available to respond to questions the evaluation team might have during the implementation of the evaluation. All RAPID partners will support the evaluation team by providing project documentation and information about project implementation, and will also be available to facilitate connections with key informants and beneficiaries for interviews or focus group discussions. All partners will be available to provide information and act as respondents, where necessary.

## 2.7 STANDARDS

The technical response including methods, and the final evaluation must be consistent with and meet the standards of USAID's Evaluation Policy.

# 3. PERIOD AND PLACE OF PERFORMANCE

## 3.1 PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

The evaluation is to be conducted between April and July 2020, with all deliverables completed by July 30, 2020.

## 3.2 PLACE OF PERFORMANCE

Kenya RAPID is implemented in Garissa, Isiolo, Marsabit, Turkana and Wajir counties. It is expected that the evaluation team will select a sample of these to visit for data collection.

# 4. DELIVERABLES

1. **Inception Report:** The offeror must submit a detailed inception report to USAID within 5 days after the first meeting between USAID, SDC and Evaluation Team. The report shall detail the evaluation methodology, limitations and ways to mitigate these and operational work plan, which must include the proposed data collection and analysis methods to address the key evaluation questions. The inception report shall also include questionnaires and interview protocols and must not exceed 15 pages.
2. **Weekly reports** during field work to update on progress and any logistical challenges to mitigate

3. **Out-briefing** following the completion of data collection and before the evaluation team departs from Kenya.
4. **Draft Evaluation Report:** Within four weeks after the end of fieldwork, the Offeror must submit a draft evaluation report for preliminary comments. This will facilitate effective review by the Mission in preparation for the presentation during the validation meeting.
5. **Debriefing/Presentation of Report:** Within two weeks after submission of the draft report, a debriefing/presentation of the results will be done. During this meeting the team will present the major findings of the evaluation to key stakeholders in Nairobi, either in person or virtually. A PowerPoint presentation will be made by the evaluation team and submitted a day before the presentation. The debriefings shall include discussions of methodology, limitations, key findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
6. **Final Report:** Within 5 workdays of comments on the Draft Evaluation Report, and based on the provisions of the USAID evaluation policy, a final evaluation report shall be presented. The final report shall incorporate comments and suggestions of partners. The format shall include an executive summary (highlighting key lessons learned), table of contents, list of acronyms, evaluation design and methodology, limitations, findings, conclusions, and recommendations and lessons learned. The report shall be submitted in English, in both electronic and three bound hard copies. The Final Report must not be more than 40 pages excluding annexes, must conform to the standards set forth in the Agency Evaluation Policy<sup>1</sup>.
7. **A brief summary** of this report, not exceeding 15 pages, excluding any potentially procurement-sensitive information shall be submitted (also electronically, in English) for dissemination among implementing partners and stakeholders. The report must meet standards outlined in the evaluation policy
8. **Two Page Summary:** To be submitted three days after USAID's approval of the final report, back and front; for easy reading and distribution.

All primary source data, both quantitative and qualitative, generated during the course of evaluation must be provided to USAID in an electronic file in an easily readable format; organized and fully documented for use by those not fully familiar with the activity or the evaluation. In addition, all background documents collected for this evaluation must be provided to USAID, along with the final report. The report and the data must also be submitted to USAID's Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC) and the Development Data Library (DDL).

## 5. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

The offeror must propose the most effective team composition based on the proposed methodology. The Evaluation Team shall be comprised of a Team Leader (TL) and at least three experts. All team members must have relevant prior experiences in Africa and prior evaluation/assessment experience. The team as a whole must have sufficient relevant experience in water, sanitation, livestock, nutrition, private sector, market systems, gender and governance. At least one team member should also have special expertise in evaluation of partnerships.

The TL is ultimately responsible for the overall management of the evaluation team and the final products. In addition, the TL is responsible for coordinating evaluation activities and ensuring the production and completion of an evaluation report in conformance with this scope of work and timelines. The TL will also ensure high quality analysis, writing quality and report integration.

USAID will approve the final team proposed.

## **6. EVALUATION MANAGEMENT**

The primary point of contact for this evaluation will be Walter Ong'eng'a, USAID/KEA Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, and he will serve as a resource person to the evaluation team. It is expected that USAID, SDC and RAPID staff will all review the evaluation plan and deliverables. Walter will coordinate inputs from all partners on the evaluation methodology and reports, and be available to respond to questions the evaluation team might have during the implementation of the evaluation.

These partners will provide all relevant documents and information necessary to complete this assignment. The evaluation team will be fully responsible for all logistical and administrative support including local and regional travel.

## **7. BUDGET**

The budget available for this activity is between \$200,000 and \$250,000.

WASHPALS shall prepare a detailed budget estimate along with the technical response.

## ANNEX II: EVALUATION METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

### Data Triangulation Methods

With regard to triangulating data from key informant interviews, the team often requested key informants to provide evidence with data to corroborate statements of fact or suggested where evidence may be available. In cases when the team felt there was an evidence gap or the evidence was contradictory, the team referred to RAPID documentation for evidence that confirms or counters the claims made. When analyzing the qualitative data, both complementary and conflicting accounts of RAPID's performance implementation have been analyzed and weighed against each other to reach a nuanced determination in this evaluation report. Interviews were treated as an iterative collection of information whereby, rather than using limited interview time to continuously reconfirm information that had been provided on several occasions already, interviewees were asked to reflect on new information that had become available to allow for deeper analysis. Any qualitative scripts that were either a) internally inconsistent during the interviews or b) included probes that resulted in inconsistent remarks were reviewed by the team and follow-up with interviewees was conducted where necessary.

### Interview Teams per County

#### COUNTY EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| <b>MARSABIT</b> | Team Leader, WASH Specialist, Gender Specialist, Nutrition Specialist, Pastoralist Specialist |
| <b>WAJIR</b>    | Team Leader, WASH Specialist, Nutrition Specialist, Pastoralist Specialist                    |
| <b>GARISSA</b>  | Team Leader, WASH Specialist, Gender Specialist, Nutrition Specialist, Pastoralist Specialist |
| <b>TURKANA</b>  | Team Leader, WASH Specialist, Gender Specialist, Nutrition Specialist, Pastoralist Specialist |
| <b>ISIOLO</b>   | Team Leader, WASH Specialist, Gender Specialist, Nutrition Specialist, Pastoralist Specialist |

## Interviews conducted at county and national level

(A list of persons interviewed is provided in Annex IV.)

| <b>LEVEL</b>           | <b>NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS</b> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>MARSABIT COUNTY</b> | 6                           |
| <b>WAJIR COUNTY</b>    | 7                           |
| <b>GARISSA COUNTY</b>  | 9                           |
| <b>TURKANA COUNTY</b>  | 8                           |
| <b>ISIOLO COUNTY</b>   | 11                          |
| <b>NATIONAL LEVEL</b>  | 27*                         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>           | <b>68</b>                   |

\*Note that several interviews at the national level were conducted with 2 staff in attendance. One interview at the national level was conducted with 4 staff in attendance.

## Design Considerations for KII and FGD Guides

While the KII guides vary based on respondent categories, they all have some variation of the following sections:

- Basic demographic and context data, including interviewee's sex, role, and location
- Respondent's relationship to RAPID
- Project background based on respondent experience
- Experience with USAID, RAPID, and/or partner coordination/outreach, as applicable
- Perception of successes and failures
- Challenges and opportunities
- Relationship with other activities, government, or stakeholders and other factors that could affect outcomes
- Promising practices that should be retained and why, as applicable
- Sustainability
  - Mechanisms for sustainability
  - Challenges to sustainability

For relevant respondents such as staff from RAPID and USAID/KEA, the evaluation team incorporated other questions to cover the following key themes:

- The RAPID approach to deciding what needs to be done and how
- The RAPID management and staffing structure over time, what has and has not worked
- The RAPID thinking on sustainability and the necessary mechanisms to achieve it
- The RAPID approach to gender integration
- The RAPID ability to modify and adapt
- The RAPID interaction, and accountability with partners and key stakeholders

## Descriptors used in Dedoose

| FIELD                    | OPTION LIST  |
|--------------------------|--|
| <b>SEX</b>               | Female/Male  |
| <b>STAKEHOLDER GROUP</b> | Government Counterpart/Private Sector/Implementing Partner County Level/Implementing Partner National Level/MWA/Donor/Funder |
| <b>GEOGRAPHY</b>         | County Level/International/National  |
| <b>THEMATIC FOCUS</b>    | Nutrition-Health/Gender/M&E/Devolution-Political Economy/Overarching/Rangeland-Agriculture/WASH                              |
| <b>CONTRIBUTION AREA</b> | M&E/Data-Data Management/Implementation/Capacity Building/Multiple/Strategy Level/Technology                                 |

## Data Coding and Analysis in Dedoose

The interview team uploaded transcripts to Dedoose as they were completed. Coding began the week of July 27 and ended the week of 31 August. To minimize bias and increase consistency in the application of the codes, only three team members coded all data sets collected during the exercise, though all team members reviewed and analyzed coded transcript text related to their area of expertise. In total, 24 codes were applied 1594 times across 65 data sets. As would be expected, some codes entered in Dedoose at the outset of the exercise were applied infrequently if at all. Reasons for this are twofold, in some cases these codes proved to be irrelevant and were extraneous to the evaluation. In others, the lack of code application signaled areas where data was missing (either because it was captured elsewhere in the coding or did not come up during the interviews, contrary to what the team anticipated).

Beginning the week of August 21, after 80 percent of the data had been coded, the Team Leader began to isolate and download coded transcript text related to each evaluation question (EQ) to begin the analysis. Each member of the evaluation team worked with the coded text related to their area of expertise to identify patterns, comparisons and substantive quotations; eventually generating an initial outline of a response for each EQ. It was at this time that secondary data from the desk review and project monitoring data was again consulted to provide further contextual background, fill in gaps in understanding, and to help to triangulate findings from the qualitative analysis. The team also attempted to identify patterns in the data to highlight convergence or divergence of opinion across counties, activity types and stakeholder groups.

## ANNEX III: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

### KENYA RAPID PERFORMANCE EVALUATION KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS: GUIDES FOR RAPID STAKEHOLDERS

Drafted – 23 June 2020

#### Tailored interview guides for the following categories:

- MWA staff (overarching and in specialist area, if available)
- Implementing partner at an overarching strategic level (including private sector) (to gauge the appropriateness of the design of RAPID, their experience with the facilitative approach, and the effectiveness of the partnership)
- Implementing partner at the county level (in specialist area if available) (including private sector)
- County government key informant at an overarching level
- County government key informant (in specialist area if available)

National level stakeholders (Ministry of Water, Sanitation and Irrigation, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock & Fisheries, NDMA and other wider sector specialists)

#### KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE – MWA STAFF

This Topic Guide is intended for use in interviews with representatives of MWA. This evaluation will assess the effectiveness of RAPID's technical assistance activities across its portfolio and to gauge the effectiveness of RAPID's partnership and facilitation approach. The evaluation will also help inform USAID's future decisions on WASH programming in Kenya. It should be followed as closely as possible to guide key informant interviews with these respondents. For a few questions, a specific set of responses shall be provided in order to assist in the collection of data that can be more easily quantified. Instructions to the interviewer are in red. Interviewers will be trained to be compliant with USAID policy with regard to the "USG Common Rule" for the protection of human subjects.

**Introduction (~10 minutes) [Much of this could be in the introductory or follow up email to schedule the interview, thus saving time on the call.]**

Thank the respondent for taking the time to participate in the interview.

#### Introduction to the researcher and the research

- i. I am a Consultant residing in \_\_\_\_\_. I represent an evaluation team fielded by Tetra Tech ARD, a Washington DC based firm that has been contracted by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) to conduct an independent evaluation of the USAID RAPID program.
- i. As part of its own planning for the next few years, USAID has asked us to conduct a performance evaluation of the Kenya RAPID program to assess its progress toward achieving its objectives. So, what we are trying to assess are the strengths and weaknesses of the program, its accomplishments and best practices, but also any obstacles and shortcomings faced and how it could have been more effective.
- ii. Ultimately the research will be used to ascertain the extent to which RAPID activities have improved lives and health through the development and management of sustainable water, sanitation and hygiene services, as well as nutrition and rangeland management support in

Kenya. It will also be used to propose recommendations based on the findings to inform future programming by USAID.

We will follow privacy protocols to protect your anonymity:

- i. Explain confidentiality and anonymity and note whether the respondent would like to remain anonymous, and that the assessment team will ask permission if s/he would like to attribute a quote to the respondent in the final report in such a way that it would make his or her identity easily known.
- ii. Explain how collected data will be stored without identifying information.
- iii. Ask if the respondent is willing to be recorded and note their response.

Explain recording, length and nature of discussion.

Check whether respondents have any questions.

1. Kindly describe RAPID's management and staffing structure. Probe for:
  - a. Key staffing especially at county level.
  - b. Relationship between national (CPCU) and county (CCU) i.e. technical support
  - c. [If private sector and WASH focal points were placed at the CCUs level? If not, what were the effects of not having those positions in the counties?]

**Facilitative Approach** - RAPID and its implementing partners shifted from direct implementation to a facilitative approach of the program.

1. How specifically did RAPID partners assess capacity of county governments in order to determine how best to design and sequence capacity building work? (A County Capacity Needs Assessment process is noted in the MWA Learning Brief on the Facilitation Approach.)
2. What (political economy) framework was used to analyze and understand the context in which RAPID partners are operating at the county level? How has this analysis been updated over time?
3. What differences were observed across the five counties and how were these observations reflected in programming? How did RAPID adapt approaches and processes to incorporate learning and shifts in the political economy of the region?
4. As noted in the USAID briefing note on the facilitative approach, "this may require a different approach to contracting and management" (p10) on behalf of USAID. How much flexibility was afforded the RAPID activity by USAID to "adapt to shocks and adjust interventions based on new learning"?
5. How well did the MOUs with county governments withstand the test of time over the five-year period? Similarly in your view, how reflective of the facilitation approach are the Terms of Reference for the National level Program Steering Committee and the County Program Steering Committees? What might you have done differently in hindsight? (Did RAPID work with informal institutions in any of the counties?)
6. How effective has the PIFA approach been in practice? What evidence do you have to help unpack this? (Was there resistance from the counties?) What challenges were faced as a result of embedding RAPID in county government offices? (The MWA Learning Brief provides a strong start as the basis for deeper exploration.) What modifications to the approach would be made in hindsight? How is the approach being used in other partner programs?
7. Are there organizations/development partners using direct implementation in the five counties? And how has that affected RAPID's facilitative approach in the county?

8. Given that public funds cannot be allocated outside of a county's planning framework, how successful has RAPID been at ensuring that projects get logged in the County Integrated Development Plans (CIDP)?
9. RAPID assisted counties to establish coordination/implementation/decision-making structures at the county level.
  - a. Were there multi-sectoral coordination structures before RAPID? If yes, how does that work with the RAPID's coordination structure in the counties?
  - b. Were the new structures an additional burden to the existing structures?
  - c. Are they likely to be sustained when RAPID exits? Which line ministry takes the lead in coordination after RAPID exits?
  - d. How did embedding CCU staff in the county government departments strengthen the facilitative approach of implementing the RAPID? What challenges did the implementing partners face?
10. RAPID developed joint work plans with counties. Kindly explain the process.
  - a. How did RAPID ensure the counties do not offload all their responsibilities to the program in the process of joint planning?
  - b. Has the implementation of those plans been successful?
  - c. What have been the challenges?
11. There is an element of co-financing expected of counties and communities.
  - a. Did the counties commit to co-financing? If yes, was this actualized? What were the arrangements? Any challenges?
  - b. Do you know if counties received WASH or other related funding from any other sources? If yes, which ones (probe for WB, UNICEF).
12. What have been the key achievements in the policy enabling environment process? Probe for:
  - a. Policies, enacted laws and the impacts, e.g., financing, changes in institution structures
  - b. What have been the key lessons/challenges?
  - c. How is RAPID working at the national level to advocate on behalf of counties?
13. In terms of support to county governments, what was the balance and sequencing between working on the supply side (capacity at county level) versus on the demand side of public participation? How did this differ (if at all) across the five counties? How did RAPID work with AHADI<sup>1</sup> on these aspects in the different counties? (Did RAPID have similar relationships with PREG partners or Afya Imarisha?)
14. How have RAPID partners engaged with and incorporated the suggestions of the County Public Participation Checklist to co-design and deliver interventions? Probe for: Establishment of community structures, Capacity building, Feedback mechanisms, Likelihood of sustaining these processes and structures, whether RAPID has worked with the media or other institutions to get messages out on participation

---

<sup>1</sup> Agile and Harmonized Assistance for Devolved Institutions (AHADI) is a USAID-supported program funded at almost US\$50m (2014-2020) to support the devolution process at the national, county and grassroots level.

## Partnership

1. How effective would you say the internal partnership of RAPID has been? On what basis are you assessing / measuring this effectiveness and sustained impact of the partnership approach in RAPID? What challenges have you faced from a partnership perspective? Probe for:
  - a. Whether the size of the partnership was a hindrance or helpful for effective programming
  - b. Whether there are clear roles and responsibilities for each partner
  - c. Whether sufficient resources (including staffing) have been allocated by each partner to fulfill their commitments
  - d. Whether governance procedures for decision making are clear
  - e. Whether targets and indicators of performance are clear
2. How well does the partnership share information on differences in approach and lessons learned? Is there effective partner-to-partner peer review? Is there a spirit of sharing amongst the partners? Probe for: clear progress review procedures, whether there is sufficient flexibility for the partners / the partnership to adapt as needed based on new information / changes in circumstances
3. What would you do differently (if you were to restart the partnership) to maximize the effectiveness of the partnership aspects within RAPID?
4. Are there any special considerations with regard to the participation of the private sector in the partnership? Has this created any conflicts amongst the partners?

## WASH

1. Kindly describe the approach adopted by RAPID to implement the WASH program in the 5 counties. Probe for
  - a. The facilitative approach, PPPs, joint planning, capacity building, community empowerment
  - b. How were the approaches determined? Why?
2. Kindly explain RAPID's PPP WASH business models work introduced in the 5 counties.
  - a. How were the WASH business model approaches determined? Probe for: Process of identification (who was involved, community opinion, if there are WASH proven models in the sector in the north)
  - b. In your opinion, how successful has the work on WASH PPP and business models been? Probe for prepaid meters, desalination, biogas, maintenance and repair, sanitation options, water treatment. SMEs, leasing models
  - c. Which ones have worked or show most promise in which counties?
  - d. Have you seen any replication in other counties? Which models do you think can be scaled?
  - e. What are the main challenges and key learnings from your activities on business models in the ASAL region?
3. How has K- RAPID contributed to improvement of governance in the WASH sector (probe for WASH governance at county, Utility, Community WASH projects, National levels).
4. How has K- RAPID contributed to efforts towards expanding financing for the WASH sector. Probe for public/private financing for WASH, financing or increased revenues for service providers in your county?

5. What were the key achievements in terms of building operational capacity for the counties in the WASH sector? Probe for:
  - a. Planning, Financing / Funding going forward
  - b. O&M skills
  - c. The ICT technology E-Maji manager platform, how it functions, who is driving it, sustainability post RAPID
  - d. PPP
6. How has K- RAPID contributed to expanding water and sanitation services in the county. What sanitation and hygiene service delivery approaches worked/didn't work in the RAPID project counties and why? Probe for views on:
  - a. CLTS
  - b. Sanitation Marketing
  - c. Hygiene promotion through media, IEC, radio
  - d. Suggestions for longer-term sanitation solutions for areas with high water table, loose soils.
7. What methods did RAPID use for provision of water in the five counties? Probe for:
  - a. County preferences/ choices informed by the 3R assessments/training (e.g. Turkana county shift of preference to water harvesting.
  - b. Variations across the implementing partners and influence that IPs had on each other
8. Are there specific aspects of the RAPID program approaches that you think have been successful/less successful? If yes, what evidence do you have for this conclusion? What factors led to or challenged success? Probe for:
  - a. Facilitative approach
  - b. Partnerships
  - c. Private sector engagement and WASH business models / replicability
  - d. Water and sanitation services
  - e. Expanded financing for WASH
9. Which approaches do you think were not suitable for the context? Are there aspects of the design/approach that were challenging during the implementation of the WASH component? If yes, which ones and why did they not quite fit?
  - a. What did RAPID do about it?
  - b. What have been the key learnings?
10. If you were to implement similar WASH projects in future, which design aspects would you retain from RAPID, which would you modify, and which would you not adopt and why? Probe for suitability of the WASH approaches in the ASAL

### **Rangeland Management and Resilience**

- I. What are the factors that contribute to the resilience of pastoralist livelihoods, and conversely, what are the factors that undermine resilience? Which of these resilience and vulnerability factors are being addressed by RAPID, and how? (How were these determined?)

2. What types of adverse events would test the resilience of pastoral livelihoods? Did any of these events occur during the RAPID implementation period? Was RAPID able to observe the outcome and if so, what did this reveal?
3. Which RAPID rangeland and resilience activities are having the greatest impact? How are the outputs of these activities being monitored, how is the overall impact being measured and monitored, and what evidence is there to suggest that resilience has strengthened?
4. What has RAPID done – through policy support, regulatory reform, information dissemination, access to finance, access to information, infrastructure development, or otherwise – to strengthen the linkages between livestock rearing communities and livestock markets? Has the activity or its partners ever supported orderly and timely off-take measures in anticipation of a poor season to ensure herders can get a better price for their livestock?
5. What has the activity learned about resilience and pastoral livelihoods, and how has it shared this learning with other stakeholders in Kenya (e.g. PREG) and beyond?
6. How did MWA influence the formulation or implementation of policies, bills, or laws at county level in ways that strengthened the resilience of pastoral livelihoods?
7. Access to forecasts and early warning information is considered to be very relevant to the resilience of pastoral livelihoods. One of the activities under IR 1.3 is “Support delivery of accessible and relevant data and tools for communities”. What relevant data and tools did RAPID support use in the delivery to communities? Did this include seasonal forecasts, early warning information, or imagery of vegetative conditions?
8. Similarly, the SOW indicates under SO 2 that the RAPID program is designed to provide data-driven insights that will support leaders to make more informed decisions on where and how to use county resources. Did this include seasonal forecasts, early warning information, or imagery of vegetative conditions?
9. PMG report 4 (September 2017), under “What could be done differently”, cited the need for increased investments on drought mitigation measures in the short term and resilience measures in the long run to minimize the effects of cyclic droughts in the ASAL areas. In the PMG report 5 (April 2018), the Deputy Chief of USAID mission is cited as stating that, “Because of Kenya RAPID’s success in raising resilience, this model is being used in the agency.” What changed from Sept 2017-April 2018? What kinds of investments were lacking in 2017? What evidence was USAID using to indicate RAPID’s success in raising resilience, and what was the model that was now being used in the agency?
10. How were partnership engagements coordinated by the Project Steering Committee with regard to implementation of rangeland management and livestock interventions at different levels?
11. Were other partners outside USAID/MWA engaged in the implementation of rangeland management and livestock activities?
12. Did other project partners bring on board additional resources in support of rangeland management and livestock interventions? (Technical capacity, equipment, facilities and financial resources)
13. What are the areas that you think still need interventions in rangeland management and livestock within the project counties? Probe for responses that relate across the value chain

### **Agriculture and Nutrition Advisor**

1. To what extent was the design of the RAPID program appropriate in addressing the nutrition needs of people living in the ASAL? Are the assumptions and theory of change valid?

2. What new or innovative features in the design of the RAPID program are considered valuable for the achievement of the planned nutrition outcomes?
3. In hindsight, which approaches were less or not well suited to addressing the nutrition needs of the people in this context?
4. With regard to nutrition, to what extent were the following aspects effectively addressed by the program and embedded in and owned by county government:
  - Guidance on program design and implementation process
  - Multi-sectoral coordination of the program
  - Capacity building for implementation of the program for county, sub-county and community level personnel
  - Resource allocation for nutrition-related activities
  - Business models for WASH and agri-nutrition programs
  - Contextual differences in socio-economic characteristics and culture between the counties in relation to drivers of malnutrition
5. To what extent did the following aspects of the program contribute to and result in greater achievement of nutrition outcomes? What evidence do you have for this assessment?
  - Integration of WASH, livestock, nutrition, food security and rangeland management in one activity.
  - Bringing diverse partners (including private partners) into the program
14. To what extent are the RAPID nutrition activities sustainable and replicable?
15. What are the major factors influencing (either positively or negatively) the achievement of the planned nutrition outcomes in the RAPID program? What are the challenges experienced by the program in the implementation of the RAPID program for improved nutrition outcomes?

## **Gender**

(Intro by thanking them for the thorough documents and reports, and for their commitment to gender sensitivity in their work.)

1. Please explain how recommendations from the Gender and Do No Harm Analysis were incorporated into the program. What are some perceived outcomes from these efforts?
2. The Gender and Do No Harm Analysis was discussed in early documents as “baseline.” Was there (or will there be) an endline?
3. How was disability integrated into the program? (We noticed that there is little mention in the reports and no measurement plans in the AMELP guide.) What are some perceived outcomes from these efforts?
4. We read in program documents that “gender considerations” were made for various components of the project. Can you share what this means?
  - a. How did the program make considerations for shifting norms (e.g. reducing the double work/time burden on women by including them in meetings and trainings)?
  - b. How did the program make considerations for active participation and decision-making power among women who attend meetings?

5. Two documents applied in the program incorporated gender considerations: Community Dialogue Cards and the Agriculture-Nutrition Manual.
  - a. How were these manuals/tools used?
  - b. Who was trained and how were the gender components incorporated?
  - c. How was the information received and was there any follow up or measurement?
6. How did RAPID address any barriers (if relevant) to women's access to trainings and/or meetings?
  - a. Did women express an inability to attend due to time / work burden in the home or other reasons? What was the program's response, if so?
  - b. How well were women able to adopt labor-saving technology (e.g. due to access to technology, interest in adoption, knowledge of adoption, decision-making power in the household to adopt/use technology)?
7. Not all relevant data in the AMELP were disaggregated by sex. Can you explain the reason for this?
8. Those data that were disaggregated by sex did not disaggregate in the target/milestones. How were the sex disaggregated data used/applied to the program?

#### KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE – IMPLEMENTING PARTNER: STRATEGIC LEVEL (INCLUDING PRIVATE SECTOR)

This Topic Guide is intended for use in interviews with representatives of Implementing Partner at strategic level. This evaluation will assess the effectiveness of RAPID's technical assistance activities across its portfolio and to gauge the effectiveness of RAPID's partnership and facilitation approach. The evaluation will also help inform USAID's future decisions on WASH programming in Kenya. It should be followed as closely as possible to guide key informant interviews with these respondents. For a few questions, a specific set of responses shall be provided in order to assist in the collection of data that can be more easily quantified. Instructions to the interviewer are in **red**. Interviewers will be trained to be compliant with USAID policy with regard to the "USG Common Rule" for the protection of human subjects.

**Introduction (~10 minutes) [Much of this could be in the introductory or follow up email to schedule the interview, thus saving time on the call.]**

Thank the respondent for taking the time to participate in the interview.

#### Introduction to the researcher and the research

- i. I am a Consultant residing in \_\_\_\_\_. I represent an evaluation team fielded by Tetra Tech ARD, a Washington DC based firm that has been contracted by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) to conduct an independent evaluation of the USAID RAPID program.
- iii. As part of its own planning for the next few years, USAID has asked us to conduct a performance evaluation of the Kenya RAPID program to assess its progress toward achieving its objectives. So, what we are trying to assess are the strengths and weaknesses of the program, its accomplishments and best practices, but also any obstacles and shortcomings faced and how it could have been more effective.
- iv. Ultimately the research will be used to ascertain the extent to which RAPID activities have improved lives and health through the development and management of sustainable water, sanitation and hygiene services, as well as nutrition and rangeland management support in

Kenya. It will also be used to propose recommendations based on the findings to inform future programming by USAID.

We will follow privacy protocols to protect your anonymity:

- i. Explain confidentiality and anonymity and note whether the respondent would like to remain anonymous, and that the assessment team will ask permission if s/he would like to attribute a quote to the respondent in the final report in such a way that it would make his or her identity easily known.
- ii. Explain how collected data will be stored without identifying information.
- iii. Ask if the respondent is willing to be recorded and note their response.

Explain recording, length and nature of discussion.

Check whether respondents have any questions.

**Facilitative Approach** - RAPID and its implementing partners shifted from direct implementation to a facilitative approach of the program.

1. How specifically did RAPID partners assess capacity of county governments in order to determine how best to design and sequence capacity building work? (A County Capacity Needs Assessment process is noted in the MWA Learning Brief on the Facilitation Approach.)
2. What (political economy) framework was used to analyze and understand the context in which RAPID partners are operating at the county level? How has this analysis been updated over time?
3. Do you know of any differences observed across the five counties and how these observations may have been reflected in programming? How did RAPID adapt approaches and processes to incorporate learning and shifts in the political economy of the region?
4. As noted in the USAID briefing note on the facilitative approach, “this may require a different approach to contracting and management” (p10) on behalf of USAID. In your view, how much flexibility was afforded the RAPID activity by USAID to “adapt to shocks and adjust interventions based on new learning”?
5. How well did the MOUs with county governments withstand the test of time over the five-year period? Similarly in your view, how reflective of the facilitation approach are the Terms of Reference for the National level Program Steering Committee and the County Program Steering Committees? What might you have done differently in hindsight? (Did RAPID work with informal institutions in any of the counties?)
6. How effective has the PIFA approach been in practice? What evidence do you have to help unpack this? (Was there resistance from the counties?) What challenges were faced as a result of embedding RAPID in county government offices? (The MWA Learning Brief provides a strong start as the basis for deeper exploration.) What modifications would be made in hindsight? How is the approach being used in other partner programs?
7. Are there organizations/development partners using direct implementation in the five counties? And how has that affected RAPID’s facilitative approach in the county?
8. Given that public funds cannot be allocated outside of a county’s planning framework, how successful has RAPID been at ensuring that projects get logged in the County Integrated Development Plans (CIDP) in the counties you are operational in?
9. RAPID assisted counties to establish coordination/implementation/decision-making structures at the county level.

- a. Were there multi-sectoral coordination structures before RAPID? If yes, how does that work with the RAPID's coordination structure in the counties?
  - b. Were the new structures an additional burden to the existing structures?
  - c. Are they likely to be sustained when RAPID exits? Which line ministry takes the lead in coordination after RAPID exits?
  - d. How did embedding CCU staff in the county government departments strengthen the facilitative approach of implementing the RAPID? What challenges did the implementing partners face?
10. RAPID developed joint workplans with counties. Kindly explain the process.
- a. How did RAPID ensure the counties do not offload all their responsibilities to the program in the process of joint planning?
  - b. Has the implementation of those plans been successful?
  - c. What have been the challenges?
11. There is an element of co-financing expected of counties and communities.
- a. Did the counties commit to co-financing? If yes, was this actualized? What were the arrangements? Any challenges?
  - b. Do you know if counties received WASH or other related funding from any other sources? If yes, which ones (probe for WB, UNICEF).
12. What have been the key achievements in the policy enabling environment process? Probe for:
- a. Policies, enacted laws and the impacts, e.g., financing, changes in institution structures
  - b. What have been the key lessons/challenges?
  - c. How is RAPID working at the national level to advocate on behalf of counties?
13. In terms of support to county governments, what was the balance and sequencing between working on the supply side (capacity at county level) versus on the demand side of public participation? How did this differ (if at all) across the five counties? How did RAPID work with AHADI<sup>2</sup> on these aspects in the different counties? (Did RAPID have similar relationships with PREG partners or Afya Imarisha?)
14. How have RAPID partners engaged with and incorporated the suggestions of the County Public Participation Checklist to co-design and deliver interventions? Probe for: Establishment of community structures, Capacity building, Feedback mechanisms, Likelihood of sustaining these processes and structures, whether RAPID has worked with the media or other institutions to get messages out on participation

## Partnership

- 1. How effective would you say the internal partnership of RAPID has been? On what basis are you assessing / measuring this effectiveness and sustained impact of the partnership approach in RAPID? What challenges have you faced, if any, from a partnership perspective? Probe for:
  - a. Whether the size of the partnership was a hindrance or helpful for effective programming

---

<sup>2</sup>Agile and Harmonized Assistance for Devolved Institutions (AHADI) is a USAID-supported program funded at almost US\$50m (2014-2020) to support the devolution process at the national, county and grassroots level.

- b. Whether there are clear roles and responsibilities for each partner
  - c. Whether sufficient resources (including staffing) have been allocated by each partner to fulfill their commitments
  - d. Whether governance procedures for decision making are clear
  - e. Whether targets and indicators of performance are clear
2. How well does the partnership share information on differences in approach and lessons learned? Is there effective partner-to-partner peer review? Is there a spirit of sharing amongst the partners? Probe for: clear progress review procedures, whether there is sufficient flexibility for the partners / the partnership to adapt as needed based on new information / changes in circumstances
  3. What would you do differently (if you were to restart the partnership) to maximize the effectiveness of the partnership aspects within RAPID?
  4. Are there any special considerations with regard to the participation of the private sector in the partnership? Has this created any conflicts amongst the partners?

**KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE – IMPLEMENTING PARTNER: IMPLEMENTATION (COUNTY/TECHNICAL) LEVEL (INCLUDING PRIVATE SECTOR)**

This Topic Guide is intended for use in interviews with representatives of Implementing Partner at implementation level. This evaluation will assess the effectiveness of RAPID’s technical assistance activities across its portfolio and to gauge the effectiveness of RAPID’s partnership and facilitation approach. The evaluation will also help inform USAID’s future decisions on WASH programming in Kenya. It should be followed as closely as possible to guide key informant interviews with these respondents. For a few questions, a specific set of responses shall be provided in order to assist in the collection of data that can be more easily quantified. Instructions to the interviewer are in **red**. Interviewers will be trained to be compliant with USAID policy with regard to the "USG Common Rule" for the protection of human subjects.

**Introduction (~10 minutes) [Much of this could be in the introductory or follow up email to schedule the interview, thus saving time on the call.]**

**Thank the respondent for taking the time to participate in the interview.**

**Introduction to the researcher and the research**

- i. I am a Consultant residing in \_\_\_\_\_. I represent an evaluation team fielded by Tetra Tech ARD, a Washington DC based firm that has been contracted by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) to conduct an independent evaluation of the USAID RAPID program.
- ii. As part of its own planning for the next few years, USAID has asked us to conduct a performance evaluation of the Kenya RAPID program to assess its progress toward achieving its objectives. So, what we are trying to assess are the strengths and weaknesses of the program, its accomplishments and best practices, but also any obstacles and shortcomings faced and how it could have been more effective.
- iii. Ultimately the research will be used to ascertain the extent to which RAPID activities have improved lives and health through the development and management of sustainable water, sanitation and hygiene services, as well as nutrition and rangeland management support in Kenya. It will also be used to propose recommendations based on the findings to inform future programming by USAID.

We will follow privacy protocols to protect your anonymity:

- i. Explain confidentiality and anonymity and note whether the respondent would like to remain anonymous, and that the assessment team will ask permission if s/he would like to attribute a quote to the respondent in the final report in such a way that it would make his or her identity easily known.
- ii. Explain how collected data will be stored without identifying information.
- iii. Ask if the respondent is willing to be recorded and note their response.

Explain recording, length and nature of discussion.

Check whether respondents have any questions.

## **WASH**

1. Kindly describe the approach adopted by RAPID to implement the WASH program in the 5 counties. Probe for
  - a. The facilitative approach, PPPs, joint planning, capacity building, community empowerment
  - b. How were the approaches determined? Why?
2. Kindly explain RAPID's PPP WASH business models work introduced in the 5 counties.
  - a. How were the WASH business model approaches determined? Probe for: Process of identification (who was involved, community opinion, if there are WASH proven models in the sector in the north)
  - b. In your opinion, how successful has the work on WASH PPP and business models been? Probe for prepaid meters, desalination, biogas, maintenance and repair, sanitation options, water treatment. SMEs, leasing models
  - c. Which ones have worked or show most promise in which counties?
  - d. Have you seen any replication in other counties? Which models do you think can be scaled?
  - e. What are the main challenges and key learnings from your activities on business models in the ASAL region?
3. What were the key achievements in terms of building operational capacity for the counties in the WASH sector? Probe for:
  - a. Planning, Financing / Funding going forward
  - b. O&M skills
  - c. The ICT technology E-Maji manager platform, how it functions, who is driving it, sustainability post RAPID
  - d. PPP
4. How has K- RAPID contributed to improvement of governance in the WASH sector (probe for WASH governance at county, Utility, Community WASH projects.
5. How has K- RAPID contributed to expanded financing for the WASH sector. Probe for public/private financing for WASH, financing or increased revenues for service providers in your county?
6. How has K- RAPID contributed to expanding water and sanitation services in the county. What sanitation and hygiene service delivery approaches worked/didn't work in the RAPID project counties and why? Probe for views on:
  - a. CLTS

- b. Sanitation Marketing
  - c. Hygiene promotion through media, IEC, radio
  - d. Suggestions for longer-term sanitation solutions for areas with high water table, loose soils.
7. What methods did RAPID use for provision of water in the five counties? Probe for:
- a. County preferences/ choices informed by the 3R assessments/training (e.g. Turkana county shift of preference to water harvesting.
  - b. Variations across the implementing partners and influence that IPs had on each other
8. Are there specific aspects of the RAPID program approaches that you think have been successful/less successful? If yes, what evidence do you have for this conclusion? What factors led to or challenged success? Probe for:
- a. Facilitative approach
  - b. Partnerships
  - c. Private sector engagement and WASH business models / replicability
  - d. Water and sanitation services
  - e. Expanded financing for WASH
9. Which approaches do you think were not suitable for the context? Are there aspects of the design/approach that were challenging during the implementation of the WASH component? If yes, which ones and why did they not quite fit?
- a. What did RAPID do about it?
  - b. What have been the key learnings?
10. If you were to implement similar WASH projects in future, which design aspects would you retain from RAPID, which would you modify, and which would you not adopt and why? Probe for suitability of the WASH approaches in the ASAL
11. Do you have other projects in the 5 counties outside the RAPID project? What is the approach? Has that been successful? Why?

### **Rangeland Management and Resilience**

1. What types of interventions have you focused on through the RAPID activity to enhance rangeland management and household resilience? How are you measuring the success and impact of these interventions?
2. Are there specific business/models that were developed and implemented in rangeland management and livestock activities?
3. How has sustainability of the project interventions on rangeland management and livestock activities been factored in and planned for?
4. How did interventions on rangeland management and livestock link with other sectors to maximize community benefits? This includes synergies with other program activities like WASH/nutrition/markets/business development...
  - Was water development linked and guided with sustainable grazing and settlement plans?
  - Did water interventions consider seasonality of resource use?

5. How has the collaboration been between relevant ministries/divisions at national and county governments in implementation of all the activities by RAPID i.e., livestock, agriculture, fisheries, public health, trade, local administration...?
6. What are some of the environmental protection interventions under the RAPID interventions?
7. What specific business cases have been developed/strengthened within the rangeland management and livestock production in the counties? Were these driven by private sector partners in RAPID or through other organizations?
  - How have these been performing so far? What part of the value chain are they focused on? (i.e. livestock finishing centers established, number of animal offtakes, feedlots established if any, community offtake plans developed within seasons). If pasture enterprises have been established, what has been their productivity and marketable amounts for the community? What conservation strategies have they put in place? What value addition do they provide?
8. Do you think there are other potential business cases that were not developed in rangeland management and livestock activities?
9. Who are the beneficiaries along the value chains? How are they benefitting? Are women, disabled, and other vulnerable members of the community benefitting?
10. How has community governance been influenced by the RAPID project in the management of rangeland/water and livestock resources?
  - Are there community bylaws that have been developed and implemented that we could refer to? Have you helped establish community governance structures like committees? If so, how have these been embedded in to structured systems within the county?
  - How was community resource governance supported by the RAPID project? Was this adequate? Are there gaps? Was the support sustainable? (Any evidence of community governance support/resource use plans/community agreements/governance and enforcement)
  - How was decision making done at community/sub-county/county regarding rangeland resource utilization/range improvement and management? Are these decisions taken from an evidence based and participative process? [Ask for evidence]
11. Did RAPID interventions mitigate potential/existing resource conflicts? How? Were they effective in reducing conflicts? Are there gaps?
  - Expected resource conflict mitigation plans/structures that was established/strengthened at community level
12. How was transboundary resource use governance done? Did RAPID support/influence on transboundary resource governance and use? [The counties are neighbors with a lot of resource use overlaps. Therefore joint resource use plans would be important for sustainability, especially grazing plans that consider agreed mobility routes and seasonal use between Wajir/Marsabit/Isiolo and Garissa cluster.]
13. What commitments were made as a result of RAPID's work at national and county government levels for enhanced rangeland management and attention to resilience? Were they fulfilled? How did that contribute to the success of RAPID interventions?
14. Did RAPID get support from the national/county governments and partners in implementation of the rangeland/livestock activities?

15. Did RAPID receive any political support in the process of implementation of rangeland and livestock activities? How did county assemblies support policy/strategy development in rangeland management? Were these adopted?
16. Did RAPID face any governance/political challenges in the process of implementation of rangeland and livestock activities? [Probe for any policies/strategies, K-RAPID interventions that were not accepted/passed by county assemblies, or not followed to completion due to political interests]
17. USAID defines resilience as “the ability of people, households, communities, countries, and systems to mitigate, adapt to, and recover from shocks and stresses in a manner that reduces chronic vulnerability and facilitates inclusive growth.” In what ways do you see your interventions contributing to the resilience of pastoral livelihoods and communities? Is commercial success contingent upon achieving resilience?

## **Nutrition**

1. To what extent was the design of the Kenya RAPID program appropriate in addressing the nutrition needs of people living in the ASAL?
2. How effective was the facilitative governance-focused approach under the RAPID program with regard to nutrition?
3. In particular were there any innovative approaches suited for addressing investment needs of the people in WASH and livestock sectors?
4. Which approaches were not well suited to addressing the nutrition needs of the people in this context?
5. To what extent were the following aspects effectively addressed by the program and embedded in and owned by county government:
  - Guidance on program design and implementation process - e.g. strategic decisions that explicitly specify the nutrition-sensitive interventions and how they are to be integrated in WASH and agriculture activities.
  - Multi-sectoral coordination of the program in terms of planning, resource mobilization and implementation of the program activities?
  - Capacity building for implementation of the program for county, sub-county and community level personnel. Were there changes particularly in terms of county government capacity and commitment?
  - Resource allocation for nutrition-related activities
  - Business models for WASH and agri-nutrition programs and their appropriateness for ASAL context.
  - Differences in socio-economic characteristics and culture between the counties
  - Contextual differences between counties e.g. in drivers of malnutrition
6. To what extent did the following aspects of the program contribute to and result in greater achievement of nutrition outcomes?
  - Integration of WASH, livestock, nutrition, food security and rangeland management in one activity.
  - What business models were developed for WASH and agri-nutrition programs? Are they appropriate to for the ASAL context?

7. What were the major factors influencing (either positively or negatively) the achievement of the planned nutrition outcomes in the RAPID program?
8. What are the challenges experienced by the program in the implementation of the RAPID program for improved nutrition outcomes? Any reflections on the role of the private sector or business models in the area of improving nutrition outcomes?

### **Gender Focal Point**

1. Please explain how your organization incorporated gender into rolling out RAPID, in your specific county/ies of focus.
  - a. We read in program documents that “gender considerations” were made for various components of the project. Can you share what this means in your context?
  - a. How did the program make considerations for shifting norms (e.g. reducing the double work/time burden on women by including them in meetings and trainings)?
  - b. How did the program make considerations for *active* participation and decision-making power among women who attend meetings?
2. Please explain how your organization incorporated recommendations from the Gender and Do No Harm Analysis into the program? What are some perceived outcomes from these efforts?
3. How did your organization incorporate elements of disability sensitivity into the RAPID program? What are some perceived outcomes from these efforts?
4. How did your organization address barriers (if relevant) to women’s access to trainings and/or meetings?
  - a. Did women express an inability to attend due to time burden in the home or even WASH-related? What was the response, if so?
  - b. How well were women able to adopt labor-saving technology (e.g. due to access to technology, interest in adoption, knowledge of adoption, decision-making power in the household to adopt/use technology)?
5. How were women entrepreneurs specifically targeted for support through Kenya RAPID?
  - a. What was the response from women entrepreneurs from this outreach, if any?
  - b. Did you notice any unintended consequences of focusing on women in this effort? If so, what did you notice?
  - c. What has been the outcome for women of targeting women entrepreneurs?

## KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE – COUNTY GOVERNMENT: STRATEGIC LEVEL

This Topic Guide is intended for use in interviews with representatives of County Government at strategic level. This evaluation will assess the effectiveness of RAPID's technical assistance activities across its portfolio and to gauge the effectiveness of RAPID's partnership and facilitation approach. The evaluation will also help inform USAID's future decisions on WASH programming in Kenya. It should be followed as closely as possible to guide key informant interviews with these respondents. For a few questions, a specific set of responses shall be provided in order to assist in the collection of data that can be more easily quantified. Instructions to the interviewer are in **red**. Interviewers will be trained to be compliant with USAID policy with regard to the "USG Common Rule" for the protection of human subjects.

**Introduction (~10 minutes) [Much of this could be in the introductory or follow up email to schedule the interview, thus saving time on the call.]**

Thank the respondent for taking the time to participate in the interview.

Introduction to the researcher and the research

- i. I am a Consultant residing in \_\_\_\_\_. I represent an evaluation team fielded by Tetra Tech ARD, a Washington DC based firm that has been contracted by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) to conduct an independent evaluation of the USAID RAPID program.
- ii. As part of its own planning for the next few years, USAID has asked us to conduct a performance evaluation of the Kenya RAPID program to assess its progress toward achieving its objectives. So, what we are trying to assess are the strengths and weaknesses of the program, its accomplishments and best practices, but also any obstacles and shortcomings faced and how it could have been more effective.
- iii. Ultimately the research will be used to ascertain the extent to which RAPID activities have improved lives and health through the development and management of sustainable water, sanitation and hygiene services, as well as nutrition and rangeland management support in Kenya. It will also be used to propose recommendations based on the findings to inform future programming by USAID.

We will follow privacy protocols to protect your anonymity:

- iv. Explain confidentiality and anonymity and note whether the respondent would like to remain anonymous, and that the assessment team will ask permission if s/he would like to attribute a quote to the respondent in the final report in such a way that it would make his or her identity easily known.
- v. Explain how collected data will be stored without identifying information.
- vi. Ask if the respondent is willing to be recorded and note their response.

Explain recording, length and nature of discussion.

Check whether respondents have any questions.

1. Since devolution, where do you think you have had your most success in terms of enhancing WASH service delivery, rangeland management and nutrition programming for your communities?
2. Since devolution, what challenges have you faced in your efforts to enhance WASH service delivery, rangeland management and nutrition programming for your communities?
3. RAPID and its MWA members shifted from direct implementation to facilitative approach to working with county governments.

- a. How specifically did RAPID partners assess capacity of your county government in order to determine how best to design and sequence a capacity building program of work?
  - b. How well has the MOU with your county government withstood the test of time over the five-year period?
  - c. Was there any resistance to RAPID's approach in the county in terms of embedding staff and moving away from direct implementation by development partners?
  - d. How effective has this facilitative approach been to date?
  - e. Are there organizations/development partners using direct implementation or any other? If yes, which ones? And how has that affected RAPID's facilitative approach in the county?
4. Given that public funds cannot be allocated outside of a county's planning framework, how successful has Kenya RAPID been at ensuring that projects get logged in your County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP)?
  5. In terms of support to county governments, what was the balance and sequencing between working on the supply side (capacity at county level) versus on the demand side of public participation? Did RAPID work with AHADI<sup>3</sup> on these aspects in your county? To what extent was RAPID successful in improving community level governance?
  6. RAPID assisted counties to establish coordination/implementation/decision-making structures at the county level.
    - a. Were there multi-sectoral coordination structures before RAPID? If yes, how does that work with the RAPID's coordination structure in the counties?
    - b. Were the new structures an additional burden to the existing structures?
    - c. Are they likely to be sustained when RAPID exits? Which line ministry takes the lead in coordination after RAPID exits?
    - d. How did embedding CCU staff in the county government departments strengthen county government's ability to advance its WASH, rangeland, nutrition and other agendas?
  7. RAPID developed joint workplans with your county. Kindly explain the process.
    - a. Has the implementation of those plans been successful?
    - b. What have been the challenges?
  8. There is an element of co-financing of WASH and other projects with the counties and communities.
    - a. Did your county commit to co-financing?
    - b. If yes, was this actualized? What were the arrangements? Any challenges?
    - c. Did your county receive WASH funding from any other sources? (If yes, which ones? Probe for WB, UNICEF.)
  9. What have been the key achievements in the policy enabling environment process? Probe for:
    - a. Policies, enacted laws and the impacts, e.g., financing, changes in institution structures
    - b. What have been the key lessons/challenges?

---

<sup>3</sup> Agile and Harmonized Assistance for Devolved Institutions (AHADI) is a USAID-supported program funded at almost US\$50m (2014-2020) to support the devolution process at the national, county and grassroots level.

10. Do you see RAPID working at the national level to advocate on behalf of counties?
11. Through RAPID, have you been able to learn from the four other county governments in the program? How has this exchange been conducted?
12. Have you been applying the County Public Participation Checklist to co-design and deliver interventions? How has RAPID helped you with this? Probe for: Establishment of community structures, Capacity building, Feedback mechanisms, Likelihood of sustaining these processes and structures, whether RAPID has worked with the media or other institutions to get messages out on participation
13. Has RAPID supported county governments in working with informal institutions? Has RAPID created new institutional structures? How effective have these been?
14. What recommendations do you have for programs like RAPID going forward?

**WASH (as appropriate)**

15. What is the role of the county in WASH service delivery? Probe for: Financing, Expansion of service provision
16. How does the county work with the national government in WASH service delivery? Probe for: Support with policy, guidelines, capacity building, financing
17. What are the key challenges of WASH service delivery in your county?
18. RAPID has assisted counties to establish coordination/implementation/decision making structures: were there multi-sectoral coordination structures before RAPID? If yes,
  - How has RAPID helped to enhance the existing structures?
  - How will the CPCU structure going to be sustained after RAPID? Who will lead?
19. Kindly explain RAPID's PPP WASH business models work introduced in the 5 counties.
  - a. How were the WASH business model approaches determined? Probe for: Process of identification (who was involved, community opinion, if there are WASH proven models in the sector in the north)
  - b. In your opinion, how successful has the work on WASH PPP and business models been? Probe for prepaid meters, desalination, biogas, maintenance and repair, sanitation options, water treatment. SMEs, leasing models
  - c. Which ones have worked or show most promise in which counties?
  - d. Have you seen any replication in other counties? Which models do you think can be scaled?
  - e. What are the main challenges and key learnings from your activities on business models in the ASAL region?
20. What were the key achievements in terms of building operational capacity for the counties in the WASH sector? Probe for:
  - a. Planning, Financing / Funding going forward
  - b. O&M skills
  - c. The ICT technology E-Maji manager platform, how it functions, who is driving it, sustainability post RAPID
  - d. PPP

21. How has K- RAPID contributed to improvement of governance in the WASH sector (probe for WASH governance at county, Utility, Community WASH projects.
22. How has K- RAPID contributed to expanded financing for the WASH sector. Probe for public/private financing for WASH, financing or increased revenues for service providers in your county?
23. How has K- RAPID contributed to expanding water and sanitation services in the county. What sanitation and hygiene service delivery approaches worked/didn't work in the RAPID project counties and why? Probe for views on:
  - a. CLTS
  - b. Sanitation Marketing
  - c. Hygiene promotion through media, IEC, radio
  - d. Suggestions for longer-term sanitation solutions for areas with high water table, loose soils.
24. What methods did RAPID use for provision of water in the five counties? Probe for:
  - a. County preferences/ choices informed by the 3R assessments/training (e.g. Turkana county shift of preference to water harvesting.
25. Variations across the implementing partners and influence that IPs had on each other
26. How specifically has RAPID assisted in building capacities of county government departments / staff? Probe for:
  - Effects of embedded CCUs in the county
  - Familiarity with CCBF. How has it been of help?
  - Are you a member of the CCBF steering committee?
  - How is the CCBF funded?
  - How will it be sustained after RAPID? Probe for effects of possible political changes in the county since CECs are members.
27. In terms of WASH service delivery, which specific aspects of the RAPID program approaches do you think have been most successful? Based on what evidence? Probe for:
  - Facilitative approach
  - Private sector engagement
  - WASH Business models,
  - Water, sanitation hygiene approaches
  - Capacity building approaches
  - Community engagements
  - What are the factors that lead to success?
  - Which approaches do you think were not suitable for the context?
28. What would you like to see RAPID build on to have greatest impact / sustainable impact for the remaining period?

## **Gender**

29. Please explain how the county government, through Kenya RAPID, incorporated gender into the program and partnerships, in your specific county.
- a. *PROBE*: How did the program make considerations for shifting norms (e.g. reducing the double work/time burden on women by including them in meetings and trainings)?
  - b. *PROBE*: How did the program make considerations for *active* participation and decision-making power among women who attend meetings?
  - a. *QUESTION*: What were the outcomes of these approaches to gender integration?
30. Please explain how the county government, through Kenya RAPID, incorporated disability sensitivity into the program and partnerships, in your specific county. What were the outcomes of these approaches to disability sensitivity?

### Resilience

31. USAID defines resilience as “the ability of people, households, communities, countries, and systems to mitigate, adapt to, and recover from shocks and stresses in a manner that reduces chronic vulnerability and facilitates inclusive growth.” In what ways do you see your interventions contributing to the resilience of pastoral livelihoods and communities? Is commercial success contingent upon achieving resilience?

## KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE – COUNTY GOVERNMENT: IMPLEMENTATION (TECHNICAL) LEVEL

This Topic Guide is intended for use in interviews with representatives of County Government at implementation level. This evaluation will assess the effectiveness of RAPID’s technical assistance activities across its portfolio and to gauge the effectiveness of RAPID’s partnership and facilitation approach. The evaluation will also help inform USAID’s future decisions on WASH programming in Kenya. It should be followed as closely as possible to guide key informant interviews with these respondents. For a few questions, a specific set of responses shall be provided in order to assist in the collection of data that can be more easily quantified. Instructions to the interviewer are in **red**. Interviewers will be trained to be compliant with USAID policy with regard to the "USG Common Rule" for the protection of human subjects.

**Introduction (~10 minutes) [Much of this could be in the introductory or follow up email to schedule the interview, thus saving time on the call.]**

**Thank the respondent for taking the time to participate in the interview.**

### Introduction to the researcher and the research

- i. I am a Consultant residing in \_\_\_\_\_. I represent an evaluation team fielded by Tetra Tech ARD, a Washington DC based firm that has been contracted by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) to conduct an independent evaluation of the USAID RAPID program.
- ii. As part of its own planning for the next few years, USAID has asked us to conduct a performance evaluation of the Kenya RAPID program to assess its progress toward achieving its objectives. So, what we are trying to assess are the strengths and weaknesses of the program, its accomplishments and best practices, but also any obstacles and shortcomings faced and how it could have been more effective.
- iii. Ultimately the research will be used to ascertain the extent to which RAPID activities have improved lives and health through the development and management of sustainable water, sanitation and hygiene services, as well as nutrition and rangeland management support in

Kenya. It will also be used to propose recommendations based on the findings to inform future programming by USAID.

We will follow privacy protocols to protect your anonymity:

- i. Explain confidentiality and anonymity and note whether the respondent would like to remain anonymous, and that the assessment team will ask permission if s/he would like to attribute a quote to the respondent in the final report in such a way that it would make his or her identity easily known.
- ii. Explain how collected data will be stored without identifying information.
- iii. Ask if the respondent is willing to be recorded and note their response.

Explain recording, length and nature of discussion.

Check whether respondents have any questions.

## **WASH**

1. Kindly explain your current role in the department.
2. How has your department interacted with Kenya RAPID's WASH project?
3. What is your opinion on RAPID's approach to support WASH service delivery in the county? Probe for: Acceptance of the facilitative approach, PPP and business and non-business models, capacity building, community empowerment/engagement.
4. With regard to joint work planning, did you participate in any of the joint planning sessions with RAPID? If yes,
  - a. How has this approach been helpful to the expansion and sustainability of the county's WASH services?
  - b. Did the counties commit to co-financing of WASH projects in the county? Was this actualized? What was the arrangement? Any challenges?
5. Kindly explain RAPID's PPP WASH business models work introduced in the 5 counties.
  - a. How were the WASH business model approaches determined? Probe for: Process of identification (who was involved, community opinion, if there are WASH proven models in the sector in the north)
  - b. In your opinion, how successful has the work on WASH PPP and business models been? Probe for prepaid meters, desalination, biogas, maintenance and repair, sanitation options, water treatment. SMEs, leasing models
  - c. Which ones have worked or show most promise in which counties?
  - d. Have you seen any replication in other counties? Which models do you think can be scaled?
  - e. What are the main challenges and key learnings from your activities on business models in the ASAL region?
6. What were the key achievements in terms of building operational capacity for the counties in the WASH sector? Probe for:
  - a. Planning, Financing / Funding going forward
  - b. O&M skills

- c. The ICT technology E-Maji manager platform, how it functions, who is driving it, sustainability post RAPID
  - d. PPP
- 7. How has K- RAPID contributed to improvement of governance in the WASH sector (probe for WASH governance at county, Utility, Community WASH projects).
- 8. How has K- RAPID contributed to expanded financing for the WASH sector. Probe for public/private financing for WASH, financing or increased revenues for service providers in your county?
- 9. How has K- RAPID contributed to expanding water and sanitation services in the county. What sanitation and hygiene service delivery approaches worked/didn't work in the RAPID project counties and why? Probe for views on:
  - a. CLTS
  - b. Sanitation Marketing
  - c. Hygiene promotion through media, IEC, radio
  - d. Suggestions for longer-term sanitation solutions for areas with high water table, loose soils.
- 10. What methods did RAPID use for provision of water in the five counties? Probe for:
  - a. County preferences/ choices informed by the 3R assessments/training (e.g. Turkana county shift of preference to water harvesting.
  - b. Variations across the implementing partners and influence that IPs had on each other
- 11. How has RAPID assisted in building capacities of county government departments/staff? Probe for:
  - a. ICT and the integrated WASH ICT platforms – E-Maji Manager platform
  - b. Embedding of CCUs in the county
  - c. Capacity building on various technologies (sensors, maintenance, prepaid meters)
  - d. If familiar with CCBF: How has it worked? How will it be sustained post RAPID?
- 12. Are there specific aspects of the RAPID program approaches that you think have been successful/ not successful? If yes, what is the evidence? Probe for:
  - a. Private sector engagements
  - b. Business models. Probe for:
    - i. Pre-paid metering,
    - ii. Maintenance of water utilities,
    - iii. NRW reduction for utilities/other water projects
    - iv. Sanitation marketing
    - v. HHWT products marketing
  - c. Water and sanitation and hygiene services- willingness to pay by communities
  - d. Community engagement
    - i. Governance of community water projects

- ii. Feedback mechanisms
  - iii. WSP relationship with community water projects
  - e. What are the factors that have led to success? What is the likelihood of sustainability of these efforts?
  - f. Which approaches do you think were not suitable for the context?
13. Were you able to learn from RAPID activities in other ASAL counties?
14. What would you like to see RAPID build on to have greatest impact / sustainable impact?

### **Rangeland Management**

1. How were the key gaps in rangeland and livestock sectors identified and addressed by the program? Probe for: *Participatory/consultative approaches used in the gaps identification and solutions design*
2. How were rangeland management and livestock interventions integrated into your County Development Plan (CIDP) and sectoral strategies? (*How did RAPID as a program contribute to CIDP development or how did it contribute to/support the implementation of your CIDP?*)
3. How were community needs in rangeland and livestock sector addressed with particular consideration for vulnerable groups (women, disabled, widows, orphans)? Probe for: *Community participation approaches, Community capacity development, Resilience in terms of grazing management plans/feed conservation/strategic resource use plans, etc.)*
4. How did individual households participate in the rangeland management and livestock interventions?
5. Were private sector actors engaged in rangeland and livestock interventions? How were they aligned to increase / support greater productivity and resilience?
6. How were business models structured to ensure sustainability of rangeland management and livestock sector activities after RAPID? Probe for: *Livestock marketing with value chain actors' linkages and market access – this will also need to show how production constraints were addressed by the program, especially feed resources.*
7. How likely is sustainability of rangeland management and livestock interventions post RAPID? Probe for: *How rangeland and water resource governance was streamlined within county, community? How were unplanned settlement and water development challenges addressed*
8. Are there areas in rangeland management/livestock support that has not received support by the RAPID project but poses a major gap in sustainable development and community well-being?
9. How did RAPID contribute to county staff capacity development to effectively implement rangeland management and livestock interventions? Probe for: *staff trained on rangeland management/livestock production*
10. Did trainings enhance implementation and sustainability of activities in RM/LS? *Were staff in relevant ministries trained and are they facilitated to make use of these skills?*
11. Was Holistic Rangeland Management implemented in your county? How is it working?
12. Was rangeland reseeding done? To what extent (Ha reseeded)?
13. What is the status of improved rangelands-vegetation cover?
14. What are the successes and challenges to rehabilitation efforts done by RAPID? What is the likely sustainability of such efforts?

15. Did RAPID support/influence policies, acts/bills/strategies and sectoral plans within the county government in rangeland / livestock and water sector? Probe for: *Policy influence on county/country rangeland management, livestock/feeds, including any county assembly acts*
16. Were you able to learn from RAPID activities in other ASAL counties?
17. What would you like to see RAPID build on to have greatest impact / sustainable impact?

## **NDMA**

1. From your perspective, what have RAPID's most successful contributions been to addressing community challenges?
2. What were some challenges that affected implementation of RAPID's rangeland management activities?
3. What is your familiarity with RAPID's resilience work and its results? How do you think it has helped households and communities to mitigate, adapt to, or recover from shocks and stresses, and reduce chronic vulnerability to these shocks? How do you think this could be measured or validated?
4. What types of information related to livestock (market prices, early warning and forecasts, etc.) does NDMA collect? What has been your level of engagement with RAPID staff? What information have they sought from you, or supported you in providing to communities and other stakeholders?
5. If RAPID was to be extended, which areas would you recommend for continued interventions and why?

## **Food and Security Advisor**

1. To what extent was the design of the Kenya RAPID program appropriate in addressing the nutrition needs of people living in the ASAL? Are the assumptions and theory of change valid?
2. What new or innovative features in the design of the Kenya RAPID program are considered valuable for the achievement of the planned nutrition outcomes?
3. To what extent were the following aspects effectively addressed by the program and embedded in and owned by county government:
  - a. Guidance on program design and implementation process
  - b. Multi-sectoral coordination of the program
  - c. Capacity building for implementation of the program for county, sub-county and community level personnel
  - d. Resource allocation for nutrition-related activities
  - e. Business models for WASH and agri-nutrition programs
  - f. Differences in socio-economic characteristics and culture between the counties
  - g. Contextual differences between counties e.g. in drivers of malnutrition
4. To what extent did integration of WASH, livestock, nutrition, food security and rangeland management in one activity contribute to and result in greater achievement of nutrition outcomes?
5. What business models, if any, were developed for WASH and agri-nutrition programs? Are they appropriate for the ASAL context?

6. What are the major factors influencing (either positively or negatively) the achievement of the planned nutrition outcomes in the Kenya RAPID program?
7. What are the challenges experienced by the program in the implementation of the Kenya RAPID program for improved nutrition outcomes?
8. Were you able to learn from RAPID activities in other ASAL counties?
9. What would you like to see RAPID build on to have greatest impact / sustainable impact?

### **SUB-COUNTY NUTRITION COORDINATOR**

1. To what extent is the design of the RAPID program appropriate in addressing the nutrition needs of people living in the ASAL?
2. What aspects of the design were innovative (new) and how appropriate were they in meeting the nutrition needs of the people?
3. To what extent were the following aspects effectively addressed by the program and embedded in and owned by county government:
  - a. Guidance on integration of nutrition into WASH, livestock and rangeland management as one activity?
  - b. Multi-sectoral coordination of the program in terms of planning, resource mobilization and implementation of the program activities?
  - c. Capacity building for implementation of the program for the sub-county and community level personnel. Were there changes particularly in terms of county government capacity and commitment?
  - d. Improving community level governance?
  - e. Resource allocation for nutrition-related activities?
  - f. Business models for WASH and agri-nutrition programs and their appropriateness for ASAL context?
4. Do you think RAPID sufficiently incorporated contextual differences in their support to your county (for example, in socio-economic characteristics and culture) as they influence drivers of malnutrition?
5. To what extent did integration of WASH, livestock, nutrition, food security and rangeland management in one activity contribute to and result in greater achievement of nutrition outcomes?
6. What business models, if any, were developed for WASH and agri-nutrition programs? Are they appropriate for the ASAL context?
7. What are the major factors influencing (either positively or negatively) the achievement of the planned nutrition outcomes in the Kenya RAPID program?
8. What are the challenges experienced by the program in the implementation of the Kenya RAPID program for improved nutrition outcomes?
9. Were you able to learn from RAPID activities in other ASAL counties?
10. What would you like to see RAPID build on to have greatest impact / sustainable impact?

### **Gender Focal Point**

- I. Please explain how the county government, through Kenya RAPID, incorporated gender into the program and partnerships, in your specific county.

- a. *PROBE*: How did the program make considerations for shifting norms (e.g. reducing the double work/time burden on women by including them in meetings and trainings)?
  - b. *PROBE*: How did the program make considerations for *active* participation and decision-making power among women who attend meetings?
  - c. *QUESTION*: What were the outcomes of these approaches to gender integration?
2. Please explain how the county government, through Kenya RAPID, incorporated disability sensitivity into the program and partnerships, in your specific county. What were the outcomes of these approaches to disability sensitivity?
  3. How did the county government incorporate recommendations from the Gender and Do No Harm Analysis into the program?
  4. How did the county government address barriers (if relevant) to women’s access to trainings and/or meetings, through the Kenya RAPID program?
    - a. *PROBE*: Did women express an inability to attend due to time burden in the home or even WASH-related? What was the response, if so?
    - b. *PROBE*: How well were women able to adopt labor-saving technology (e.g. due to access to technology, interest in adoption, knowledge of adoption, decision-making power in the household to adopt/use technology)?

#### KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE – NATIONAL-LEVEL STAKEHOLDERS

This Topic Guide is intended for use in interviews with representatives at the national level. This evaluation will assess the effectiveness of RAPID’s technical assistance activities across its portfolio and to gauge the effectiveness of RAPID’s partnership and facilitation approach. The evaluation will also help inform USAID’s future decisions on WASH programming in Kenya. It should be followed as closely as possible to guide key informant interviews with these respondents. For a few questions, a specific set of responses shall be provided in order to assist in the collection of data that can be more easily quantified. Instructions to the interviewer are in **red**. Interviewers will be trained to be compliant with USAID policy with regard to the "USG Common Rule" for the protection of human subjects.

**Introduction (~10 minutes) [*Much of this could be in the introductory or follow up email to schedule the interview, thus saving time on the call.*]**

**Thank the respondent for taking the time to participate in the interview.**

#### **Introduction to the researcher and the research**

- i. I am a Consultant residing in \_\_\_\_\_. I represent an evaluation team fielded by Tetra Tech ARD, a Washington DC based firm that has been contracted by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) to conduct an independent evaluation of the USAID RAPID program.
- ii. As part of its own planning for the next few years, USAID has asked us to conduct a performance evaluation of the Kenya RAPID program to assess its progress toward achieving its objectives. So, what we are trying to assess are the strengths and weaknesses of the program, its accomplishments and best practices, but also any obstacles and shortcomings faced and how it could have been more effective.
- iii. Ultimately the research will be used to ascertain the extent to which RAPID activities have improved lives and health through the development and management of sustainable water, sanitation and hygiene services, as well as nutrition and rangeland management support in

Kenya. It will also be used to propose recommendations based on the findings to inform future programming by USAID.

We will follow privacy protocols to protect your anonymity:

- i. Explain confidentiality and anonymity and note whether the respondent would like to remain anonymous, and that the assessment team will ask permission if s/he would like to attribute a quote to the respondent in the final report in such a way that it would make his or her identity easily known.
- ii. Explain how collected data will be stored without identifying information.
- iii. Ask if the respondent is willing to be recorded and note their response.

Explain recording, length and nature of discussion.

Check whether respondents have any questions.

### **Facilitative Approach (All)**

1. Since devolution, where do you think counties have had the most success in terms of enhancing WASH service delivery, rangeland management and nutrition programming for your communities?
2. Since devolution, what challenges have counties faced in their efforts to enhance WASH service delivery, rangeland management and nutrition programming for your communities?
3. Do you know of any differences observed across the five ASAL counties in the RAPID activity (Garissa, Isiolo, Marsabit, Turkana, Wajir) and how these observations may influence? Such differences could include economic, political, cultural, institutional
4. Are you familiar with RAPID's work to build capacity at the county level? How successful do you think they have been in this area? Probe for: Policy support, implementation support, etc.

### **WASH**

1. What role does your ministry/department/organization play in the WASH sector?
2. How do the national and county governments work to ensure WASH services are provided to the people living in the ASALs? Probe for:
  - Financing through treasury, donor funding, others
  - Research
3. Are you familiar with the RAPID program?
4. In what areas has RAPID worked with your ministry/agency at the national level? Probe for
  - Policy contributions
  - Financing for WASH
  - Learnings from the field
5. In what areas would you say RAPID design to WASH implementation in the ASAL has been successful?
  - a. Why do you think there was success in those areas?
  - b. Which approaches do you think were not suitable for the context?
6. What are some of the WASH challenges that you think a WASH project like RAPID should be addressing?

7. What would you like to see RAPID build on to have greatest impact / sustainable impact?

### **Rangelands**

1. How did RAPID support national government strategy on rangeland management within the ASALS?
2. How did RAPID contribute to increasing water access for multipurpose use within the project counties?
3. Do you think the RAPID strategy to the water/rangelands management sector was ideal and suitable to the ASAL county context?
4. Could you suggest some areas on water and rangeland development for future interventions?
5. EWS is now used to support decision making cushioning communities against uncertainties and reduction of vulnerability, how was this supported by the project?
6. Are the communities benefiting from EWS? How?
  - a. Is the National Drought Management Authority (NDMA) climatic information in use by the producers/communities? Are the monthly/quarterly reports recommendations reaching to the end users for planning?

### **Nutrition**

1. To what extent was the design of the Kenya RAPID program appropriate in addressing the nutrition needs of people living in the ASAL? Are the assumptions and theory of change valid?
2. What new or innovative features in the design of the Kenya RAPID program are considered valuable for the achievement of the planned nutrition outcomes?
3. To what extent were the following aspects effectively addressed by the program and embedded in and owned by county government:
  - a. Guidance on program design and implementation process
  - b. Multi-sectoral coordination of the program
  - c. Capacity building for implementation of the program for county, sub-county and community level personnel
  - d. Resource allocation for nutrition-related activities
  - e. Business models for WASH and agri-nutrition programs
  - f. Differences in socio-economic characteristics and culture between the counties
  - g. Contextual differences between counties e.g. in drivers of malnutrition
4. To what extent did integration of WASH, livestock, nutrition, food security and rangeland management in one activity contribute to and result in greater achievement of nutrition outcomes?
5. What business models, if any, were developed for WASH and agri-nutrition programs? Are they appropriate for the ASAL context?
6. What are the major factors influencing (either positively or negatively) the achievement of the planned nutrition outcomes in the Kenya RAPID program?
7. What are the challenges experienced by the program in the implementation of the Kenya RAPID program for improved nutrition outcomes?
8. Were you able to learn from RAPID activities in other ASAL counties?

9. What would you like to see RAPID build on to have greatest impact / sustainable impact?

**Gender**

1. Please explain how the Ministry of Public Service, Youth, and Gender Affairs supported gender integration in the Kenya RAPID program and partnerships.
  - d. *PROBE*: How did the program make considerations for shifting norms (e.g. reducing the double work/time burden on women by including them in meetings and trainings)?
  - e. *PROBE*: How did the program make considerations for *active* participation and decision-making power among women who attend meetings?
  - a. *QUESTION*: What were the outcomes of these approaches to gender integration?
2. Please explain how the Ministry of Public Service, Youth, and Gender Affairs supported disability sensitivity in the Kenya RAPID program and partnerships. What were the outcomes of these approaches to disability sensitivity?

## ANNEX IV: DATA SOURCES

### List of Key Informants

Below are the names of the key informants consulted during the review (pending completion of 3-4 interviews) categorized by type.

| Respondent Name                                     | Title  | Geographic Focus |
|---|--|------------------|
| <b>MWA &amp; RAPID Implementing Partners</b>        |  |                  |
| Doris Kaberia                                       | RAPID Chief of Party   | National         |
| Kenneth Owuocha                                     | RAPID Deputy Chief of Party  | National         |
| Ayub Were   | RAPID M&E Specialist   | National         |
| Job Kitetu  | RAPID WASH Specialist  | National         |
| Beatrice Akinyi                                     | RAPID Agricultural/Nutrition Advisor                                   | National         |
| Teresia Njoki                                       | CARE Canada, Program Quality, Learning & Accountability Sector         | National         |
| Lane Bunkers  | CRS Kenya, Country Representative                                      | National         |
| Timothy Ngure                                       | CRS Kenya, Program Manager   | National         |
| Jeff Arensen  | FH Kenya, Country Director   | National         |
| Alex Mwaura   | FH Kenya, Program Director   | National         |
| Enock Oruko   | World Vision Kenya, Associate Director                                 | National         |
| James An'gawa                                       | World Vision Kenya, Director Program Development and Quality Assurance | National         |
| Rafael Callejas                                     | Former MWA CEO   | National         |
| <b>USAID &amp; SDC</b>                              |  |                  |
| Aden Abdikarim Daud                                 | SDC Program Officer, Food Security                                     | National         |
| Betty Mugo  | USAID – Gender Advisor   | National         |
| Dorine Genga  | USAID – PREG COR   | National         |
| Vicky Liyai   | USAID – RAPID COR  | National         |
| Walter Ong'eng'a                                    | USAID – M&E Specialist   | National         |
| <b>National Government and Development Partners</b> |  |                  |
| Paul Kimeu  | NDMA Project Manager   | National         |
| Lewnida Sara  | World Bank, WASH   | National         |
| James Muli Musinga                                  | World Bank, Agriculture  | National         |
| <b>Private Sector</b>                               |  |                  |
| Aisha Walcott-Bryant                                | IBM Kenya, Research Scientist  | National         |
| Andrew Meme   | IBM Kenya, Business Development Executive                              | National         |
| Daniela Benedicto                                   | Acacia Water   | National         |
| Evan Thomas   | SweetSense, Inc. CEO   | National         |
| Isaac Wambugu                                       | IBM Kenya, Technical Lead  | National         |
| Marcus Schreurs                                     | Maji Milele/Water Forever, Managing Director                           | National         |
| Marlies Batterink                                   | Aqua for All, RAPID Project Officer                                    | National         |
| Sarah Kimura  | IBM Kenya, Kenya RAPID Program Manager                                 | National         |
| Sjef Ernes  | Aqua for All, former CEO   | National         |
| Styvers Kathuni                                     | SweetSense, Inc. Regional Director                                     | National         |
| <b>County Counterparts</b>                          |  |                  |
| Issa Oyow   | Ministry of Water & Irrigation County Executive Committee Member       | Garissa County   |
| Abdihakim S. Mohamed                                | Agriculture Water Director   | Garissa County   |
| Abdi Digale   | Public Health Officer  | Garissa County   |
| Eric Mwatuni  | Sub-county Livestock Production Officer and M&E                        | Garissa County   |

|                             |   |                 |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------|
| Dennis Makii                | Agriculture Deputy Director                   | Garissa County  |
| Salome Chemjor              | County Home Economist                         | Garissa County  |
| Michael Mugo                | County Public Health Officer                  | Isiolo County   |
| Kilion Ousa                 | Public Health Officer                         | Isiolo County   |
| Chachu Godana               | Water Engineer                                | Isiolo County   |
| Florence Mwangangi          | Agriculture Director                          | Isiolo County   |
| Slyvester Mugo              | Senior Assistant Livestock Production Officer | Isiolo County   |
| David Mwangi                | Livestock Production Officer                  | Isiolo County   |
| Saida Abdulrahman           | Nutrition Coordinator                         | Isiolo County   |
| Bishar Jillo                | Water Director                                | Isiolo County   |
| Florence Kathure<br>Gitonga | Sub-county Nutrition Coordinator              | Isiolo County   |
| David Gitira Muturia        | Agriculture Officer, Moyale Sub-county        | Marsabit County |
| Alex Mbundi                 | Livestock Officer, Moyale Sub-county          | Marsabit County |
| Bernerdette Njoki           | Public Health Officer, Saku Sub-county        | Marsabit County |
| Stephen Katelo              | County Director, Water and ICT                | Marsabit County |
| Hassan Halakhe              | County Director, Health                       | Marsabit County |
| Wilson Silali               | Agricultural Extension Officer                | Turkana County  |
| John Eipa                   | Director Livestock Production                 | Turkana County  |
| Kibiego Reuben              | County WASH Coordinator                       | Turkana County  |
| Godwin Wambani              | Sub-county WASH Coordinator                   | Turkana County  |
| Pauline Lochipo             | Livestock Production Officer                  | Turkana County  |
| Tito Ochieng                | Agriculture Director                          | Turkana County  |
| Esekon Debra                | Nutrition Officer                             | Turkana County  |
| Shukri Mohamed Issak        | WASH Coordinator                              | Wajir County    |
| Hassan Mahamed Adan         | Agriculture and Irrigation Director           | Wajir County    |
| Bernard Ouma Otieno         | Livestock Director                            | Wajir County    |
| Hassan Nguyo                | Livestock Officer, North Sub-county           | Wajir County    |
| Edwin Onkeyo                | Agriculture Officer, North Sub-county         | Wajir County    |
| Rodgers Opole               | WAJWASCO Commercial Manager                   | Wajir County    |
| <b>RAPID Staff</b>          |   |                 |
| Johnson Nganga              | County Lead                                   | Marsabit County |
| Daniel Kiting'a             | Program Officer, M&E                          | Garissa County  |
| Sam Ombeki                  | Program Manager/County Lead                   | Garissa County  |
| Alfred Ileri                | MEAL Officer and Agriculture County Lead      | Turkana County  |
| Emmanuel Olela              | Program Information Management/MEAL Officer   | Isiolo County   |
| Roy Okelo                   | Project Manager/County Lead                   | Isiolo County   |

## Background Documentation

### AMELP AND ANNUAL WORKPLANS

- Kenya RAPID Activity M&E Plan (AMEP) - Final and Approved 3.10.2017
- Kenya RAPID Work plans:
  - Final Kenya RAPID Year 2 Work Plan
  - Kenya RAPID Approved Year 3 Annual Workplan 09.11.2017 Submitted
  - Kenya RAPID Year 1 Annual Workplan -1<sup>st</sup> October 2015 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2016 - Approved
  - Kenya RAPID Year 4 Annual Workplan 06.11.2018 USAID Approved Version
  - Year 5 Annual Work Plan for USAID Approved 03.12.2019

### COMPRESSED FILES

(contains .zip or .rar folders, compressed folders of all other documents)

- AMELP and Annual Workplans
- Contextual and Sector Reports
- GOK County Development and Investment Plans
- Kenya RAPID PMG Reports
- MWA-RAPID Scope of Work and Proposal
- Program Policy Briefs
- Related GOK Policy Documents
- Success Stories and Videos

### CONTEXTUAL AND SECTORAL REPORTS

- Final Kenya RAPID Midterm Evaluation Report-April 16 final
- Kenya RAPID Baseline S Final Report
- Kenya RAPID DNH and Gender Final
- RAPID County Capacity Needs Assessment
- RAPID Summary of County Capacity Needs Assessment: Water, Livestock and Rangeland Management Sectors

### GOK COUNTY DEVELOPMENT AND INVESTMENT PLANS

- Garissa County Integrated Development Plan 2018-2022
- Garissa County Integrated Development Plan CIDP 2013-2017
- Isiolo County Integrated Development Plan 2018-2022
- Isiolo County Integrated Development Plan CIDP 2013-2017
- Marsabit County Integrated Development Plan 2018-2022
- Marsabit County Integrated Development Plan CIDP 2013-2017
- Turkana County Integrated Development Plan 2018-2022
- Turkana County Integrated Development Plan CIDP 2013-2017
- Wajir County Integrated Development Plan 2018-2022

- Wajir County Integrated Development Plan CIDP 2013-2017

## INDEX

- Desk Review References
- Index file

## KENYA RAPID PMG REPORTS

- 1<sup>st</sup> PMG Report 26<sup>th</sup> September 2016
- 2<sup>nd</sup> PMG Meeting Report
- 3<sup>rd</sup> PMG Meeting Report
- 4<sup>th</sup> PMG Meeting Report
- 5<sup>th</sup> PMG Meeting Report
- 6<sup>th</sup> PMG Meeting Report 10.10.18
- 7<sup>th</sup> PMG Meeting Report
- 8<sup>th</sup> PMG Meeting Report 15.10.2019

## MWA-RAPID SCOPE OF WORK AND PROPOSAL

- KENYA RAPID APS OAA-14-000001 MWA September 1 2015 FINAL\_16 10 2015
- Kenya RAPID SOW \_ AID-615-A-15-00008 - MWA final Approved Proposal \_ Sept 28th 2015

## PROGRAM POLICY BRIEFS

- Community Dialogue Cards
- Agri-Nutrition Manual - Jan 2018
- Learning Briefs
  - A learning Brief on Technologies of Resilience v2
  - Beyond the Program Borders - 15.12.19
  - Learning brief-Using Facilitation Approach-PIFA-Revised-04-02-2020

## QUARTERLY REPORTS

- Kenya RAPID FY16 Reports
  - Kenya RAPID FY16 Q1 Report January 2016
  - Kenya RAPID FY16 Q2 Report Final
  - Kenya RAPID FY16 Q3 Report for the Period between April-June 2016
  - Kenya RAPID FY16 Q4 Report July 1<sup>st</sup> – September 30 2016
- Kenya RAPID FY17 Reports
  - Kenya RAPID FY17 Q1 Report to USAID January 31<sup>st</sup> 2017 Submitted Version
  - Kenya RAPID FY17 Q2 Report to USAID April 28<sup>th</sup> 2017 Final and Submitted
  - Kenya RAPID FY17 Q3 Report to USAID July 31<sup>st</sup> 2017 Final and Submitted
  - Kenya RAPID FY17 Q4 Report Final and Submitted to USAID October 26<sup>th</sup> 2017
- Kenya RAPID FY18 Reports
  - Kenya RAPID FY18 Q1 Report to USAID January 31 2018 Final and Submitted
  - Kenya RAPID FY18 Q2 Report to USAID March 31 2018 Final and Submitted

- Kenya RAPID FY18 Q3 Report to USAID July 31 2018 Final and Submitted
- Kenya RAPID FY18 Q4 Report to USAID October 31 2018 Final and Submitted
- Kenya RAPID FY19 Reports
  - Kenya RAPID FY19 Q1 Report to USAID January 31 2019 Final and Submitted
  - Kenya RAPID FY19 Q2 Report to USAID April 30 2019 Final and Submitted
  - Kenya RAPID FY19 Q3 Report to USAID July 31 2019 Final and Submitted
  - Kenya RAPID FY19 Q4 Report to USAID October 31 2019 Final and Submitted
- Kenya RAPID FY20 Reports
  - Kenya RAPID FY20 Q1 Report to USAID January 31<sup>st</sup> 2020 Final and Submitted

#### RELATED GOK POLICY DOCUMENTS

- Garissa Water Framework Final
  - Final Edited Water Act
  - Garissa Draft Water Policy – Final
  - Garissa Water Sector Strategy – CEC’s Summary
  - Garissa Water Sector Strategy (Final Draft)
  - Summary Garissa Policy Goals 05.07.2018
  - Summary Water Act
- Wajir Water Policies and Bills
  - Final Draft – Wajir County Water Management Bill 2015
  - Wajir County Water Bills
  - Wajir County Water Policy and Bill Simplified Version 13.4.17
  - Wajir Water Sector Policy Draft 01
- 2017 Isiolo County Water Sector Policy – Final Draft
- Agri-Nutrition Manual – Jan 2018
- Community Dialogue Cards
- Final Draft of Sessional Paper on National Water Policy 25 February 2019
- Isiolo Water and Sanitation Services Bill (12<sup>th</sup> Nov. 2019)
- Isiolo Water and Sanitation Services Bill (12<sup>th</sup> Nov. 2019)
- Marsabit Water and Sewerage Services ACT2018-Final
- Marsabit Water Services Bill 2018 – VELLUM COPY FINAL
- National WaterAct\_No43of2016
- The Turkana County Water Act, 2019
- Turkana Water Services Regulations 2017-Final \_ 23022018

#### SUCCESS STORIES AND VIDEOS

- Kenya RAPID Videos [Word doc with links to 11 videos]
- Success Stories
  - Impact Stories
  - Lessons Learnt and Reflections Report

## References from Initial Findings Report/Desk Review

### DEVOLUTION AND GOVERNANCE

- Cheeseman, N., et al. Kenya's 2017 elections: winner-takes-all politics as usual?, *Journal of Eastern African Studies* (2019) 13:2, 215-234, DOI: 10.1080/17531055.2019.1594072
- Cheeseman, N., K. Kanyinga and G. Lynch Introduction: The political economy of Kenya: Community, clientelism, and class in *The Oxford Handbook of Kenyan Politics*. 25 February 2020.
- D'Arcy, M. Chapter 18: Devolution and County Government in *The Oxford Handbook of Kenyan Politics*. 25 February 2020.
- Kenya School of Government: Centre for Devolution Studies. Building Public Participation in Kenya's Devolved Government. Working Papers 1-7. February 2015
- Koehler, J. Exploring policy perceptions and responsibility of devolved decision-making for water service delivery in Kenya's 47 county governments. *Geoforum* 92 (2018) 68-80.
- Lind, J., Devolution, shifting centre-periphery relationships and conflict in northern Kenya. *Political Geography* 63 (2018) 135-147
- Ngigi, S. and D. Busolo. Devolution in Kenya: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly. *Public Policy and Administration Research*. Vol.9, No.6, 2019.
- USAID. (2015). The Facilitation Approach: A Discussion Paper.

### WASH

- Constitution of Kenya; Constitutional Functional Context: Article 186 & Schedule IV: Part II.
- County Integrated Development Plans 2018-2022 (Garissa, Isiolo, Marsabit, Turkana, Wajir)
- County Sanitation Profiles 2014; 2017 (GOK/WB).
- Development Initiatives: December 2018 enhancing access to safe water and improved sanitation services in Kenya are we on track? Report.
- GOK/UN Women/UNICEF: Public Expenditure Review; Health, Water and Sanitation
- Government of Kenya / World Bank. Boosting Shared prosperity for the North and Northern Eastern Counties of Kenya.
- Kenya environmental Hygiene and Sanitation Policy 2016, Water Act 2016, Draft Sanitation Bill 2019; PPP Act 2013, CLTS national protocols and M&E Tools
- Koehler et al. (2015) Pump-Priming Payments for Sustainable Water Services in Rural Africa. *World Development*
- Sustainable solutions to Water supply in Kenya (Oxfam International, 2017)

### RANGELAND MANAGEMENT

- Agricultural Sector Development Support Programme (ASDSP). <http://www.nafis.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/asdsp-brochure.pdf>
- Agricultural Sector Development Support Programme II(ASDSP II) Overview. <http://www.kilimo.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/ASDSP-II-Overview.pdf>
- Feed the Future FEEDBACK. 2014. Feed the Future Northern Kenya Zone of Influence Baseline Report. Rockville, MD: Westat. [https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/PA00KPHV.pdf](https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00KPHV.pdf)

- Feed the Future FEEDBACK. 2015. Feed the Future Northern Kenya Resilience and Economic Growth in Arid Lands Impact Evaluation Midline Report. Rockville, MD: Westat. [https://cg-281711fb-71ea-422c-b02c-ef79f539e9d2.s3.us-gov-west-1.amazonaws.com/uploads/2019/07/NorthernKenya\\_REGAL\\_IE\\_Midline\\_December2015\\_Addendum2017.pdf](https://cg-281711fb-71ea-422c-b02c-ef79f539e9d2.s3.us-gov-west-1.amazonaws.com/uploads/2019/07/NorthernKenya_REGAL_IE_Midline_December2015_Addendum2017.pdf)
- Kenya Accelerated Value Chain Development Programme (AVCD). <https://avcdkenya.net/>
- Outcome Harvesting Report: Resilience and Economic Growth In the Air Lands-Accelerated Growth by Jennifer Himmelstein (REGAL-AG). [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329513156\\_Outcome\\_Harvesting\\_Report\\_Resilience\\_and\\_Economic\\_Growth\\_In\\_the\\_Air\\_Lands-Accelerated\\_Growth\\_REGAL-AG](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329513156_Outcome_Harvesting_Report_Resilience_and_Economic_Growth_In_the_Air_Lands-Accelerated_Growth_REGAL-AG)
- Regional Pastoral Livelihoods Resilience Project. <http://www.resilience.go.ke/objective/>
- Resilience and Economic Growth in Arid Lands -Improving Resilience (REGAL IR). <https://2012-2017.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1860/REGAL%20IR.pdf>
- Resilience and Economic Growth in the Arid Lands–Accelerated Growth (REGAL-AG). <http://www.acdivoca.org/projects/resilience-and-economic-growth-in-the-arid-lands-accelerated-growth-regal-ag/>

## NUTRITION

- Black R.E., Victora C.G., Walker S.P., Bhutta Z.A., Christian P., de Onis M., Ezzati M., ... Maternal and Child Nutrition Study Group (2013). Maternal and child undernutrition and overweight in low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet*, 382 (9890), 427-451.
- Carl Timler, Stéphanie Alvarez, Fabrice DeClerck et al., Exploring solution spaces for nutrition-sensitive agriculture in Kenya and Vietnam. *Agricultural Systems* 180 (2020) 102774.
- International Food Policy Research Policy Institute (IFPRI) Discussion Paper 01681, October 2017.
- Kenya Demographic and Health Survey (2008-09).
- Kenya Demographic and Health Survey (2014).
- Kimberly R. Jacob Arriola, Anna Ellis, Amy Webb-Girard et al., Designing integrated interventions to improve nutrition and WASH behaviors in Kenya. Pilot and Feasibility Studies (2020) 6:10 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40814-020-0555-x>.
- United Nations Children’s Fund (2013). Improving child nutrition: The achievable imperative for global progress. New York, New York: UNICEF
- USAID Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy 2014-2025
- USAID WASH and Nutrition Development Strategy Implementation Brief. January 2015

## GENDER


- Black R.E., Victora C.G., Walker S.P., Bhutta Z.A., Christian P., de Onis M., Ezzati M., ... Maternal and Child Nutrition Study Group (2013). Maternal and child undernutrition and overweight in low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet*, 382 (9890), 427-451.
- Carl Timler, Stéphanie Alvarez, Fabrice DeClerck et al., Exploring solution spaces for nutrition-sensitive agriculture in Kenya and Vietnam. *Agricultural Systems* 180 (2020) 102774.
- International Food Policy Research Policy Institute (IFPRI) Discussion Paper 01681, October 2017.
- Kenya Demographic and Health Survey (2008-09).

- Kenya Demographic and Health Survey (2014).
- Kimberly R. Jacob Arriola, Anna Ellis, Amy Webb-Girard et, al., Designing integrated interventions to improve nutrition and WASH behaviors in Kenya. Pilot and Feasibility Studies (2020) 6:10 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40814-020-0555-x>.
- United Nations Children’s Fund (2013). Improving child nutrition: The achievable imperative for global progress. New York, New York: UNICEF
- USAID Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy 2014-2025
- USAID WASH and Nutrition Development Strategy Implementation Brief. January 2015

## ANNEX V: DISCLOSURE OF ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST


|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Name</b>  | Oscar Kipchirchir Koech   |
| <b>Title</b>   | Consultant  |
| <b>Organization</b>  | Tetra Tech  |
| <b>Evaluation Position?</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> Team Leader <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Team member  |
| <b>Evaluation Award Number</b> (contract or other instrument)  | AID-OAA-TO-16-00016   |
| <b>USAID Project(s) Evaluated</b> (Include project name(s), implementer name(s) and award number(s), if applicable)  | Kenya RAPID;<br>MWA/Kenya and others;<br>AID-615-A-15-00008.  |
| <b>I have real or potential conflicts of interest to disclose.</b>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No   |
| <p><b>If yes answered above, I disclose the following facts:</b></p> <p>Real or potential conflicts of interest may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Close family member who is an employee of the USAID operating unit managing the project(s) being evaluated or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.</li> <li>2. Financial interest that is direct, or is significant though indirect, in the implementing organization(s) whose projects are being evaluated or in the outcome of the evaluation.</li> <li>3. Current or previous direct or significant though indirect experience with the project(s) being evaluated, including involvement in the project design or previous iterations of the project.</li> <li>4. Current or previous work experience or seeking employment with the USAID operating unit managing the evaluation or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.</li> <li>5. Current or previous work experience with an organization that may be seen as an industry competitor with the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.</li> <li>6. Preconceived ideas toward individuals, groups, organizations, or objectives of the particular projects and organizations being evaluated that could bias the evaluation.</li> </ol> | <p><i>I was selected to be among a team of trainers from my Institution (University of Nairobi) to support the KRAPID- Short Course on Rangeland Management &amp; Livestock Production to trainees from the 5 KRAPID project counties. The training was offered from Monday 19th to Friday 23th August 2019 at the University of Nairobi, African Dryland Institute for Sustainability (ADIS), who were contracted to offer the course. I offered two training session in my area of specialty, namely;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rangeland feed and fodder production systems</li> <li>• Rangeland livestock production systems</li> </ul> <p><i>This is the only link I have with KRAPID project, through the University of Nairobi as a technical expert.</i></p> |

I certify (1) that I have completed this disclosure form fully and to the best of my ability and (2) that I will update this disclosure form promptly if relevant circumstances change. If I gain access to proprietary information of other companies, then I agree to protect their information from unauthorized use or disclosure for as long as it remains proprietary and refrain from using the information for any purpose other than that for which it was furnished.

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| <b>Signature</b> |  |
| <b>Date</b>      | 14 <sup>th</sup> May 2019   |


|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Name</b>  | SOPHIE OCHOLA  |
| <b>Title</b>   | Prof.  |
| <b>Organization</b>  | Tetra Tech   |
| <b>Evaluation Position?</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> Team Leader <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Team member |
| <b>Evaluation Award Number</b> (contract or other instrument)  | AID-OAA-TO-16-00016  |
| <b>USAID Project(s) Evaluated</b> (Include project name(s), implementer name(s) and award number(s), if applicable)  | Kenya RAPID; MWA/Kenya and others; AID-615-A-15-00008.                               |
| <b>I have real or potential conflicts of interest to disclose.</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No                  |
| <p><b>If yes answered above, I disclose the following facts:</b><br/> Real or potential conflicts of interest may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Close family member who is an employee of the USAID operating unit managing the project(s) being evaluated or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.</li> <li>2. Financial interest that is direct, or is significant though indirect, in the implementing organization(s) whose projects are being evaluated or in the outcome of the evaluation.</li> <li>3. Current or previous direct or significant though indirect experience with the project(s) being evaluated, including involvement in the project design or previous iterations of the project.</li> <li>4. Current or previous work experience or seeking employment with the USAID operating unit managing the evaluation or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.</li> <li>5. Current or previous work experience with an organization that may be seen as an industry competitor with the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.</li> <li>6. Preconceived ideas toward individuals, groups, organizations, or objectives of the particular projects and organizations being evaluated that could bias the evaluation.</li> </ol> |  |

I certify (1) that I have completed this disclosure form fully and to the best of my ability and (2) that I will update this disclosure form promptly if relevant circumstances change. If I gain access to proprietary information of other companies, then I agree to protect their information from unauthorized use or disclosure for as long as it remains proprietary and refrain from using the information for any purpose other than that for which it was furnished.

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| <b>Signature</b> |  |
| <b>Date</b>      | 13-05-2020  |


|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Name</b>  | Ben Rinehart   |
| <b>Title</b>   | Associate  |
| <b>Organization</b>  | Tetra Tech   |
| <b>Evaluation Position?</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> Team Leader <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Team member |
| <b>Evaluation Award Number</b> (contract or other instrument)  | AID-OAA-TO-16-00016  |
| <b>USAID Project(s) Evaluated</b> (Include project name(s), implementer name(s) and award number(s), if applicable)  | Kenya RAPID;<br>MWA/Kenya and others;<br>AID-615-A-15-00008.                         |
| <b>I have real or potential conflicts of interest to disclose.</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No                  |
| <p><b>If yes answered above, I disclose the following facts:</b></p> <p>Real or potential conflicts of interest may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Close family member who is an employee of the USAID operating unit managing the project(s) being evaluated or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.</li> <li>2. Financial interest that is direct, or is significant though indirect, in the implementing organization(s) whose projects are being evaluated or in the outcome of the evaluation.</li> <li>3. Current or previous direct or significant though indirect experience with the project(s) being evaluated, including involvement in the project design or previous iterations of the project.</li> <li>4. Current or previous work experience or seeking employment with the USAID operating unit managing the evaluation or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.</li> <li>5. Current or previous work experience with an organization that may be seen as an industry competitor with the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.</li> <li>6. Preconceived ideas toward individuals, groups, organizations, or objectives of the particular projects and organizations being evaluated that could bias the evaluation.</li> </ol> |  |

I certify (1) that I have completed this disclosure form fully and to the best of my ability and (2) that I will update this disclosure form promptly if relevant circumstances change. If I gain access to proprietary information of other companies, then I agree to protect their information from unauthorized use or disclosure for as long as it remains proprietary and refrain from using the information for any purpose other than that for which it was furnished.

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| <b>Signature</b> |  |
| <b>Date</b>      | May 14, 2020  |


|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Name</b>  | Kenneth CAPLAN  |
| <b>Title</b>   | Evaluation Team Leader  |
| <b>Organization</b>  | Tetra Tech  |
| <b>Evaluation Position?</b>  | X Team Leader <input type="checkbox"/> Team member                  |
| <b>Evaluation Award Number</b><br><i>(contract or other instrument)</i>  | AID-OAA-TO-16-00016   |
| <b>USAID Project(s) Evaluated</b><br><i>(Include project name(s), implementer name(s) and award number(s), if applicable)</i>  | Kenya RAPID;<br>MWA/Kenya and others; AID-615-A-15-00008.           |
| <b>I have real or potential conflicts of interest to disclose.</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| <b>If yes answered above, I disclose the following facts:</b><br><i>Real or potential conflicts of interest may include, but are not limited to:</i>   |   |
| 1. <i>Close family member who is an employee of the USAID operating unit managing the project(s) being evaluated or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.</i>         |   |
| 2. <i>Financial interest that is direct, or is significant though indirect, in the implementing organization(s) whose projects are being evaluated or in the outcome of the evaluation.</i>            |   |
| 3. <i>Current or previous direct or significant though indirect experience with the project(s) being evaluated, including involvement in the project design or previous iterations of the project.</i> |   |
| 4. <i>Current or previous work experience or seeking employment with the USAID operating unit managing the evaluation or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.</i>    |   |
| 5. <i>Current or previous work experience with an organization that may be seen as an industry competitor with the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.</i>              |   |
| 6. <i>Preconceived ideas toward individuals, groups, organizations, or objectives of the particular projects and organizations being evaluated that could bias the evaluation.</i>                     |   |

I certify (1) that I have completed this disclosure form fully and to the best of my ability and (2) that I will update this disclosure form promptly if relevant circumstances change. If I gain access to proprietary information of other companies, then I agree to protect their information from unauthorized use or disclosure for as long as it remains proprietary and refrain from using the information for any purpose other than that for which it was furnished.

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| <b>Signature</b> |  |
| <b>Date</b>      | 13 May 2020   |


|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Name</b>   | Siobhan Girling  |
| <b>Title</b>  | Associate  |
| <b>Organization</b>   | Tetra Tech   |
| <b>Evaluation Position?</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Team Leader <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Team member |
| <b>Evaluation Award Number</b><br><i>(contract or other instrument)</i>   | AID-OAA-TO-16-00016  |
| <b>USAID Project(s) Evaluated</b><br><i>(Include project name(s), implementer name(s) and award number(s), if applicable)</i>   | Kenya RAPID;<br>MWA/Kenya and others;<br>AID-615-A-15-00008.                         |
| <b>I have real or potential conflicts of interest to disclose.</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No                  |
| <b>If yes answered above, I disclose the following facts:</b><br><i>Real or potential conflicts of interest may include, but are not limited to:</i><br>1. Close family member who is an employee of the USAID operating unit managing the project(s) being evaluated or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.<br>2. Financial interest that is direct, or is significant though indirect, in the implementing organization(s) whose projects are being evaluated or in the outcome of the evaluation.<br>3. Current or previous direct or significant though indirect experience with the project(s) being evaluated, including involvement in the project design or previous iterations of the project.<br>4. Current or previous work experience or seeking employment with the USAID operating unit managing the evaluation or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.<br>5. Current or previous work experience with an organization that may be seen as an industry competitor with the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.<br>6. Preconceived ideas toward individuals, groups, organizations, or objectives of the particular projects and organizations being evaluated that could bias the evaluation. |  |

I certify (1) that I have completed this disclosure form fully and to the best of my ability and (2) that I will update this disclosure form promptly if relevant circumstances change. If I gain access to proprietary information of other companies, then I agree to protect their information from unauthorized use or disclosure for as long as it remains proprietary and refrain from using the information for any purpose other than that for which it was furnished.

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| <b>Signature</b> |  |
| <b>Date</b>      | May 14, 2020  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Name</b>   | Evelyn Makena Mugambi  |
| <b>Title</b>  | WASH specialist  |
| <b>Organization</b>   | Tetra Tech   |
| <b>Evaluation Position?</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Team Leader <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Team member |
| <b>Evaluation Award Number</b><br><i>(contract or other instrument)</i>   | AID-OAA-TO-16-00016  |
| <b>USAID Project(s) Evaluated</b><br><i>(Include project name(s), implementer name(s) and award number(s), if applicable)</i>   | Kenya RAPID;<br>MWA/Kenya and others;<br>AID-615-A-15-00008.                         |
| <b>I have real or potential conflicts of interest to disclose.</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No                  |
| <b>If yes answered above, I disclose the following facts:</b><br><i>Real or potential conflicts of interest may include, but are not limited to:</i><br>1. Close family member who is an employee of the USAID operating unit managing the project(s) being evaluated or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.<br>2. Financial interest that is direct, or is significant though indirect, in the implementing organization(s) whose projects are being evaluated or in the outcome of the evaluation.<br>3. Current or previous direct or significant though indirect experience with the project(s) being evaluated, including involvement in the project design or previous iterations of the project.<br>4. Current or previous work experience or seeking employment with the USAID operating unit managing the evaluation or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.<br>5. Current or previous work experience with an organization that may be seen as an industry competitor with the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.<br>6. Preconceived ideas toward individuals, groups, organizations, or objectives of the particular projects and organizations being evaluated that could bias the evaluation. |  |

I certify (1) that I have completed this disclosure form fully and to the best of my ability and (2) that I will update this disclosure form promptly if relevant circumstances change. If I gain access to proprietary information of other companies, then I agree to protect their information from unauthorized use or disclosure for as long as it remains proprietary and refrain from using the information for any purpose other than that for which it was furnished.

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| <b>Signature</b> |  |
| <b>Date</b>      | 14.05.2020  |

**U.S. Agency for International Development**

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20523

Tel: (202) 712 0000

Fax: (202) 216 3524