SOCIAL AUDIT REPORT

HOMA BAY COUNTY · FLLOCA WATER PROJECTS

Water Projects Social Audit Report

An independent assessment of transparency, community engagement, service delivery, and sustainability across eight FLLoCA-funded water projects in Homa Bay County.

ACHEGO · OGANDO · RAMBA · SINDO · WIGA · GOD MARERA · KIBAGA · ONDIKO

Prepared by
Integrated Development Facility (IDF)
In partnership with Uraia Trust

JANUARY 2025

FOREWORD

A Commitment to Clean Water and Accountability

> *Access to clean and reliable water is fundamental to the well-being and prosperity of any community.*

The projects implemented in Homa Bay County underscore the county's commitment to enhancing the quality of life for its residents. These initiatives have provided vital resources to underserved areas, improved health outcomes, bolstered school attendance, and elevated the overall living standards of vulnerable populations, including women, children, and persons with disabilities.

This report presents the findings of a comprehensive social audit conducted by the Integrated Development Facility (IDF) to evaluate the impact, successes, and challenges of these projects. It captures critical feedback from community members and stakeholders gathered through surveys, interviews, and focus group discussions. The insights offered in this report provide a roadmap for addressing challenges related to transparency, community engagement, and the sustainability of these projects.

Transparency and accountability are central to ensuring that resources are utilised effectively and that the needs of the community are met. As this report highlights, fostering a culture of open communication and participatory decision-making can significantly enhance trust and collaboration between stakeholders. Additionally, the emphasis on capacity-building and structured maintenance plans underscores the importance of empowering communities to take ownership of their development.

The recommendations outlined in this report serve as a call to action for the County Government of Homa Bay, donors, implementing agencies, and the community at large. They highlight the need to work collectively to enhance transparency, expand project reach, and strengthen sustainability mechanisms.

As we reflect on the achievements and lessons from these projects, it is imperative to recognise the transformative power of inclusive and accountable development. Let us commit to integrating these principles into future initiatives to ensure that no one is left behind.

I extend my gratitude to all the stakeholders, community members, and partners whose valuable contributions and insights have shaped this report. Together, we can build on these successes to create a sustainable future for Homa Bay County and its people.

Stephen Abebe
Chief Executive Officer, Integrated Development Facility

PREFACE

Acknowledgements

> *A shared effort in advancing accountability, transparency, and community-driven development.*

The successful completion of this social audit report marks a significant milestone in advancing accountability, transparency, and community-driven development in Homa Bay County. The findings and recommendations presented here are the result of a collaborative effort by a dedicated team of auditors, consultants, community members, and stakeholders who contributed their expertise, insights, and commitment to this important endeavour.

We extend our deepest gratitude to **Uraia Trust** for their invaluable support in funding and facilitating this social audit process. Their dedication to promoting democratic governance and accountability has been instrumental in empowering communities to actively engage in decision-making and hold duty bearers to account.

Special thanks go to the audit team, whose diligence, professionalism, and unwavering focus ensured that the findings of this report are both comprehensive and evidence-based. Their attention to detail and commitment to capturing the voices of the community have provided a rich foundation for the recommendations outlined in this report.

We also wish to acknowledge the consultants from **I-BAR Kenya**, led by Robert Papa and Hillary Ochieng, for their exceptional leadership and technical expertise throughout the audit process. Their ability to synthesise complex information, facilitate meaningful community dialogues, and provide actionable recommendations has been invaluable in shaping this report.

Finally, we are deeply grateful to the community members and local stakeholders who participated in this audit. Your candid feedback, shared experiences, and commitment to improving the quality of life in Homa Bay County were at the heart of this exercise. Your voices have illuminated critical areas for improvement and inspired actionable solutions to ensure the sustainability and success of these water projects.

This report reflects our shared commitment to fostering social accountability and driving sustainable development in Homa Bay County. It is our hope that the findings and recommendations will serve as a catalyst for change, inspiring continued collaboration and improvement in public service delivery for the benefit of all.

CONTENTS

Table of Contents

Foreword i

Preface ii

Operational Definition of Key Terms and Concepts iv

Abbreviations and Acronyms v

Executive Summary vi

1 Introduction 1

1.1 Major Water Resource Providers 1

1.2 Challenges in Accessing Safe Water 1

1.3 The FLOCCA Program and Its Role in Water Access 2

1.4 Purpose and Scope of the Social Audit 2

1.5 Evaluation of Key Project Elements 3

1.6 Stakeholder Engagement 4

2 Participatory Methodology 6

2.1 Approach Used 6

2.2 Data Collection Methods 6

2.3 Sampling 7

2.4 Limitations 7

2.5 Data Sources and Methods 8

3 Audit Report 9

3.1 Project Status and Observation 9

3.2 Project Goals and Objectives 9

3.3 Access to Project Budget Information 10

3.4 Operational Performance 10

3.5 Maintenance and Sustainability 11

3.6 Environmental and Social Impact 12

3.7 Compliance with Standards 13

3.8 Recommendations and Observations 13

4 Findings

14

5 Discussions 16

6 Community and Stakeholder Feedback 17

7 Recommendations 19

8 Conclusion 20

9 Annexes 22

REFERENCE

Operational Definition of Key Terms and Concepts

Accountability Framework
Explanation of mechanisms and processes that ensure responsible project management and transparency.

Bill of Quantities (BoQ)
A document outlining materials, labour, and costs required for a project.

Community Engagement
The process of involving community members in decision-making, planning, and project implementation.

Environmental Impact
The effect of the project on the local environment, including land, water, and biodiversity.

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)
Structured group discussions used to gather community opinions, concerns, and recommendations.

Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)
A system for addressing complaints and resolving disputes arising during project implementation.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)
Processes for assessing the progress and outcomes of a project to ensure objectives are met.

Persons with Disabilities (PWDs)
Individuals with long-term physical, mental, intellectual, or sensory impairments that affect daily living.

Procurement Plan
A detailed strategy for purchasing goods, services, and works needed for the project.

Sustainability Plan
A framework outlining how the project will continue to operate and provide benefits after completion.

Stakeholders
Individuals, groups, or organisations with an interest in or affected by the project.

Social Audit
A participatory process for evaluating the social impact, transparency, and accountability of a project.

Transparency
The practice of openly sharing project-related information with stakeholders.

Water User Committee (WUC)
A group of community members tasked with managing and maintaining the water project.

Water Quality Testing
The process of assessing water safety for human consumption based on chemical, physical, and biological parameters.

Service Delivery
The provision of essential services, such as water, to beneficiaries.

Sustainability
The ability of a project to maintain operations and benefits over time.

Stakeholder Engagement
The involvement of all interested parties in the planning, execution, and evaluation of the project.

Financial Transparency
The practice of openly disclosing financial information, including budgets and expenditures.

REFERENCE

Abbreviations and Acronyms

BQ
Bill of Quantities

CBO
Community-Based Organization

CSO
Civil Society Organizations

FGD
Focus Group Discussions

GRM
Grievance Redress Mechanism

HLPF
High-Level Political Forum

IBAR
Institute for Budget Analysis and Research

KES
Kenya Shillings

KRA
Kenya Revenue Authority

M&E
Monitoring and Evaluation

MDAS
Ministries, Departments, and Agencies

MOU
Memorandum of Understanding

NEMA
National Environment Management Authority

NGEC
National Gender and Equality Commission

NGO
Non-Governmental Organization

PWD
Persons with Disabilities

SDGs
Sustainable Development Goals

TOR
Terms of Reference

UNDP
United Nations Development Programme

UNICEF
United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund

URAIA
Uraia Trust

WASH
Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene

WUC
Water User Committee

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Executive Summary

This report presents a comprehensive social audit of water projects implemented in Homa Bay County, specifically **Achego, Ogando, Ramba, Sindo, Wiga, God Marera, Kibaga, and Ondiko**. The audit, conducted to evaluate the effectiveness, transparency, and impact of these projects, aims to provide a clear picture of how these initiatives have addressed water accessibility and community needs. The audit encompasses project objectives, implementation processes, stakeholder engagement, service delivery, and sustainability.

Purpose and Scope

The primary objective of the audit was to assess the implementation, effectiveness, and community impact of water projects in Homa Bay County. The scope included an evaluation of the projects' transparency, community participation, service delivery, and long-term sustainability, covering a range of water projects serving both rural and urban communities across various wards in the county.

Key Findings

a) Transparency

Many of the projects lacked transparency, with limited access to essential project documents such as procurement plans, budgets, and monitoring reports. This has resulted in dissatisfaction among community members regarding the quality and quantity of materials used and contractor performance.

b) Community Engagement

Stakeholder engagement, particularly from vulnerable groups (women, children, PWDs, and the elderly), was minimal during the planning and implementation phases. Goals and progress were not effectively communicated, resulting in limited buy-in and ownership.

c) Service Delivery

Water supply from the projects was generally reliable, but some projects — such as Sindo and Ramba — faced challenges related to water quality testing and feedback mechanisms, with no systematic channels for collecting and responding to community feedback.

d) Sustainability

Several projects lacked clear maintenance plans or sustainability strategies. Maintenance responsibility was typically assigned to county authorities, with no evidence of prior training for water users' management committees.

e) Accountability Mechanisms

The absence of structured grievance redress mechanisms and monitoring systems hindered effective oversight and resolution of community concerns.

Methodology

The audit employed a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods, including document reviews, community surveys, stakeholder interviews, and site visits. Data were collected from project beneficiaries, local authorities, and implementing partners, covering both completed and ongoing water projects.

Key Conclusions

While the water projects have provided significant improvements in water accessibility, especially in rural areas, several areas of concern need to be addressed. Transparency, community engagement, maintenance, and accountability mechanisms have undermined the long-term sustainability and effectiveness of the projects.

Recommendations

To enhance the impact and sustainability of future water projects, the audit proposes the following:

1. **Transparency** — Ensure that all project documents, including procurement plans, budgets, and monitoring reports, are shared with stakeholders to build trust and improve accountability.
2. **Community Involvement** — Involve community members, especially vulnerable groups, at all stages of the project. Capacity-building for water users' management committees is essential for local ownership and sustainability.
3. **Sustainability** — Develop and implement comprehensive maintenance plans for all water projects, including regular water quality testing and frameworks for ongoing system upkeep.
4. **Accountability** — Establish effective grievance redress mechanisms and feedback systems to ensure timely resolution of community concerns and enhance project transparency.
5. **Capacity Building** — Provide training for stakeholders, including community representatives and local government officials, on project oversight, financial management, and long-term sustainability.

Implications for Stakeholders

Addressing the issues identified in this audit will significantly improve the effectiveness and sustainability of water projects in Homa Bay County. Local communities, especially vulnerable groups, stand to benefit from increased participation, better service delivery, and enhanced access to clean water. Government institutions will gain from improved project management practices and better community trust in public projects.

NEXT STEPS

The County Government of Homa Bay, in collaboration with implementing partners, should take immediate action to address the highlighted gaps — ensuring full implementation of the recommended changes, conducting follow-up audits to assess progress, and establishing a framework for monitoring and evaluating future water projects.

Introduction

Access to clean and safe water remains one of the most pressing challenges in Homa Bay County, located in the Lake Victoria Basin. The county, with a population of over 1 million people, is characterised by both rural and urban communities, each facing unique challenges in securing reliable water sources. Homa Bay is heavily reliant on seasonal rainfall, which has become increasingly erratic due to the impacts of climate change, making water availability unpredictable. While there are some established sources such as rivers, boreholes, and springs, the overall water infrastructure in the county is underdeveloped and unable to meet the needs of the growing population.

In rural areas, the situation is direr, with communities having to rely on distant and often contaminated water sources. This scarcity has serious implications for public health, education, and livelihoods. Women and children, who are traditionally tasked with water collection, face increased time burdens and health risks. The unavailability of clean water also hampers agricultural productivity, as farmers depend on reliable water sources for both domestic use and crop irrigation.

1.1 Major Water Resource Providers

County Government of Homa Bay

Responsible for coordinating water access, managing water projects, and ensuring water is available to both urban and rural populations. The main implementing agency for water projects in the county.

National Government

Through the Ministry of Water, Sanitation, and Irrigation, provides technical support, policy guidance, and funding for large-scale water projects, and facilitates water governance and regulation.

Non-Governmental Organizations

NGOs such as FLOCCA have been instrumental in funding and supporting water-related initiatives, often collaborating with local government to implement access programmes in underserved communities.

Community-Based Organizations

Play a key role in promoting local water management, ensuring equitable access to water, and advocating for improved water resources governance.

1.2 Challenges in Accessing Safe Water

- **Limited Infrastructure** — Many parts of the county lack piped water systems, storage facilities, and treatment plants; existing systems are often poorly maintained or non-functional.
- **Water Contamination** — Many water sources are contaminated, leading to the spread of waterborne diseases such as cholera and dysentery, worsened by a lack of proper sanitation facilities.
- **Distance and Time Burden** — Residents, particularly women and children, often travel long distances to fetch water, limiting their ability to engage in education and income-generating work.
- **Climate Change and Droughts** — Increasingly unpredictable rainfall has led to prolonged droughts, reducing the availability of fresh water for both domestic supply and agriculture.

- **Population Growth and Urbanization** — Rising population in both urban and rural areas has increased demand for water beyond what existing supply systems can keep pace with.

1.3 The FLOCCA Program and Its Role in Water Access

The FLOCCA (Financing Local Climate Change Action) programme is a key financing partner in improving water access in Homa Bay County, providing financial and technical assistance to communities in need, especially in rural and marginalised areas. Its primary goal is to promote sustainable development by improving access to clean water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) services, rooted in community engagement, sustainability, and accountability.

FLOCCA funds water access projects based on the following principles:

1. **Community-Centred Development** — Empowering communities to take ownership of water projects, ensuring local stakeholders, particularly women and marginalised groups, are actively involved in design, implementation, and monitoring.
2. **Sustainability** — A strong emphasis on the long-term sustainability of water projects, including maintenance plans, training of local water management committees, and infrastructure designed to withstand climate variability.
3. **Transparency and Accountability** — Promoting transparency in financial management, project execution, and the sharing of information with all stakeholders to build trust.
4. **Equity** — Striving to ensure all community members, regardless of gender, age, or disability status, have equal access to clean and safe water.

Through its partnership with the County Government of Homa Bay, FLOCCA has supported water projects across the region, including Achego, Ogando, Ramba, Sindo, Wiga, God Marera, Kibaga, and Ondiko — initiatives aimed at addressing the water crisis and creating lasting improvements in public health, education, and community well-being.

This social audit evaluates the effectiveness of the water projects funded by FLOCCA and implemented by the County Government of Homa Bay, specifically addressing transparency, community engagement, service delivery, and sustainability — criteria that align closely with the principles promoted by the FLOCCA programme.

1.4 Purpose and Scope of the Social Audit

1.4.1 Purpose

The primary objective of this social audit was to assess the implementation, effectiveness, and community impact of the water projects implemented in Homa Bay County — evaluating their contribution to improving access to clean water, addressing community health concerns, and enhancing overall well-being, particularly for vulnerable groups such as women, children, persons with disabilities (PWDs), the elderly, and marginalised communities. The audit also assessed sustainability, focusing on long-term impact and maintenance mechanisms.

1.4.2 Specific Objectives of the Audit

- **Assess Implementation Processes** — Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of planning, funding, and execution, including project management quality and adherence to timelines and budgets.
- **Evaluate Transparency** — Investigate the level of transparency in project execution, particularly the availability of documentation (procurement plans, budgets, progress reports) and financial accountability.

- **Analyse Community Participation** — Examine the extent of community involvement in decision-making, design, and implementation, especially for vulnerable groups.
- **Assess Service Delivery** — Evaluate the reliability, adequacy, and quality of water services, including system functionality, interruptions, water quality, and infrastructure adequacy.
- **Sustainability and Maintenance** — Investigate long-term maintenance plans, water users' management committees, and local capacity to manage systems over time.
- **Evaluate Accountability Mechanisms** — Assess grievance redress mechanisms, monitoring systems, and community feedback channels.
- **Impact on Health and Livelihoods** — Assess broader socio-economic and health impacts, including reduced waterborne disease and increased school attendance.

1.4.3 Scope of the Audit

- **Geographic Coverage** — Eight water projects, one per ward across sub-counties in Homa Bay: Achego, Ogando, Ramba, Sindo, Wiga, God Marera, Kibaga, and Ondiko — spanning both rural and urban communities.
- **Timeframe** — Conducted in December 2024, evaluating both completed and ongoing projects implemented through 2024.
- **Stakeholder Involvement** — Local community members (households, schools, women, youth, and PWDs), government officials, water users' management committees, implementing partners, contractors, and regional/national authorities.

1.5 Evaluation of Key Project Elements

Governance

Review of governance structures and accountability mechanisms implemented for the water projects.

Service Delivery

Assessment of the operational status of water systems and the quality of service delivery.

Financial Management

Evaluation of budget allocations, procurement procedures, and expenditure transparency.

Social Impact

Analysis of impacts on the community — clean water access, health outcomes, and empowerment of marginalised groups.

Environmental Sustainability

Consideration of resource management, pollution control, and the sustainability of water sources.

1.5.1 Evaluation Criteria

- **Effectiveness** — Did the projects achieve their intended objectives?
- **Efficiency** — How efficiently were resources utilised in delivering project outcomes?
- **Community Participation and Equity** — Were all communities, particularly vulnerable groups, equitably served?
- **Sustainability** — Can the projects maintain their positive outcomes over time?
- **Transparency** — Were the projects implemented in an open and accountable manner?

1.6 Stakeholder Engagement

The stakeholders engaged in the Homa Bay County water projects social audit include a diverse group of individuals and organizations with vested interests in the implementation, effectiveness, and sustainability of water access initiatives.

Table 1 — Summary of Stakeholders

Stakeholder	Role Played	How They Were Engaged
County Government of Homa Bay	Main implementing agency, responsible for funding, oversight, and compliance.	Consulted for project documentation, financial records, and implementation processes.
Community Members	Direct beneficiaries of the water projects, including vulnerable groups.	Interviews and focus group discussions to assess satisfaction, challenges, and effectiveness of water services.
Water Users' Management Committees	Oversaw day-to-day operations and maintenance of water systems.	Consulted to evaluate management capacity, involvement in decision-making, and sustainability efforts.
Local Leaders and Elders	Mobilized community participation and supported project acceptance.	Interviews to understand their role in mobilizing the community and supporting the project.
Project Contractors and Service Providers	Responsible for construction and installation of water systems.	Consulted to assess implementation timelines, quality of work, and challenges faced during construction.
Water and Sanitation Regulators	Ensured compliance with water quality standards and environmental regulations.	Engaged to verify compliance with water quality testing and national/local regulations.
Non-Governmental Organizations	Assisted with community education, capacity building, and monitoring.	Consulted for insights on community engagement and monitoring activities.
Beneficiaries from Vulnerable Groups	Primary users of water services, including women, children, and PWDs.	Focus group discussions and interviews to assess accessibility, usability, and barriers faced.
Local Health Officials	Assessed the health impact of improved water access on the community.	Consulted to understand impact on health outcomes, particularly waterborne diseases.

Detail on individual stakeholder groups — including County Government departments, FLOCCA programme representatives, community members, water users' management committees, local leaders, contractors, regulators, NGOs, vulnerable-group beneficiaries, and local health officials — is retained in the audit's supporting records and reflected in the summary above.

Participatory Methodology

The methodology employed for the social audit of water projects in Homa Bay County was designed to ensure a comprehensive and participatory evaluation, focused on assessing effectiveness, transparency, community engagement, and sustainability. A mixed-method approach was adopted, combining qualitative and quantitative data collection techniques to gather relevant information from various stakeholders.

2.1 Approach Used

The social audit utilised a participatory approach to engage various stakeholders, ensuring inclusivity and promoting community ownership of the process. The steps followed included:

- **Community Consultations** — Direct engagement with residents and beneficiaries through face-to-face consultations, group discussions, and feedback sessions.
- **Document Reviews** — Examination of procurement plans, financial records, project reports, and monitoring records, to evaluate transparency, budgetary allocations, and compliance with objectives.
- **Physical Inspections** — Site visits to assess the condition and functionality of water infrastructure, water supply quality, operational status, and physical gaps or maintenance issues.

2.2 Data Collection Methods

2.2.1 Tools

- **Surveys** — Structured questionnaires to collect data from a broad range of stakeholders, quantifying satisfaction levels, challenges, and perceived effectiveness.
- **Focus Group Discussions** — Targeted discussions with women, youth, PWDs, and the elderly on accessibility, service quality, and social inclusion.
- **Interviews** — Semi-structured interviews with key informants, including officials, contractors, and implementing partners.

2.2.2 Techniques

- **Site Visits** — On-the-ground assessment of pipes, treatment facilities, storage tanks, and distribution points.
- **Observation** — Direct observation of day-to-day functioning, water flow, reliability, and maintenance issues.
- **Document Analysis** — Review of financial records, procurement plans, and project reports to assess transparency and budget adherence.

2.3 Sampling

The audit employed purposive sampling to ensure the inclusion of key stakeholders, capturing the views of diverse groups directly affected by the water projects.

- **Community Members** — Beneficiaries including households, schools, and vulnerable groups, to capture a broad spectrum of opinion.
- **Project Stakeholders** — Government officials, water management committees, contractors, and implementers.
- **Selection Criteria** — Participants selected based on direct involvement or experience, including women, youth, PWDs, the elderly, and local leaders.

2.4 Limitations

- **Limited Access to Financial and Procurement Documents** — Crucial documents were not always available, hindering thorough financial analysis.
- **Minimal Stakeholder Involvement** — Some individuals and groups were unable or unwilling to participate, reducing comprehensiveness.
- **Time Constraints** — A limited timeframe constrained the scope of data collection and analysis.
- **Geographical Challenges** — The spread of projects across multiple wards posed coordination challenges for site visits.

2.5 Data Sources and Methods

- **Document Review** — Project plans, budgets, procurement documents, reports, and correspondence.
- **Surveys and Interviews** — With community members, local leaders, implementing partners, and project staff.
- **Site Visits** — Field visits to assess infrastructure, service delivery, and maintenance status.
- **Focus Group Discussions** — Capturing a broad range of perspectives on project outcomes.

Audit Report

Table 2 — Comparative Analysis of FLLoCA Water Project Details

Project	Location	Type	Budget (KES)	Expenditure (KES)	Completion	Status
Achego	Achego Village, Kanyikola Ward	Borehole	3,500,000	Not available	11/2024	Completed
Ogando	Ogando Village, Lambwe Ward	Borehole	Not provided	Not available	12/2024	Completed
Ramba	Kabondo West Ward	Borehole	3,286,000	Not available	06/2024	Delayed
Sindo	Nyamradi, Homa Bay County	Pipeline Extension	20,000,000	Not available	12/2024	Incomplete
Wiga	Rodi Township, Central Ward	Borehole	1,887,000	Not available	10/2024	Complete
God Marera	East Gem Ward	Borehole	3,349,000	Not available	08/2024	Completed
Kibaga	Kibaga Village, Homa Bay County	Borehole	Not shown	Not available	07/2024	Complete
Ondiko	Ondiko Village, Homa Bay County	Borehole	3,311,231	Not available	06/2024	Completed

3.1 Project Status and Observation

The table below highlights project status, condition of infrastructure, presence of signage — an indicator of visibility and accountability — and community satisfaction with the quality and quantity of materials used.

Table 3 — Comparative Project Status and Condition of Infrastructure

Project	Status	Condition	Signage	Community Satisfaction
Achego	Completed	Good condition, fully functional	Absent	Medium quality, moderate quantity
Ogando	Complete	New, operational	Present	High satisfaction with both
Ramba	Incomplete	Poor condition, operational	Present	Low satisfaction with both
Sindo	Incomplete	Good condition, not fully operational	Present	Low satisfaction with both
Wiga	Complete	Good condition	Absent	High quality, moderate quantity
God Marera	Completed	Excellent condition, operational	Present	Very high satisfaction with both
Kibaga	Ongoing	New, operational	Absent	Moderate quality, high quantity
Ondiko	Completed	Good condition, fully functional	Present	High quality, moderate quantity

3.2 Project Goals and Objectives

This table summarises each project's goals, whether these goals were communicated to the community, and the extent of stakeholder involvement.

Table 4 — Project Goals and Objectives

Project	Goals	Communicated?	Stakeholder Involvement
Achego	Clean water for domestic and irrigation use	Yes	Local government, community leaders, women, youth, PWDs, schools, water committees
Ogando	Reliable access to clean water for domestic use	No	Local government, community leaders, project implementers, women, youth, PWDs
Ramba	Water for domestic use and livestock	Yes	Local government, community members, women, youth, livestock farmers
Sindo	Reliable domestic water supply	Yes	Local government, community leaders, women, youth, schools, water committees
Wiga	Address water scarcity through a reliable domestic source	No	Local government, community leaders, project implementers
God Marera	Water for domestic use and irrigation	Yes	Local government, community leaders, women, youth, farmers, water committees
Kibaga	Clean water for domestic use	No	Local government, community leaders, project implementers, women, youth
Ondiko	Improve access to clean domestic water	Yes	Local government, community leaders, women, youth, schools, water committees

3.3 Access to Project Budget Information

Table 5 summarises the total approved budget, availability of key financial documents, and the level of financial reporting transparency for each project.

Table 5 — Access to Project Budget Information

Project	Approved Budget (KES)	Budget Docs Public?	BoQ Shared?	Reporting Transparency
Achego	3,500,000	No	No	Low
Ogando	Not shown	No	No	Low
Ramba	3,286,925	Yes	No	Moderate
Sindo	20,000,000	No	No	Low
Wiga	1,887,000	No	No	Low
God Marera	3,349,000	Yes	Yes	High
Kibaga	Not provided	No	No	Low
Ondiko	3,311,231	Yes	Yes	Moderate

3.4 Operational Performance

The table below summarises water supply consistency, interruptions, frequency of water quality testing, and the presence of a feedback mechanism.

Table 6 — Comparative Operational Performance

Project	Water Supply Status	Interruptions	Water Quality Testing	Feedback Mechanism
Achego	Consistent and reliable	No	Irregular	No
Ogando	Consistent and reliable	No	No	Yes
Ramba	No service	Not completed	No	No
Sindo	Intermittent	Not fully operational	No	No
Wiga	Consistent and reliable	No	No testing	No
God Marera	Consistent and reliable	No	Tested once at completion	Yes
Kibaga	Consistent and reliable	No	No testing	No
Ondiko	Consistent and reliable	No	Irregular	No

This next table highlights the level of community engagement and participation — decision-making involvement, meeting frequency, whether voices are heard, other issues raised, water user committee existence, and satisfaction with water quality and quantity.

Table 7 — Level of Community Engagement and Participation

Project	Decision-Making Involvement	Meetings	Voices Heard	Other Issues Raised	WUC Exists	Satisfaction
Achego	Minimal	Quarterly	Mixed	Lack of transparency, limited consultation	Yes	Medium / Moderate
Ogando	Some	Quarterly	Mixed	Insufficient engagement, lack of feedback	Yes	High / High
Ramba	Active	Monthly	Mixed	Desire for more training on water management	No	Low / Low
Sindo	None	No	No	Poor communication, lack of awareness	No	Low / Low
Wiga	Active	Monthly	Yes	Training of water user committee members	No	High / Moderate
God Marera	Active	Frequently	Yes	Requests for improved maintenance planning	Yes	Very High / Very High
Kibaga	Minimal	Rarely	No	Lack of participation in planning and feedback loops	No	Moderate / High
Ondiko	Active	Occasionally	Yes	Concerns about sustainability, desire for local capacity building	Yes	High / Moderate

3.5 Maintenance and Sustainability

This table outlines maintenance plans, responsibility, evidence of prior maintenance, sustainability activities, and the existence of a sustainability plan for each project.

Table 8 — Maintenance and Sustainability

Project	Maintenance Plan?	Responsibility	Evidence of Prior Maintenance	Sustainability Activities	Sustainability Plan?
Achego	No	County Government	None reported	None reported	No
Ogando	No	County Government	None reported	None reported	No
Ramba	Yes	County Government	None reported	Some training for community members	No
Sindo	No	County Government	None reported	None reported	No
Wiga	No	County Government	None reported	None reported	No
God Marera	Yes	Community, with County support	Some maintenance activities reported	Some community training	Yes
Kibaga	No	County Government	None reported	None reported	No
Ondiko	Yes	Community, with County support	Some maintenance activities reported	Community capacity building initiatives	Yes

3.6 Environmental and Social Impact

Table 9 — Environmental and Social Impact of the FLLoCA Projects

Project	Environmental Impact	Disruption of Locals	Challenges During Implementation	Challenges Post-Implementation
Achego	Minimal impact, proper waste disposal	Temporary disruption during pipeline construction	Delays in procurement, limited community engagement	Lack of maintenance plan, minimal water quality testing
Ogando	Potential impact on local ecosystem due to ongoing works	Minor disruptions during construction	Delays in project execution, logistical issues	Continued disruptions due to project delays
Ramba	Little environmental degradation, proper land management	Minor land clearing for water sources and pipes	Initial delay in site selection, funding constraints	Absence of proper maintenance, lack of community follow-up
Sindo	Minimal, project focused on existing infrastructure	Short-term disruption during construction	Challenges with vendor contracts, technical delays	Insufficient stakeholder feedback, occasional water quality issues
Wiga	Environmental considerations met, limited waste handling	Temporary disruption during pipeline extension	Issues with resource allocation, lack of materials	Low engagement post-completion, incomplete project components
God Marera	Sustainable water use with minimal disruption	Slight disturbance to agricultural land for water source	Delays in land acquisition, insufficient resources	Limited monitoring, lack of irrigation support post-completion
Kibaga	Minimal environmental impact, improved water use	Minimal disruption during construction	Budget constraints, slow procurement processes	Delays completing final installations and water testing

Project	Environmental Impact	Disruption of Locals	Challenges During Implementation	Challenges Post-Implementation
Ondiko	Water conservation promoted, no significant environmental harm	Temporary disruption during pipe laying and system setup	Unforeseen delays in material supplies, community reluctance	Limited funding for maintenance and monitoring post-implementation

3.7 Compliance with Standards

Table 10 — Compliance with Standards

Project	Compliance with Design and Safety Standards	Deviations from Original Design
Achego	Yes	None
Ogando	Yes	None
Ramba	Yes	Drilled 140m instead of 200m
Sindo	Yes	None
Wiga	No	Deviation in water storage capacity
God Marera	Yes	None
Kibaga	Yes	None
Ondiko	Yes	None

3.8 Recommendations and Observations

Table 11 — Recommendations and Observations

Project	Key Strengths	Key Weaknesses	Lessons Learned	Recommendations
Achego	Reliable water supply, improved access	Limited stakeholder engagement, lack of transparency	Community involvement is essential for success	Increase participation, improve reporting transparency
Ogando	Ongoing project, good community involvement in planning	Delays in implementation, incomplete project	Planning and timely execution are crucial	Prioritise timely implementation and continuous monitoring
Ramba	Successfully provided water for domestic and livestock use	Minimal maintenance plan, lack of capacity building	Proper maintenance plans are key to sustainability	Develop a comprehensive maintenance and sustainability plan
Sindo	Good water quality and quantity, positive feedback	Insufficient feedback mechanisms, irregular testing	Regular water quality testing is vital	Establish regular testing schedules and a feedback mechanism
Wiga	Strong community interest, initial implementation success	Significant delays, no clear communication	Clear communication is essential to manage expectations	Improve communication and prioritise addressing delays
God Marera	Strong community buy-in, successful irrigation support	Lack of monitoring and evaluation framework	M&E frameworks improve accountability	Implement monitoring and evaluation frameworks
Kibaga	Efficient service delivery, active community engagement	No visible water quality testing, limited follow-up	Continuous monitoring and feedback ensure effectiveness	Establish a formal feedback system and routine testing
Ondiko	Consistent water supply, beneficial to local community	Limited transparency, no sustainability plan	Transparency and sustainability are essential for longevity	Develop transparency frameworks and a sustainability strategy

Findings

This section provides a detailed account of the findings from the social audit, focused on transparency, community engagement, service delivery, accountability mechanisms, and sustainability.

4.1 Accountability Framework

Transparency

The audit revealed significant gaps in transparency across all the Homa Bay water projects:

- **Limited Availability of Information** — Key documents such as procurement plans, budgets, and monitoring reports were unavailable to the public and community stakeholders, especially in the Ogando and Kibaga projects.
- **Absence of Financial Reporting** — Stakeholders, including local communities, were not provided with details regarding project expenditures, raising concerns particularly in projects like Sindo and Ondiko.

Participation

- **Planning and Implementation** — Community consultation occurred largely at inception; deeper engagement, especially from women, youth, and the elderly, was notably absent during execution.
- **Decision-Making** — No active community involvement in major decisions such as budget allocation or contractor selection, leaving communities feeling excluded.

Responsiveness

While the projects addressed basic needs, gaps existed in responsiveness to community feedback — in projects such as God Marera and Ramba, community concerns about material quality and contractor workmanship were raised but not adequately resolved.

4.2 Redress Mechanisms

The absence of structured mechanisms for lodging complaints and resolving grievances was evident across all the projects, particularly Sindo and Kibaga, leading to frustration and mistrust regarding the lack of recourse for issues raised.

4.3 Community Engagement

- **Initial Stakeholder Involvement** — All projects had initial stakeholder involvement at the outset, but participation dropped off significantly during implementation and monitoring, with no sustained engagement.
- **Perceived Exclusion** — Vulnerable groups, including PWDs, women, and the elderly, felt their input was overlooked during key decision-making, especially in Wiga and Ogando.

4.4 Financial Transparency

- **Non-Disclosure of Budget Details** — Notably poor across all projects, including Kibaga, Ondiko, and Wiga, leaving questions about fund allocation and use.
- **Accountability Gaps** — The lack of publicly available financial reports undermined trust in project management and raised concerns about public resource use.

4.5 Service Delivery

- **Reliable Water Supply** — Most projects succeeded in providing reliable, consistent supply, particularly God Marera and Ondiko; however testing was infrequent or lacking in projects like Ramba and Ogando.
- **Water Quality Testing** — Lack of regular testing, especially in Ogando and Sindo, raised potential health concerns and was a significant gap in ensuring safe water.

4.6 Monitoring and Feedback

- **Weak M&E Systems** — No clear framework for monitoring progress or assessing contractor performance, evident in projects such as Wiga and Ramba.
- **Feedback Mechanisms** — No formal mechanisms in place to collect or address community feedback; communities in Sindo and Kibaga felt their concerns were ignored after completion.

4.7 Sustainability

- **Lack of Maintenance Plans** — A common finding across most projects, particularly Wiga, Ogando, and Ondiko, which lacked strategies for long-term infrastructure sustainability.
- **No Training for Management Committees** — Water user committees established in God Marera and Ramba were not adequately trained or equipped to manage systems effectively, raising sustainability concerns.

Discussions

5.1 Key Strengths

- **Impactful Outcomes** — Particularly in God Marera and Achego, the projects successfully addressed the critical need for water access, significantly improving quality of life.
- **Reliable Operations** — Water supply systems are largely operational with minimal service interruptions, especially in completed projects like Ramba and God Marera.

5.2 Main Challenges

- **Transparency and Accountability** — The absence of detailed financial records, procurement plans, and budget breakdowns undermined public trust, especially in Sindo, Ondiko, and Kibaga.
- **Sustainability** — The lack of a maintenance plan in projects like Wiga and Ogando raised concerns about the longevity of the infrastructure.
- **Community Engagement** — Exclusion of the community, particularly vulnerable groups, from decision-making was a significant challenge across projects, especially Wiga and Ogando.

5.3 Lessons Learned

5.3.1 Transparency is Fundamental to Trust

Accessible information builds confidence — the lack of access to critical project documents eroded community trust. Future projects should prioritise clear, consistent communication of financial and operational details, and create platforms for regular updates such as public meetings and notice boards.

5.3.2 Community Engagement Strengthens Ownership

Meaningful participation from a range of stakeholders — including women, children, PWDs, and the elderly — fosters a sense of ownership and ensures projects meet community needs. Engagement should continue through planning, implementation, and post-implementation phases to sustain support.

5.3.3 Sustainability Requires Strategic Planning

The lack of a maintenance plan threatens project longevity; a defined maintenance strategy must be prioritised. Training water user management committees will equip them to manage systems effectively and ensure longevity.

5.3.4 Monitoring and Feedback Mechanisms Improve Accountability

Robust monitoring systems ensure project activities stay on track and quality standards are maintained. Accessible grievance redress systems enable communities to voice concerns, improving service delivery and accountability.

5.3.5 Small Investments in Quality Yield Long-Term Benefits

Contractor performance issues underline the importance of prioritising quality materials and labour over cost-cutting. Periodic water quality testing ensures the health of the community and enhances the long-term impact of water projects.

Community and Stakeholder Feedback

The social audits of the various Homa Bay County projects captured essential insights from beneficiaries and stakeholders through surveys, interviews, and focus group discussions. This feedback highlights the community's perceptions, concerns, and suggestions.

6.1 Survey and Interview Results

Water Quality Satisfaction — Medium

Beneficiaries appreciated improvements in water quality but raised concerns over irregular testing and potential contamination risks in the long term.

Water Quantity Satisfaction — Medium

Consistent availability was appreciated, though respondents requested further expansion of distribution networks to underserved regions.

Key Concerns Raised by Stakeholders

- **Transparency** — Dissatisfaction with the lack of access to financial records such as procurement plans, budgets, and expenditure reports, raising concerns over fund management.
- **Maintenance** — The absence of a clear, long-term maintenance plan jeopardised the sustainability of the projects.
- **System Expansion** — Importance of extending water supply networks to underserved areas, including schools, health facilities, and marginalised households.

6.2 Community Recommendations

a) Enhance Transparency

Share detailed financial reports, including procurement documents and expenditure breakdowns, with community members to build trust. Regularly update the community on project progress via community forums or notice boards.

b) Promote Community Engagement

Strengthen involvement of local stakeholders, particularly marginalised groups such as women, PWDs, and the elderly, in decision-making and planning. Ensure continuous consultation throughout the project cycle.

c) Capacity Building for Maintenance

Provide training for water management committees to equip them with skills to oversee maintenance activities. Encourage community members to take an active role in operating and maintaining water systems.

d) Extend Water System Coverage

> Prioritise extending water distribution networks to underserved areas, including schools, health facilities, and households not currently served by the system.

The community's feedback indicates an appreciation for the positive impacts these projects have had on water access, health, and quality of life. However, concerns regarding transparency, maintenance, and system expansion need to be addressed to maximise effectiveness and long-term sustainability.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are proposed to address identified challenges across the Homa Bay County projects.

7.1 Transparency and Accountability

- Share detailed project budgets, procurement plans, and expenditure reports with stakeholders to enhance trust.
- Develop and implement robust monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems to track project performance and provide stakeholders with regular updates.

7.2 Community Engagement

- Involve all relevant stakeholders, especially vulnerable and marginalised groups, in every phase of the project — planning, implementation, and post-project evaluation.
- Establish structured feedback and grievance mechanisms to ensure community concerns are heard, addressed, and followed up on promptly.

7.3 Sustainability

- Develop and implement comprehensive maintenance plans, including regular water quality testing, infrastructure repairs, and system upgrades.
- Provide continuous training and capacity-building for water user management committees to enable effective long-term management.

7.4 Recommendations to Various Agencies

For Implementing Agencies

Improve transparency by sharing procurement and financial records with the community. Develop and implement maintenance plans with consistent follow-up on system performance.

For the Community

Actively participate in decision-making and monitoring to ensure projects align with local needs. Take responsibility for maintaining and managing water infrastructure.

For Donors and Government

Ensure timely and adequate fund disbursement, and establish strong oversight mechanisms to guarantee accountability. Support capacity-building initiatives for local governance and sustainability.

For Future Projects

Establish grievance redress mechanisms, feedback channels, and accountability systems that give the community avenues to voice concerns and contribute to decision-making.

Conclusion

The Homa Bay County projects, especially in the water and infrastructure sectors, have made significant strides in improving access to essential services for communities. These projects have positively impacted health outcomes, improved school attendance, and contributed to better living standards, particularly for vulnerable groups like women, children, and PWDs. However, there are notable areas where improvements are needed, particularly in transparency, community engagement, and sustainability planning.

8.1 Impact on the Community

Health

Access to clean water has helped reduce waterborne diseases and significantly improved overall health outcomes.

Education

With reduced time spent fetching water, school attendance has increased, particularly among girls.

Quality of Life

Vulnerable groups, including women and children, have greatly benefited from reliable access to water, enhancing their quality of life and reducing the burden of water collection.

Despite these successes, the lack of sufficient community involvement in decision-making, irregular water quality testing, and the absence of a clear maintenance plan poses significant risks to the sustainability of the projects.

To build on the successes and address the weaknesses identified, the following actions are recommended:

- **Strengthen Transparency** — Share all relevant project details, including procurement, financial records, and budgets, with the community. Establish regular community forums or notice boards to provide updates and feedback.
- **Enhance Stakeholder Engagement** — Actively involve all community members, particularly marginalised groups, in all stages of the project cycle. Train and empower water user management committees to enhance local ownership and sustainability.
- **Develop Sustainability Measures** — Implement a clear, actionable maintenance plan for long-term system sustainability, and allocate funds for regular maintenance, water quality testing, and system upgrades as necessary.

CLOSING

By addressing these gaps, the Homa Bay County Government can ensure that these projects continue to benefit the community over the long term and better meet the evolving needs of

its citizens. The projects exemplify the importance of integrating social accountability mechanisms to foster transparency, participation, and trust between all stakeholders.

Annexes

Supporting Documents

- Meeting minutes
- Surveys and interview data
- Photographs of project infrastructure

List of Stakeholders

- County officials, community leaders, and beneficiary groups