

---

This item was submitted to [Loughborough's Research Repository](#) by the author.  
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

## Scaling-up sanitation and hygiene promotion through grant-making

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

PUBLISHER

© WEDC, Loughborough University

VERSION

VoR (Version of Record)

PUBLISHER STATEMENT

This work is made available according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) licence. Full details of this licence are available at: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

LICENCE

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

REPOSITORY RECORD

Ouma, Vincent M., and Muhuri Jackson. 2019. "Scaling-up Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion Through Grant-making". figshare. <https://hdl.handle.net/2134/31524>.

**40<sup>th</sup> WEDC International Conference, Loughborough, UK, 2017**

LOCAL ACTION WITH INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION TO IMPROVE AND  
SUSTAIN WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE SERVICES

**Scaling-up sanitation and hygiene promotion  
through grant-making**

*Ouma Vincent (Kenya) & Muhuri Jackson*

PAPER 2752

---

*Kenya losses USD 324 million per year due to poor sanitation (World Bank, 2012), and 19,500 Kenyans, including 17,100 children under 5 die each year due to diarrhoea. This paper aims to demonstrate how the Kenya Sanitation and Hygiene Improvement Programme (K-SHIP) is scaling up Sanitation & Hygiene promotion through grant-making while contributing to the country's target of being Open Defecation Free (ODF) by the year 2020. KSHIP is funded by Water Supply & Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC) through Global Sanitation Fund (GSF) and implemented by Amref Health Africa in Kenya. In 2016, K-SHIP competitively contracted 17 sub-grantees(SGs) who implemented sanitation and hygiene activities in 11 counties reaching over 235,663 people with S&H services. The capacity of the SGs was built and the model can be used as an advocacy tool for resource mobilization. 149 villages have been certified ODF which is associated with reduced sanitation related morbidity.*

---

**About KSHIP**

The Kenya Sanitation and Hygiene Improvement Programme (KSHIP) is a flagship programme in Kenya funded by the WSSCC (based in UNOPs, Geneva) through GSF, a resource established with an aim of supporting developing countries to attain sustainable access to basic sanitation and adopt appropriate hygiene practices. It is the first 5 (2014-2019) year programme funded through this mechanism and implemented in Kenya. The Ministry of Health (MoH) at the National level is the policy holder supporting the program with policy guidance and technical assistance and also focuses on policy formulation, resource mobilization and establishment of standards and guidelines, training and capacity building, curriculum development and international representation. K-SHIP intends to accelerate sanitation coverage to reach over 1.92 million people with appropriate sanitation and hygiene interventions using the Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) approach. This support will directly contribute to the achievements of the Open Defecation Free (ODF) road map goals and the national health sector goals.

The country programme proposal (CPP) team came up with the proposal for K-SHIP and AMREF Health Africa in Kenya was competitively awarded the contract as the Executing agency (EA) and is implementing in 11 counties through grant making. Program Implementation is based on the following components:

- Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion
- Equity & Inclusion (E&I)
- Capacity Development and Sanitation Marketing
- Advocacy and Communication
- Evidence Based Documentation and Learning
- Strengthening national and sub-national coordination mechanisms

The program implementation method is purely grant-making to the Sub-grantees who by support of the technical assistance from the EA and MoH implement in their respective counties.

### **Program goals and objectives**

KSHIP has and still is contributing towards improved access to sanitation products for the community; a raised profile of sanitation and hygiene for the national and county leaders and an enhanced advocacy mechanism at national and county levels; documentation and sharing of experiences and learning within and between counties and; strengthened coordination mechanisms at national and county level. Achievement of these objectives will in turn serve to boost the reduction of the burden of diseases resulting from poor sanitation and hygiene and improve the health outcomes of target communities as well as achieving the broader goals of poverty eradication, health and environmental improvement, gender equality and long-term social and economic development through sanitations & hygiene promotion.

### **Process of grant making**

The Program Coordinating Mechanism (PCM) established the Technical Review Committee (TRC) made up of the AMREF/KSHIP staff and Officers from the MoH to carry out the process of recruiting sub-grantees.

### **Tender opening of responses to expression of interest (EOI)**

An advert calling for proposals from potential sub-grantees was floated in the Kenyan dailies and ran for one month. Upon opening the tender box a total of 116 proposal application packages were registered.

### **Preliminary evaluation of the expression of interest (EOI) proposals**

The Technical Review Committee (TRC) convened a meeting to evaluate and rank all the 116 proposal applications received. Specifically the TRC aimed to ascertain the following from all the application packages received from the prospective Sub Grantees.

- SG's Organizational Background information
- SG's Experience in program implementation
- SG's Monitoring and Evaluation plans
- SG's Governance and Management Structure
- SG's Human and Physical resources
- SG's resource mobilization and Management processes
- SG's networking and collaboration with other stakeholders
- Completeness of SG's proposal package

Each of these components was tagged a maximum attainable mark of 5 (five). 54 Sub-grantees scored a weighted mean aggregate of at least 3.1, (62%) and qualified for Onsite Capacity Assessment (OCA).

### **Onsite capacity assessment**

The TRC visited the head office(s) and the field offices of all the 54 shortlisted organizations. Guided by an assessment tool, it assessed the capacity of the organizations by reviewing documents and interviewing relevant staffs. The organizational assessment was aimed at establishing the strengths and weaknesses of these organizations and making recommendations to enable the EA make appropriate decisions on targets sharing and contracting of these sub grantees to implement KSHIP.

The key aspects of the assessment were:

- Governance and risk management
- Strategic and operation planning
- Programme management
- Financial management and reporting
- Monitoring and Evaluation

### **Ranking of the sub-grantees**

Based on the above elements, the Technical Review Committee assessed the organizations, ranked and grouped them in five categories as per their weighted average score.

**Green: SGs with a weighted average lying between 4.0 and 5.0 ranges are considered to have strong capacity to implement the K-SHIP grant/activities**

<b>Blue: SGs with a weighted average between 3.0 and 4.0 ranges are considered Strong Capacity but having minor gaps that can be addressed in less than 3 months</b>
<b>Yellow: SGs with a weighted average between 2.0 and 3.0 ranges are considered adequate capacity with gaps that can be addressed in at least three months</b>
<b>Orange: SGs with a weighted average between 1.0 and 2.0 ranges are considered average capacity but with gaps that can be addressed in at least six months</b>
<b>Red: SGs with a weighted average between 0.0 and 1.0 ranges are considered inadequate capacity</b>

A total of 17SGs were successfully contracted including one government department and one specific for Sanitation Marketing.

The objectives allocated to the EA by GSF and the findings of the capacity assessment guided the targets given to each of the sub grantees for implementation. The sub grantees then developed their work plans in consultation with the EA and against these; they signed a contract with the EA.

### **Allocation of budgets to sub counties and sub grantees**

Allocation of budget to the respective sub counties was dependent on the KSHIP targets. The following factors were considered for allocation of budgets per Sub County:

- Sanitation and hygiene status of the targeted Sub-County.
- Population density.
- Geographical coverage.
- Infrastructural context

### **Contracting the sub-grantees**

Specific conditions are recommended for each sub grantee assessed. Where necessary and applicable, each contract signed takes into consideration these conditions and has specific clauses relevant to the Sub Grantee in question to ensure they deliver on the targets given while ensuring the resources provided are optimally used.

### **Field implementation of programme activities**

Upon completion of the contracting process, the SGs were capacity built in CLTS approaches, Financial Management and Reporting, Monitoring & Evaluation as well as Program management and Governance. They were then continuously supported and guided to implement the assigned field activities including CLTS triggering, follow up, receiving claims from villages, varication, 3<sup>rd</sup> party certification, and ODF celebration. Other activities included village sanitation mapping, community mobilization, conducting social events, other local trainings, advocacy and profiling sanitation at county level.

### **Year 1 programme achievements**

- **149** villages certified as ODF
- **81,516** people are currently living in ODF Environments
- **235,663** people have been reached with key sanitation messages
- **72,226** people have hand washing facilities
- **4015** vulnerable people supported to actively participate in S&H activities and access sanitation and hygiene services.
- **1205** Natural leaders (NLs), Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), CSOs and Government personnel were sensitized on E&I
- **753** CHVs oriented and sensitized in sanitation and hygiene
- **342** government officers and SG staff trained as CLTS promoters and facilitators
- **1346** Community Health Volunteers (CHVs) and Natural Leaders (NLs) oriented as hygiene promoters
- **23** trained during **Training of Trainers (ToT)** for Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM)
- **60** Public Health Officers and **30** lecturers trained on CLTS
- **315** county officials and leaders sensitized on Sanitation and Hygiene and MHM

### Benefits of grant making

- Encourages a move towards funded models which aids the formation of new partnerships, which can be the beginning of something good. Pooling resources of grant managers across trusts may be a solution, or perhaps the development of community foundations as a local brokerage model. The better trusts reach into the communities they fund, the better understanding they will have of whether they are achieving best value for their money.
- Improves implementation and performance through regular communication. Cultivating a relationship between program professionals and sub grantees that includes regularly scheduled phone calls, site visits, and communication via e-mail helps to build trust, which leads to improved project implementation and performance by all involved. The Project officer gains a deeper understanding of the project and, when a problem arises, is better positioned to recommend strategies to address the problem or reallocate resources.
- Ongoing grant reviews improves grant management by both the grantees and the foundation. As part of the review process, both the foundation and the SGs can make changes based on actual events and the learning that inevitably occurs over the course of grant period.
- Formative evaluation supports SGs success and summative evaluation of longer-term initiatives adds to learning in the field. Not only do allow for longer-term evaluations, but also enabling ongoing conversations with program and sub grantees.
- Provide opportunities to work with other funders to support the long-term sustainability of proven initiatives. One of our key strategies is to support SG's ability to secure sufficient financial resources to sustain an initiative/project, as well as to scale or replicate the project when appropriate.

### Challenges of grant making

- The grant making process is risky. Risks of failure, foundations reputation and risks that resources will be spent on a project without meeting the set goals are often experienced during the process. Discussions on ways to mitigate these risks should be carried out and ideas incorporated on the work plan to reduce these risks.
- Pressure to make grants while still planning. Taking time to plan, design the grant programme and assemble the right partners is a challenge in the grant making process.
- Communication. Ineffective communication plan among key stake holders is a great challenge in the grant making process. If the Executive Agency and the Sub Grantees do not communicate, the initiative will start to unravel. Everyone needs to be informed. Other external audiences such as the media could also support.
- Issuing requests for proposals and or funding guidelines that are unclear could be a challenge since it would lead to inappropriate proposals from the grantees that will not be funded, (garbage out, garbage in). This wastes time and slows down the ability to reach set goals.
- Inadequate data to inform decision making is a challenge in the grant making process if the EA does not design evaluation into its overall project and has not been collecting enough data. Funding for the next phases by its board would be unwarranted as a result.

### Important lessons learnt / recommendations

- **Small grants need to be both efficient and high touch.** Given the relatively small size of these grants, it is important that the application process be appropriately streamlined. Continually look for ways to simplify, most recently creating a faster renewal process for general operating support Sub-grantees. At the same time the program strives for efficiency, it is also proudly high touch.
- **Small grants can allow for more "risk" taking.** Many Small Sub-grantees are still developing, with lean financials, informal infrastructure and limited capacity. They are often doing impactful and innovative work but may not yet have the formal evaluation tools to demonstrate measurable outcomes.
- **Supporting small non-profits allows funding different types of organizations, including community organizing and arts education groups.** For example, there are many arts education groups that, while small, play a vital role in the context of cuts to school programs. Community organizing non-profits are often smaller as well, given that fewer philanthropic and government funds are directed toward their work, yet they are important drivers of civic engagement and systemic social change.

- **Supporting small non-profits allows us to better reach low income communities.** Small grants allow the Foundation to reach organizations in highly underserved communities that, a responsive funder would not likely reach through Regular Grant Program.
- **Inform yourself about relevant legal and tax issues.** If you decide to fund directly, undertake due diligence on the relevant legal and tax issues, and set up the processes and timetable to govern your work. Enlist staff and long-term consultants as allies in making sure that things run smoothly administratively, as well as programmatically. As one grants administrator from a private foundation observed, "Generally grants administrators are another set of ears for grantees to answer questions, helping them to understand how to think about reporting, or whatever."
- **Develop ways to help you communicate effectively with Sub-grantees and applicants.** Consider the communication culture in the country or region in which you plan to work, and how might that condition your dealings with grantees? For example, are people most comfortable communicating in face-to-face settings or may some of the work be conducted by phone or e-mail? Might they hesitate to communicate news, especially bad news, in a timely manner? It is valuable to emphasize the importance of working with grantees to ensure mutual comfort and clarity of expectations regarding how and when you should be in touch.
- **Give attention to the interests and concerns of local communities.** The experience from consultants can be particularly helpful in coordinating local conversations. It is important to organize meetings to scope the field and for others to get to know you. When exploring a field with potential grantees, remember that your education may cost them time and resources. You may want to reimburse their travel expenses, provide honoraria, offer training, or underwrite groups working on similar issues to network and learn from each other.
- **Take advantage of the knowledge and connections of local philanthropies.** Successful grant-making maintains contact with local donors and donor networks when gathering initial information, and considering a partnership further down the road.

## Conclusion

Considering that KSHIP has only been implemented for one year, best part of which went to planning and laying ground for implementation, it's prudent to conclude that grant-making is an applicable method for ensuring results-based programmes that aim to achieve results at scale.

---

## Acknowledgements

We wish to sincerely extend our gratitude to Christopher Oyieko, Geoffrey Ikiara, Sheba Odondi and Moses Lengewa all of Amref Health Africa in Kenya for their pearls of wisdom in drafting this paper and to the Ministry of Health, Kenya for their unending cooperation and commitment in ensuring KSHIP's grant making method is justified. Much more credit goes to our sub-grantees who work tirelessly on the ground to ensure the programme realizes its results.

---

## References

- Grants Manual, Amref Health Africa in Kenya, Amref Resource Centre, 2010.
- The Constitution of Kenya, 2010. Attorney General Nairobi. Chapter 4: Bill of Rights, sub article 43 (1) a pg49. Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya, Ministry of Health Division of Environmental Health, National ODF Kenya Campaign Framework, 2016/17-2019/20.
- Republic of Kenya, Ministry of Health Division of Environmental Health, Kenya Environmental Sanitation and Hygiene Strategic Framework, 2016-2020.
- Kenya, Ministry of Public Health and Sanitation. (2012). Accelerating Access to Rural Sanitation in Kenya, with support from UNICEF, SNV and PLAN.
- World Bank Group Water and Sanitation Programme (WSP), "Economic Impact of Poor Sanitation" in Kenya, updated using 2010 DHS data.

**Contact details**

*The principal author, Vincent M. Ouma is a Project Manager for the Global Sanitation Funded Programme at Amref Health Africa in Kenya (KSHIP). The co-Author Muhuri Jackson is an Intern at Amref Health Africa in Kenya, KSHIP holding a bachelor's degree in Health Services Management (Public Health) and passionate about community health.*

Vincent M. Ouma  
30125-00100 Nairobi  
Tel: +254 708046604  
Email:

[Vincent.Ouma@amref.org/vincelon@gmail.com](mailto:Vincent.Ouma@amref.org/vincelon@gmail.com)

Muhuri Jackson  
30125-00100 Nairobi Kenya  
Tel: +252712472060  
Email:

[Jackson.Muhuri@amref.org/jacmuhuri@gmail.com](mailto:Jackson.Muhuri@amref.org/jacmuhuri@gmail.com)

---