

October 2025

Summative Evaluation: Improving Access to Safely Managed Water Supply in the Resilience Building Programme for Ethiopia-II Woredas December 2017- December 2023



Commissioned by: UNICEF Ethiopia Country Office

Authors:

Niaz Ullah Khan, Team Leader
Sajid Zaman, WASH and Data Management Specialist
Dr. Mussarrat Youssuf, UNICEF Ethiopia

Evaluation Manager:

Summative Evaluation of Improving Access to Safely Managed Water Supply in the Resilience Building Programme for Ethiopia-II Woredas (December 2017- December 2023)

Final Evaluation Report

UNICEF Ethiopia

© United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), October 2025

UNECA Compound, Zambezi Building, Box 1169

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Photo Credit: UNICE Ethiopia/2024/Nahom Tesfaye

The purpose of publishing evaluation reports produced by the UNICEF Ethiopia country office is to fulfil a corporate commitment to transparency through the publication of all completed evaluations. The reports are designed to stimulate a free exchange of ideas among those interested in the topic and to assure those supporting the work of UNICEF that it rigorously examines its strategies, results, and overall effectiveness. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the policies or views of UNICEF.

The text has not been edited to official publication standards and UNICEF accept no responsibility for errors. The designations in this publication do not imply an opinion on the legal status of any country or territory, or of its authorities, or the delimitation of frontiers.

The copyright of this report is held by the United Nations Children's Fund. Permission is required to reproduce, photocopy, or in any other way quote from this report in printed or electronic form. For information on how to obtain permission, please write to the Communications Office of UNICEF Ethiopia.

This report is available for download at: <https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/reports>

Please cite the work as follows: © United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), 2025, "Summative Evaluation of Improving Access to Safely Managed Water Supply in the Resilience Building Programme for Ethiopia-II Woredas (December 2017- December 2023)", UNICEF Ethiopia Country Office, Ethiopia.

For further information, please contact:
UNICEF Ethiopia Country Office
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
UNECA Compound, Zambezi Building, Box 1169
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Contents

ANNEX 1-A: CONSTRUCTED THEORY OF CHANGE	2
ANNEX I-B: RESET-II LOGFRAME TARGETS AND ACHIEVEMENTS.....	3
ANNEX 2: EVALUATION QUESTIONS (AS PER TORS) AND SUGGESTED REFINEMENTS	5
ANNEX 3: EVALUATION MATRIX.....	11
ANNEX 4: LIST OF KEBELES SELECTED FOR WATER SOURCE OBSERVATION	24
ANNEX 5: HOUSEHOLD SURVEY SAMPLING.....	25
ANNEX 6: LIST OF KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION	27
ANNEX 7: LITERATURE REVIEWED	29
ANNEX 8: WATER SOURCE OBSERVATION TOOL.....	31
ANNEX 10: CHECKLISTS FOR KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS.....	42
ANNEX 11: CHECKLISTS FOR FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS	53
ANNEX 12: CHECKLIST FOR CASE STUDIES.....	58
ANNEX 13: ETHICAL REVIEW APPROVAL BY HML-IRB.....	60
ANNEX 14: CONSENT AND ASSENT FORMS.....	62
ANNEX 15: RESET-II LOGFRAME TARGETS AND ACHIEVEMENTS	70
ANNEX 16: ANALYSED HOUSEHOLD DATA TABLES.....	72
ANNEX 18: EVALUATION REFERENCE GROUP AND YOUNG EVALUATORS	119
ANNEX 19: TOR FOR FINAL EVALUATION OF EU-RESET PROJECT	120

Annex 1-A: Constructed Theory of Change

Level	Statements	Indicators
Impact	Strengthened resilience and improved livelihoods of vulnerable communities in drought-prone RESET-II woredas through increased access to safe water.	% increase in number of people who have access to safe and sustainable water supply in RESET-II woredas (Target: 20% by 2020)
Outcome	Improved access to safe and sustainable water supply for 82,000 drought-affected people in 16 woredas.	Number of new users of safe and sustainable water supplies in RESET-II woredas (Target: 82,000 by 2020)
Output 1	Woreda based hydrogeological maps are produced for all EU-RESET-II project woredas	Number of RESET-II woredas with suitability maps developed (Target: 41)
Output 2	16 test productive boreholes drilled based on the recommendation of the study	Number of wells drilled (Target: 16 by 2020) Number of water systems constructed and functioning (Target: 16 by 2020) % increase in drilling success rate (Target: ≥80%)
Output 3	Knowledge gained from the hydrogeological study is documented and disseminated among the main WASH stakeholders in Ethiopia.	Number of institutions aware of mapping results (Target: 20 by 2020) Number of government staff trained in mapping techniques (Target: 5 by 2020)
Activities	Remote sensing and GIS overlay analysis Field validation (ground truthing) Identification and drilling of productive sites Construction of water distribution systems Capacity-building and training Dissemination workshops and sustainability reviews	<i>Monitored through implementation records and reporting mechanisms</i>
Assumptions	Government remains committed to water sector improvements No major delays in procurement or implementation Contractors deliver quality work on schedule Groundwater conditions match mapping predictions Stakeholders actively use and share data Security conditions allow field operations	

Annex I-B: RESET-II Logframe Targets and Achievements

(verified during evaluation)

Level / Indicators	Baseline	Target	Achieved (Project Final Report)	Verified (Evaluation)	Comments by Evaluators
Overall Objective: Contribute to strengthening economic opportunities and resilience of vulnerable communities through improved water access in 41 woredas	0	20% increase by 2020	56.7% of target 82,000	38.9% of target are currently using six functional boreholes; additional 15.9% of target expected after post-construction of two other boreholes	Beneficiaries also supported in livestock rearing and timesaving for livelihoods; however, water safety remains a major concern. The project produced hydrological maps for 39 woredas are used as one of the planning tools along with other techniques, however, there is no significant evidence that the project created hydrological maps have been used for drilling the boreholes and indirectly benefited the users in other areas.
Purpose / Specific Objective: Improve access to safe and sustainable water supply for drought-affected populations in 16 woredas	0	82,000 people	46,470 people	31,817 current users; additional 13,000 users after pending completion	Delays in post construction work due to reliance on government and other financing
Output 1.1: Hydrogeological maps produced	2	41	39 completed	39 verified via KIIs	Maps recognized as a planning tool but no strong evidence they

					guided drilling decisions
Output 2.1: Test productive boreholes drilled	0	20	16	14 productive, but 7 had poor yield (<5 L/s) or water quality problems	50% unsuitable for post-construction due to fluoride/ salinity and low discharge
Output 2.2: Water systems constructed and functional	0	14	7	6 functional systems constructed including one borehole (Mubarek) saline and unsuitable for drinking	Major gap from assumption of govt-financed post-drilling works
Output 2.3: Drilling success rate	30–45%	80%	87.5%	87.5% verified across 10 visited sites	Strong technical achievement compared to national average in terms of productive well but only 73.9% of planned depth was achieved (3,932 meters out of planned 5,320 meters) because of limited drilling capacity of some contractors.
Output 3.1: Knowledge dissemination and capacity building	0	20 organizations reached	58 organizations (138 individuals) sensitized; 60 shared results online (2020 workshop)	Awareness confirmed via KIIs, but no workshop reports available to verify participation	Verification gap due to missing documentation
Output 3.2: Government staff trained in mapping techniques	0	5 staff	92 staff trained (87 male, 5 female)	Confirmed via KIIs, but no participant list or training report available	Overachievement in numbers, but weak verification and limited coverage of water quality/ climate-smart approaches

Annex 2: Evaluation Questions (As Per ToRs) and Suggested Refinements

Evaluation Criterion	Evaluation Questions as per ToRs	Suggested Refinement	Refined Question
Relevance	EQ1: To what extent is the RESET-II project design and implementation relevant in increasing access to safe and sustainable water for drought affected people, considering responsiveness to specific and evolving local needs changing in times of crisis?	No Change	Revised EQ1: To what extent is the RESET-II project design and implementation relevant in increasing access to safe and sustainable water for drought affected people, considering responsiveness to specific and evolving local needs changing in times of crisis?
	EQ2: To what extent has the project addressed WASH relevant gaps for children, especially the most marginalized such as children with disabilities, girls, and out-of-school children, in the current context?	No Change	Revised EQ2: To what extent has the project addressed WASH relevant gaps for children, especially the most marginalized such as children with disabilities, girls, and out-of-school children, in the current context?
Coherence	EQ 3: To what extent is the project aligned with EU and UNICEF priorities with respect to securing equitable access to water?	No Change	Revised EQ 3: To what extent is the project aligned with EU and UNICEF priorities with respect to securing equitable access to water?
	EQ 4: How has the project approach facilitated linkages and multiplied value between sectors and actors to accelerate access to safe and sustainable water?	This question overlaps with a similar as EQ 9 under the Efficiency criterion. Suggested to remove from here.	
	EQ 5: How well does the project complement other initiatives in the same sector working to provide secure water access to vulnerable populations, such as the ONE-WASH UNICEF program?	No Change	Revised EQ 4: How well does the project complement other initiatives in the same sector working to provide secure water access to vulnerable populations, such as the

			ONE-WASH UNICEF program?
	EQ 6: Are there any synergies or conflicts with other projects or policies?	No Change	Revised EQ 5: Are there any synergies or conflicts with other projects or policies?
Efficiency	EQ 7: To what extent have the outputs of the project been achieved with the appropriate number of resources (funds, expertise, time, procedures, rules and regulations, administrative costs, etc.)?	No Change	Revised EQ 6: To what extent have the outputs of the project been achieved with the appropriate number of resources (funds, expertise, time, procedures, rules and regulations, administrative costs, etc.)?
	EQ 8: Were financial and human resources used optimally to deliver the project, and were there cost-effective alternatives that could have achieved similar or better results?	No Change	Revised EQ 7: Were financial and human resources used optimally to deliver the project, and were there cost-effective alternatives that could have achieved similar or better results?
	EQ 9: How has the project result's approach facilitated linkages and multiplied value between sectors and actors to accelerate access to safe and sustainable water?	This question overlaps with a similar as EQ 4 under the Coherence criterion. Suggested to keep here.	Revised EQ 8: How has the project result's approach facilitated linkages and multiplied value between sectors and actors to accelerate access to safe and sustainable water?
	EQ 10: Was the project implemented within the planned timeframe, and if not, what were the reasons for any delays or cost overruns?	No Change	Revised EQ 9: Was the project implemented within the planned timeframe, and if not, what were the reasons for any delays or cost overruns?
Effectiveness	EQ 11: To what extent has the project achieved its preset objectives, outputs, and outcomes among the target population?	No Change	Revised EQ 10: To what extent has the project achieved its preset objectives, outputs, and outcomes among the target population?
	EQ 12: What were the key enabling or hindering factors affecting the successful implementation of WASH	No Change	Revised EQ 11: What were the key enabling or hindering factors affecting the successful

	interventions, and how were challenges addressed?		implementation of WASH interventions, and how were challenges addressed?
	EQ 13: To what extent did the use of advanced technology aid the efforts to improve access to safe and sustainable water supply for drought-affected populations in the selected woredas?	No Change	Revised EQ 12: To what extent did the use of advanced technology aid the efforts to improve access to safe and sustainable water supply for drought-affected populations in the selected woredas?
	EQ 14: How has the combination of different mappings and capacity building of local authorities made a difference (and are likely to be making a difference in the coming years) to the water supply in drought affected areas?	The question has two parts 1) how the mapping and capacity building made difference to water supply services in drought areas? This part of the question is covered under EQ 13 2) Will the project's mapping and capacity building support make difference in future? this part of the question is covered under EQ 18. Suggested to remove this as explain above	
Sustainability	EQ 15: Will the benefits of the project last after the end of the RESET-II project period?	This is a broad question, and subsequent evaluation questions also addressing some other aspects. Here, we suggest maintaining our focus on O&M only as following. "To what extent will the benefits of the project be sustained after the end of the RESET-II project period, in terms of	Revised EQ 13: To what extent will the benefits of the project be sustained after the end of the RESET-II project period, in terms of water point functionality and maintenance?"

		water point functionality and maintenance?"	
	EQ 16: What benefits of the RESET-II project are likely to last in the lives of individuals, families, communities, and the broader environment? Have lessons learned through monitoring been sufficiently incorporated continuously to inform better achievement of results and sustainability of the project?	This question combines two distinct but interrelated themes: the sustainability of benefits at the individual and community levels, and the effectiveness of monitoring mechanisms to ensure the long-term achievement of these benefits. Thus, two separate questions are suggested as below: What benefits of the RESET-II project are likely to last in the lives of individuals, families, communities, and the broader environment? Have lessons learned through monitoring been sufficiently incorporated continuously to inform better achievement of results and sustainability of the project?	Revised EQ 14: What benefits of the RESET-II project are likely to last in the lives of individuals, families, communities, and the broader environment? Revised EQ 15: Have lessons learned through monitoring been sufficiently incorporated continuously to inform better achievement of results and sustainability of the project?
	EQ 17: Which measures that have been put in place are actively contributing to the sustainability of the project?	No Change	Revised EQ 16: Which measures that have been put in place are actively contributing to the sustainability of the project?
	EQ 18: Are the gains made through this project, especially the use of innovative approaches and laying the ground for local capacity to utilize these	No Change	Revised EQ 17: Are the gains made through this project, especially the use of innovative approaches and laying the ground for local capacity to utilize these

	technologies, scalable at large?		technologies, scalable at large?
Impact	EQ 19: To what extent and which intended and unintended long-term results have been achieved by the project?	Suggested to merge similar questions i.e. EQ 19 and 24 and aligning with contribution-based study design rather than attribution-based as "To which intended and unintended long-term results have the RESET-II project contributed, and to what extent?"	Revised EQ 18: To which intended and unintended long-term results have the RESET-II project contributed, and to what extent?
	EQ 20: To what extent has the EU-RESET project contributed to sustained improvements in the desired outcomes, in the lives of the intended beneficiaries, especially to the men, women, girls and boys from the marginalized sections of the society and those with disabilities?	Suggested to merge these interlinked questions as "To what extent and in what ways has the EU-RESET project contributed to sustained improvements in the lives of its intended beneficiaries, particularly men, women, girls, and boys from marginalized groups, including persons with disabilities through enhanced gender equality, social inclusion, empowerment, and equitable access to and decision-making over WASH services?"	Revised 19: To what extent and in what ways has the EU-RESET project contributed to sustained improvements in the lives of its intended beneficiaries, particularly men, women, girls, and boys from marginalized groups, including persons with disabilities through enhanced gender equality, social inclusion, empowerment, and equitable access to and decision-making over WASH services?
	EQ 21: To what extent and in what ways has the project influenced gender equality, social inclusion, and the empowerment of marginalized groups (e.g., women, persons with disabilities) in terms of access to and decision-making over WASH services?		
	EQ 22: To what extent has the project intentionally or unintentionally influenced systems and policies in different sectors to support safely managed water supply?	Suggested to merge these interlinked questions as "To what extent and how has the project influenced systems, policies, and institutional capacities, both intentionally and unintentionally across sectors and at local levels, to	Revised EQ20: To what extent and how has the project influenced systems, policies, and institutional capacities, both intentionally and unintentionally across sectors and at local levels, to support safely managed water supply, strengthen local governance, and enhance community
	EQ 23: How has the project impacted local governance, institutional capacity, and community ownership in managing WASH infrastructure and services?		

		support safely managed water supply, strengthen local governance, and enhance community ownership of WASH infrastructure and services?"	ownership of WASH infrastructure and services?
	EQ 24: What unintended positive or negative impacts (e.g., environmental effects, economic benefits, displacement of vulnerable groups) have resulted from the project?	Already Merged with EQ 19 as revised EQ 18	

Annex 3: Evaluation Matrix

Revised EQ #	Evaluation Question	Sub-Questions	Data Sources / Approach	Data Collection Methods	Indicators / Success Standards
Relevance					
1	EQ 1: To what extent is the RESET-II project design and implementation relevant in increasing access to safe and sustainable water for drought affected people, considering responsiveness to specific and evolving local needs changing in times of crisis?	Were the local needs of drought-affected populations identified and considered? Was the project adapted to evolving local crises (e.g., conflict, displacement, drought)? To what extent were gender, disability, and climate vulnerabilities integrated in project design?	Project design documents, baseline and pre-situation analysis Climate and hazard vulnerability maps/ analysis Government emergency response frameworks Inclusion strategy (gender/disability) Interviews with MoWE, local authorities and UNICEF	Document and literature review KIIs with government, UNICEF, and implementing partners FGDs with beneficiary communities Review of inclusion and climate mainstreaming tools/ approach	Evidence of needs assessment aligned to local crises Inclusion of adaptive design features (flexible targeting, contingency planning) Extent to which gender, disability, and climate vulnerabilities are integrated into project design (e.g., none, partial, full integration) Types of changes made to project design or implementation in

Revised EQ #	Evaluation Question	Sub-Questions	Data Sources / Approach	Data Collection Methods	Indicators / Success Standards
					response to emerging crises or community feedback (e.g. flexible siting, timing, or targeting)
2	EQ 2: To what extent the project addressed WASH relevant gaps for children, especially the most marginalized such as children with disabilities, girls, and out-of-school children, in the current context?	Were children with disabilities, girls and out-of-school children prioritized in planning? Were WASH interventions tailored to their access needs? Was infrastructure inclusive and appropriate for children? To what extent were persons with disabilities included in planning, access, and monitoring of WASH services in accordance with the twin-track approach outlined in DIPAS?	Project activity plans and WASH technical design guidelines Lists of WASHCOMs members disaggregated by gender and disability Interviews with local schools' teachers, caregivers and Adolescent/Youth Local WASH infrastructure assessments	KIIs with UNICEF, project partners FGDs with caregivers, Adolescent/Youth, teachers and WASHCOMs Water Source observation checklist Household survey	Proportion of accessible water points Representation of women and persons with disabilities in water management WASHCOMs Extent to which WASH interventions addressed the specific needs of marginalized children (e.g., girls, children with disabilities, out-of-school children) Range of perceptions from children with

Revised EQ #	Evaluation Question	Sub-Questions	Data Sources / Approach	Data Collection Methods	Indicators / Success Standards
					disabilities, caregivers, and girls regarding usability and appropriateness of WASH services
Coherence					
3	EQ 3: To what extent is the project aligned with EU and UNICEF priorities with respect to securing equitable access to water?	Was the project aligned with EU/UNICEF strategies on equity and access? Were global commitments like SDG 6, LNOB, and rights-based approaches embedded? Was alignment ensured with national sector policies/ strategies (e.g. Ethiopian Water Sector and Health Policies, Ethiopian Climate-Resilient Green Economy (CRGE) Strategy Ethiopian Drinking Water Standards and ONE-WASH)?	EU and UNICEF WASH strategy documents National ONE-WASH Programme Phase II Rights-based programming frameworks Project proposal and ToC Water and health Policies, CRGE strategy and Drinking Water Standards Review	Comparative document review (project vs organizational strategy) KIIs with policy/coordination actors Mapping of SDG indicators and LNOB commitments in project documents	Extent to which project documentation reflects alignment with EU/UNICEF equity strategies Explicit reference to SDG 6 and LNOB in project design Consistency with ONE-WASH principles and targets Harmonizing water quality testing schedules with national standards

Revised EQ #	Evaluation Question	Sub-Questions	Data Sources / Approach	Data Collection Methods	Indicators / Success Standards
					Range of stakeholder perspectives on strategic coherence and alignment
	EQ 4: How has the project approach facilitated linkages and multiplied value between sectors and actors to accelerate access to safe and sustainable water? Overlap with similar question as EQ 9 under the Efficiency. Suggested to remove from here.				
4	EQ 5: How well does the project complement other initiatives in the same sector working to provide secure water access to vulnerable populations, such as the ONE-WASH UNICEF program?	Was there coordination with other WASH programmes? Were there examples of synergy or shared resources?	Coordination meeting notes Reports from ONE-WASH and other similar Sector partners feedback	KIIs with sector partners including the local authorities Document review	Examples of synergy or integration Avoidance of duplication
5	EQ 6: Are there any synergies or conflicts with other projects or policies?	Were there overlaps or contradictions with other initiatives? How were potential conflicts addressed?	Government policy documents i.e. Ethiopian Water Sector and Health Policies, Ethiopian CRGE Strategy and Ethiopian Drinking Water Standards Donor reports Sector partners feedback	KIIs with sector partners including the local authorities Desk review Stakeholder feedback	No reported conflict Stakeholder perceptions of coherence

Revised EQ #	Evaluation Question	Sub-Questions	Data Sources / Approach	Data Collection Methods	Indicators / Success Standards
Efficiency					
6	EQ 7: To what extent have the outputs of the project been achieved with the appropriate number of resources (funds, expertise, time, procedures, rules and regulations, administrative costs, etc.)?	Were the resources proportionate to the results achieved? Were the scientific mapping techniques more resource-efficient compared to traditional methods? Were administrative bottlenecks (procurement, logistics) affecting delivery?	Financial reports Implementation plans and output reports Technical assessments of mapping and drilling process	KIIs with UNICEF, Aquacon Engineering, Acacia Water, and MoWE Document review	Borehole success rate compared to national average Total cost vs planned per borehole Deviation in total drilled depth and justifications
7	EQ 8: Were financial and human resources used optimally to deliver the project, and were there cost-effective alternatives that could have achieved similar or better results?	Did the joint venture model (Aquacon & Acacia Water) improve quality and reduce cost overruns? Were the project's technologies and contracting models cost-effective?	Cost-benefit analyses UNICEF procurement and supervision records Contractors and technical advisors	Financial review KIIs with engineers, UNICEF team, and partners	Cost per successful borehole vs national benchmark Stakeholder assessments of cost-efficiency compared to other similar interventions
8	EQ 9: How has the project result's approach facilitated linkages and multiplied value between sectors and actors to accelerate access to safe and sustainable water?	Did technical partnerships (EWTI, local water bureaus, NGOs) lead to more efficient delivery? Were technical roles (mapping, drilling, supervision) well-coordinated?	Partner reports Coordination meeting notes Project management reviews	KIIs with stakeholders at zonal, woreda and regional level Document Review	Extent and quality of cross-sector collaboration (e.g. frequency, effectiveness) Degree to which duplication with other programmes was avoided or mitigated

Revised EQ #	Evaluation Question	Sub-Questions	Data Sources / Approach	Data Collection Methods	Indicators / Success Standards
9	EQ 10: Was the project implemented within the planned timeframe, and if not, what were the reasons for any delays or cost overruns?	What operational challenges (e.g., drilling contractor performance) affected the schedule? Were contingency plans effective in mitigating delays?	Project Gantt charts and timeline logs Supervision reports Security and logistics memos	Timeline review KIIs with UNICEF and drilling supervisors	Extent of adherence to planned implementation timelines by result area Explanation and analysis of variance between planned vs actual number of people served
Effectiveness					
10	EQ 11: To what extent has the project achieved its preset objectives, outputs, and outcomes among the target population?	Were Results 1–3 fully achieved against targets? Were the boreholes operational and used? Did the capacity building efforts translate to improved practice?	Output tracking sheets Field assessments Training evaluations	Water Source observation checklist FGDs and KIIs with WASHCOMs, trainees, and officials Household survey	14/16 boreholes successful Proportion of households in targeted communities using project water supply system Proportion of trained experts applying acquired skills post-training
11	EQ 12: What were the key enabling or hindering factors affecting the successful implementation of WASH interventions, and how were challenges addressed?	How did security, logistics, and drilling contractor capacity affect effectiveness? How did adaptive management respond to challenges?	Risk logs and mitigation plans Contractor performance assessments Midterm and final reports	KIIs with UNICEF and MoWE Document review	Nature and extent of changes in drilling or supervision model based on learning Frequency and handling of contractor

Revised EQ #	Evaluation Question	Sub-Questions	Data Sources / Approach	Data Collection Methods	Indicators / Success Standards
					non-performance cases
12	EQ 13: To what extent did the use of advanced technology aid the efforts to improve access to safe and sustainable water supply for drought-affected populations in the selected woredas?	How accurate and actionable were the overlay maps? Did RS-GIS improve borehole success or reduce cost/time? To what extent did the groundwater reservoirs identified through the overlay maps have sufficient water quantity and comply with the permissible drinking water quality standards outlined in the Ethiopian Drinking Water Quality Standards?"	Hydrogeological maps Borehole tracking reports Technical partner interviews Water Quality Repots	KIIs with UNICEF, Acacia Water, and local engineers Document review	Success rate of drilling versus identified sites through mapping Comparison of time/cost required for siting using RESET-II vs previous benchmarks
	EQ 14: How has the combination of different mappings and capacity building of local authorities made a difference (and are likely to be making a difference in the coming years) to the water supply in drought affected areas? Suggested to remove this question as per comments given under heading 4.1. Evaluation Questions				

Revised EQ #	Evaluation Question	Sub-Questions	Data Sources / Approach	Data Collection Methods	Indicators / Success Standards
Sustainability					
13	EQ 15: Will the benefits of the project last after the end of the RESET-II project period? Suggested to maintain focus on O&M only as following (see comments given under heading 4.1. Revised EQ 15: To what extent will the benefits of the project be sustained after the end of the RESET-II project period, in terms of water point functionality and maintenance?"	Are water points still functional and maintained? Are O&M mechanisms and local systems in place? Are local authorities and communities empowered and equipped to manage water supply?	Post-implementation monitoring reports Interviews with WASHCOMs, RWBs, and UNICEF	Water Source observation checklist KIIs and FGDs with service users and managers	% of functional boreholes after project close Existence of maintenance plans and fee collection systems
14	EQ 16: What benefits of the RESET-II project are likely to last in the lives of individuals, families, communities, and the broader environment? Have lessons learned through monitoring been sufficiently incorporated continuously to inform better achievement of results and sustainability of the project? Suggested to splitting this into two distinct questions	Have household water collection time and costs decreased in a lasting way? Has access to safe drinking water reduced health risks? Are community-level benefits (economic, social, environmental) visible and persistent?	Beneficiary feedback Health and education service data Case studies	FGDs with communities and schools' teachers KIIs with local health centres staff Water quality test results Household survey Individual interviews for any significant personal change	Reported change in daily time spent collecting water (by gender and age group) Change in household expenditure on water (e.g., trucking or alternate sources) Perceived longer-term changes in health, income, or education

Revised EQ #	Evaluation Question	Sub-Questions	Data Sources / Approach	Data Collection Methods	Indicators / Success Standards
	Revised EQ 16 (1): What benefits of the RESET-II project are likely to last in the lives of individuals, families, communities, and the broader environment?				attributed to improved water access
15	Revised EQ 16 (2): Have lessons learned through monitoring been sufficiently incorporated continuously to inform better achievement of results and sustainability of the project?	Were mid-course corrections made based on performance data or risks? Was adaptive learning visible across Results 1–3 (e.g. revised drilling depths, map use, contractor management)?	Monitoring reports Drilling supervision documentation Internal learning session notes	KIIs with UNICEF, MoWE, and partners Document review	Number and types of adaptive decisions made during implementation Extent to which implementation methods evolved based on experience or learning
16	EQ 17: Which measures that have been put in place are actively contributing to the sustainability of the project?	Are trained experts/ volunteers retained and deployed in the system? Is there active coordination with RWBs and local bureaus for sustainability? Is the current tariff collection sufficient to cover the regular O&M costs, as well as any major future repairs of the water supply system? Have any additional resources been secured, or	Capacity building records MoWE and EWTI HR data Government and sector partners budget/ investment plans WASH COMs records	KIIs with MoWE, EWTI, RWBs and collaborating sector partners Document review FGD with WASHCOMs	% of trained individuals still in WASH roles Inclusion of project areas in public sector plans Proportion of O&M cost and tariff collection Extent of additional funding or partnerships

Revised EQ #	Evaluation Question	Sub-Questions	Data Sources / Approach	Data Collection Methods	Indicators / Success Standards
		partnerships established, to ensure the sustainability of water supply services within the target communities?			mobilized as a result of RESET-II
17	EQ 18: Are the gains made through this project, especially the use of innovative approaches and laying the ground for local capacity to utilize these technologies, scalable at large?	Have any innovations been replicated in other regions/countries? Have local systems adapted tools for their own use (e.g. groundwater maps)?	UNICEF Innovation reports National planning documents Interviews with stakeholders in Somali, SNNP, Angola, Kenya, etc.	Desk review KIIs with regional, national, and global actors	# of scale-up initiatives using same model Qualitative evidence of uptake and replication
Impact					
18	EQ 19: To what extent and which intended and unintended long-term results have been achieved by the project? Suggested to merge similar questions i.e. EQ 19 and 24 and aligning with contribution-based study design rather than attribution: Revised EQ 19 & 24: To which intended and unintended long-term results have the RESET-II project contributed, and to what extent?	To what extent, water users experienced sustained improvements in access, quality, affordability, and reliability of water supply? Have household-level burdens (e.g. time, cost) been sustainably reduced? To what extent has the project contributed to improved health, educational, or institutional outcomes beyond the immediate WASH intervention?	Household and Water source surveys Stakeholders feedback Institutional capacity assessment reports Project monitoring data Environmental impact assessments (if available)	FGDs with beneficiaries and schools' teachers Household survey Water Source observation checklist KIIs with MoWE, regional water bureaus, and health officials	Reported use of time saved from water collection (e.g., productive, educational, household tasks), disaggregated by gender and age Changes in reported incidence of waterborne disease or health facility case load (qualitative or facility-level data) Improved capacity of water bureaus in planning and

Revised EQ #	Evaluation Question	Sub-Questions	Data Sources / Approach	Data Collection Methods	Indicators / Success Standards
		Were there any long-term unintended consequences (positive or negative)? Did groundwater use under RESET-II raise any sustainability concerns, including depletion risks?		Desk review of relevant statistics and reports	groundwater use Evidence of sustained water point functionality and usage over time Environmental safeguards applied and monitored
19	EQ 20: To what extent has the EU-RESET project contributed to sustained improvements in the desired outcomes, in the lives of the intended beneficiaries, especially to the men, women, girls and boys from the marginalized sections of the society and those with disabilities? EQ 21: To what extent and in what ways has the project influenced gender equality, social inclusion, and the empowerment of marginalized groups (e.g., women, persons with disabilities) in terms of access to and decision-making over WASH services?	Have beneficiaries experienced long-term improvements in livelihoods, employment, access to basic services, and reduced dependency on emergency water services (e.g., trucking)? Were the most marginalized groups, including persons with disabilities, effectively reached through appropriate targeting, inclusive design, and participation in WASHCOMs and training initiatives? Did water collection time savings contribute to increased participation in education, income	Monitoring reports Community and household data WASH COMs records and member profiles Project reports Case studies	KIIs with UNICEF, MoWE, WASHCOMs Household surveys FGDs with women, caregivers, Adolescent/Youth, PWDs and WASHCOMs Individual interviews for any significant personal change	Reduced reliance on water trucking Extent to which marginalized beneficiaries (e.g., women, PWDs, remote groups) accessed services and reported changes in their daily lives Evidence of changes in livelihood opportunities linked to improved water access (qualitative or quantitative) Proportion of women/PWDs in

Revised EQ #	Evaluation Question	Sub-Questions	Data Sources / Approach	Data Collection Methods	Indicators / Success Standards
	Suggested to merge these interlinked questions as Revised EQ20 and 21: To what extent and in what ways has the EU-RESET project contributed to sustained improvements in the lives of its intended beneficiaries, particularly men, women, girls, and boys from marginalized groups, including persons with disabilities through enhanced gender equality, social inclusion, empowerment, and equitable access to and decision-making over WASH services?	generation, and leadership opportunities? Did the intervention address physical and cultural barriers to equitable access to WASH services?			leadership roles Perceptions of changes in gender roles or time allocation post-project Reported changes in school attendance attributed to improved water access (disaggregated by sex and disability)
20	EQ 22: To what extent has the project intentionally or unintentionally influenced systems and policies in different sectors to support safely managed water supply? EQ 23: How has the project impacted local governance, institutional capacity, and community ownership in managing WASH infrastructure and services?	Did national or sub-national institutions integrate the mapping approach, technology, and knowledge tools (e.g., maps, training) into planning processes? Were there policy shifts, updated guidelines, or increased budgets as a result of project learning? Were local water bureaus better equipped to plan and	MoWE planning documents Briefs and partner reports Draft revised water policy Capacity assessment reports Training evaluations Community WASH governance documentation	KIIs with national and regional authorities, woreda/ zonal water offices and RWBs Desk review of sector strategies FGDs with WASHCOMs Review of fee collection systems and maintenance logs	Integration of groundwater mapping in sector plans Updated technical guidance or training curriculum Scale-up decisions linked to RESET-II outcomes Proportion of staff trained under RESET-II still active in relevant

Revised EQ #	Evaluation Question	Sub-Questions	Data Sources / Approach	Data Collection Methods	Indicators / Success Standards
	Suggested to merge these interlinked questions as Revised EQ22 and 23: To what extent and how has the project influenced systems, policies, and institutional capacities, both intentionally and unintentionally across sectors and at local levels, to support safely managed water supply, strengthen local governance, and enhance community ownership of WASH infrastructure and services?"	oversee groundwater-based water supply services? Did communities take ownership of WASH infrastructure and services (e.g., fee collection, maintenance)?			WASH roles Functioning WASH COMs and O&M systems Local budgeting for continued service
	EQ 24: What unintended positive or negative impacts (e.g., environmental effects, economic benefits, displacement of vulnerable groups) have resulted from the project? <i>Suggested to merge similar questions i.e. EQ 19 and 24 and aligning with contribution-based study design rather than attribution as in row 18</i>				

Annex 4: List of Kebeles Selected for Water Source Observation

Sr. #	Region	Zone	Woreda	Kebele
1	SNNP	Wolayita	Damot Pula	Warite Balaka
2	SNNP	Wolayita	Boloso Sore	Legama
3	SNNP	South Omo	Hammer	Erbore
4	SNNP	South Omo	Dasenech	Oldemo
5	Somali	Liben	Liben	Deka Suftu2
6	Somali	Siti	Mieso	Hawanile
7	Somali	Liben	Moyale	Mubarek
8	Afar	Zone 1	Adear	Hado
9	Oromia	East Bale	Rayitu	Kara Tule
10	Amhara	East Gojjam	Enerji Enauga	Mertolemariam

Annex 5: Household Survey Sampling

The project's final report (June 2024) noted a baseline of zero water supply coverage in the target kebeles and reported a 100 per cent coverage of project-supported water infrastructure by project completion. However, for conservative planning purposes, the problem analysis method assumes a 30 per cent coverage in the control group (p_1) and 80 per cent coverage in the intervention group (p_2) for sample size estimation.

Given the unknown intra-cluster correlation coefficient (ICC), a Design Effect (DEFF) of 1.5, commonly used in Demographic and Health Surveys, has been adopted to adjust for potential clustering within kebeles. To ensure statistical validity, the sample size is calculated using a 95 per cent confidence level and 80 per cent power, which are standard thresholds for significance and detection capability in public health evaluations.

$$n = \frac{(Z_{\alpha/2} + Z_{\beta})^2 \times (p_1(1 - p_1) + p_2(1 - p_2))}{(p_1 - p_2)^2}$$

- n = Required sample size per group (before adjusting for clustering)
- $Z_{\alpha/2} = 1.96$ (Z-score for 95 per cent confidence level)
- $Z_{\beta} = 0.84$ (Z-score for 80 per cent power)
- $p_1 = 0.3$ (expected proportion of water supply services in the control group)
- $p_2 = 0.8$ (expected proportion of water supply services in the intervention group)
- $(p_1 - p_2)$ = expected effect size (90 per cent improvement)

Based on the sample size formula, the estimated number of respondents per cluster is 11.6. After applying a DEFF of 1.5 to account for intra-cluster correlation, the adjusted sample size increases to 17.4 respondents per cluster. To account for an anticipated non-response rate of 10 per cent, the sample size is further adjusted to 19.1. For practical implementation and ease of field deployment, the sample size is rounded up to the nearest multiple of ten. Accordingly, the final sample size is set at 20 respondents per cluster.

Table: Sample Size in Each of The Selected Cluster

Sr. #	Region	Zone	Woreda	Kebele	Sample Households
1	SNNP	Wolayita	Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	20
2	SNNP	Wolayita	Boloso Sore	Legama	20
3	SNNP	South Omo	Hammer	Erbore	20
4	SNNP	South Omo	Dasenech	Oldemo	20
5	Somali	Liben	Liben	Deka Suftu2	20
6	Somali	Siti	Mieso	Hawanile	20
7	Somali	Liben	Moyale	Mubarek	20
8	Afar	Zone 1	Adear	Hado	20
9	Oromia	East Bale	Rayitu	Kara Tule	20
10	Amhara	East Gojjam	Enerji Enauga	Mertolemariam	20
	Total Sample				200

The selection of household within the cluster has been made through applying an equal interval within the households while uniformly distributing the cluster and ensuring that ensuring the representation of diverse respondent types, including households of female-heads, out of school children and persons with disabilities.

Annex 6: List of Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussion

List of KIIs

Stakeholder/Organization	Region					Total	Gender	
	SNNP	Somali	Oromia	Afar	Amhara		Male	Female
UNICEF WASH Team- Country Office						1	1	
MoWE Officials - Federal						1	1	
Implementing partner - CARE						1	1	
Implementing partner - Save the Children						1	1	
Sector Partners-FCDO						1	1	
Ethiopian Water Technology Institute (EWTI)						1	1	
Technical Partners - Contractor Firms-Acacia Water						1	1	
Technical Partners -Contractor Firms-Aquacon Engineering						1	1	
Regional Water Bureaus (RWBs)	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	
Zonal Water Bureaus	2	2	1	1	1	7	7	
Local Health Service Providers	1	1				2		2
Executive Members of WASH Committee	4	3	1	1	1	10	10	
Total KIIs	8	7	3	3	3	32	30	2

List of FGDs

Sr #	Type of FGD	Venue			Number of Participants	Gender	
		Region	Woreda	Kebele		Male	Female
1	FGD with Women/ caregivers water users	SNNP	Wolayita	Damot Pulsa	7		7
2	FGD with Women/ caregivers water users	SNNP	Hamer	Erbore	8		8
3	FGD with Women/ caregivers water users	Somali	Liben	Deka Suftu 2/ Buntekeren	6		6
4	FGD with Women/ caregivers water users	Afar	Ada'ar	Hado	7		7
5	FGD with Women/ caregivers water users	Oromia	Rayitu	Kara Tule	8		8

6	FGD with WASHCOM Memberer/Village Leader	SNNP	Wolayita	Legama,	6	2	4
7	FGD with WASHCOM Memberer/Village Leader	SNNP	Dasenech	Oldemo	8	5	3
8	FGD with WASHCOM Memberer/Village Leader	Somali	Siti	Hawanile	6	2	4
9	FGD with WASHCOM Memberer/Village Leader	Somali	Liben	Mubarek	6	4	2
10	FGD with Persons with Disabilities (PWDs)	SNNP	Hamer	Erbore	7	3	4
11	FGD with Persons with Disabilities (PWDs)	Somali	Liben	Mubarek	6	4	2
12	FGD with Persons with Disabilities (PWDs)	Afar	Ada'ar	Hado	7	5	2
13	FGD with School Management Committees and Teachers	SNNP	Dasenech	Oldemo	7	4	3
14	FGD with School Management Committees and Teachers	SNNP	Wolayita	Waite Balaka	7	7	
15	FGD with School Management Committees and Teachers	Somali	Liben	Deka Suftu 2/ Buntekeren	6		6
16	FGD with Adolescent/ Youth (14 Years and Above)	SNNP	Wolayita	Legama	7	7	
17	FGD with Adolescent/ Youth (14 Years and Above)	SNNP	Hamer	Erbore	7	7	
18	FGD with Adolescent/ Youth (14 Years and Above)	Somali	Liben	Deka Suftu 2/ Buntekeren	6		6
19	FGD with Adolescent/ Youth (14 Years and Above)	Somali	Liben	Mubarek	6		6

Annex 7: Literature Reviewed

Project Design and Implementation Documents

1. Terms of Reference for the Summative Evaluation of the EU RESET-II Project.
2. Project Document: *Improving Access to Safely Managed Water Supply in the Resilience Building Programme for Ethiopia RESET-II Woredas* (UNICEF, 2017).
3. Final and Annual Project Report to the EU Delegation.
4. *Groundwater Mapping for Climate Resilient WASH in Ethiopia – Phase 1 Report* (Acacia Water, 2020).
5. *Drilling Landscape Analysis* (UNICEF, 2023).
6. *Project Brief of MWML Initiative*.
7. *Drilling Summary Report* (Aquacon Engineering PLC and Acacia Water, 2023).
8. *Water Quality Report of Mubarek Kebele* (2021).

Ethiopian Sector Policies and Strategic Frameworks

9. Ethiopia Water Resources Management Policy (2001).
10. One WASH National Programme (OWNP) Phase II Document (2018).
11. Climate-Resilient Green Economy (CRGE) Strategy of Ethiopia (2011).
12. Climate Resilient WASH Strategic Framework (GWP and UNICEF, 2022).

UNICEF Strategic Frameworks and Guidelines

13. UNICEF Strategy for Water, Sanitation and Hygiene 2016–2030.
14. WASH in the new UNICEF Strategic Plan 2022–2025.
15. UNICEF–Global Water Partnership Strategic Framework for Climate Resilient WASH (2022).
16. *Unless We Act Now: The Impact of Climate Change on Children* (UNICEF, 2015).
17. UNICEF Ethiopia. *SNNPR Regional Public Expenditure Analysis* (2021).
18. UNICEF. *Menstrual Hygiene Management in Schools: Ethiopia Case Study* (2020).
19. UNICEF Brand Book (internal guidance on visual identity and communication).

Socioeconomic, Climate, and Environmental Reports

20. Ethiopia Socioeconomic Panel Survey 2021/22.
21. World Bank. *Ethiopia Poverty and Equity Brief* (2023).
22. World Bank. *Ethiopia Human Capital Index* (2020).
23. Government of Ethiopia. *Universal Rural Road Access Programme Progress Report* (2018–2022).
24. Ethiopian Ministry of Agriculture. *Annual Agricultural Performance Report* (2022/2023).

Human Rights and International Development Frameworks

25. United Nations. *The Human Right to Water and Sanitation*, UNGA Resolution A/RES/64/292 (2010).
26. 3rd International Conference on Financing for Development by UNDESA (2016).
27. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD).
28. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).

Evaluation and Ethical Standards

29. UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016).
30. UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2020).
31. UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System.
32. UNEG Guidance Document: *Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations*.
33. UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Terms of Reference and Inception Reports.
34. UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards.
35. UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis (2021).
36. *Disability-Inclusive Evaluations in UNICEF: Guideline for Achieving UNDIS Standards* (2020).
37. UN Secretary-General's Bulletin: *Special Measures for Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse* (ST/SGB/2003/13).
38. United Nations Protocol on Allegations of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse Involving Implementing Partners (2018).

Literature Review Checklist

Basic Details

- Title of Document: _____
- Year Published: _____
- Source: ☐ UNICEF ☐ Government ☐ Partner ☐ Online ☐ Other: _____
- Type: ☐ Report ☐ Study ☐ Strategy ☐ Policy ☐ Evaluation ☐ Other: _____

Core Information Captured

- Main focus area: _____
- Covers which sectors: ☐ Water Supply ☐ Mapping ☐ Capacity Building ☐ Systems strengthening
- Geographic relevance: ☐ Somali ☐ Afar ☐ SNNP ☐ Oromia ☐ Amhara ☐ Regional ☐ National ☐ Other: _____
- Population focus: ☐ Children ☐ Women ☐ Persons with Disabilities ☐ WASHCOM ☐ Other: _____
- Mentions RESET-II project? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Evaluation Usefulness

- Supports which OECD-DAC criteria? (tick all)
- ☐ Relevance ☐ Coherence ☐ Effectiveness ☐ Efficiency ☐ Impact ☐ Sustainability ☐ Cross-cutting
- Evidence quality: ☐ Strong ☐ Moderate ☐ Weak
- Use for final report? ☐ Yes ☐ Possibly ☐ No

Key Notes

- _____
- _____

Review Info

- Reviewed by: _____

Date: ____ / ____ / ____

=

Annex 8: Water Source Observation Tool

Section A: Identification and Location

Sr. #	Questions/ Instructions	Codes	Response
1.	Region	Text	
2.	Woreda	Text	
3.	Kebele	Text	
4.	Estimated Beneficiary households	Enter Number	
5.	Depth of the Water Bore	In Feet	

Section B: Infrastructure and Operational Status

Sr. #	Questions/ Instructions	Codes	Response
6.	Is the water source functional today? <i>If option 2 or 3 is selected, Skip to question 10</i>	1: Yes 2: No 3: Standby only	
7.	If functional, for how many hours is it operated daily?	1 <1 hour 2: 1–3 hrs 3: 4–8 hrs 4: >8 hrs	
8.	Is a bulk water meter installed? <i>If option 2 is selected, Skip to question 12</i>	1: Yes 2: No	
9.	Is the meter functioning and in use?	1: Yes 2: No	
10.	Water production <i>Applicable to functional water sources "Option 1 in response of question 8"</i> <i>If a water meter is not installed, use a calibrated container (e.g. a measured cane or bucket) to estimate water production by recording the time taken to fill it and calculating flow accordingly</i>	Gallon Per Minute	
11.	Energization system	1: None 2: Manual 3: Solar	

	<i>If option 1 or 2 is selected, Skip to question 14</i>	4: Grid-electricity 5: Generator	
12.	Condition of energization system	1: Fully functional 2: Partially functional 3: Not functional	
13.	Is a chlorinator installed on water source? <i>If option 2 is selected, Skip to section C</i>	1: Yes 2: No	
14.	If yes, chlorination is regularly applied and recorded?	1: Applied and Recorded 2: Applied but not recorded 3: Not Applied	

Section C: Technical Condition and Maintenance

Sr. #	Questions/ Instructions	Codes	Response
15.	General condition of borehole superstructure? <i>In the absence of a superstructure, inspect the borehole casing for any signs of damage, corrosion, or exposure to contamination risks, and document its overall condition</i>	1: Good 2: Fair 3: Poor	
16.	Pump or tap condition	1: Fully functional 2: Minor issues 3: Major issues 4: Not working 5: No Pump or tap installed	
17.	Storage tank condition	1: No Storage Tank 2: Good 3: Fair 4: Poor	
18.	Is there visible leakage or spillage?	1: Yes 2: No	
19.	Drainage around water point <i>If option 3 is selected, Skip to section D</i>	1: Well, maintained 2: Poorly maintained 3: No drainage system	
20.	Wastewater safely disposed.	1: Yes 2: No	

--	--	--	--

Section D: Water Quality Monitoring

Sr. #	Questions/ Instructions	Codes	Response
21.	How often is water testing done? <i>If option 5 or 98 is selected skip to Section E</i>	1: Monthly 2: Quarterly 3: Bi-Annually 4: Annually 5: Never 98: Don't know	
22.	When last water quality testing conducted?	DD/MM/YY	
23.	Who facilitated the water quality test?	1: WASHCOM 2: MoWE/RWB 3: Water Utility 4: UNICEF/ Partner NGO 96: Other (Please specify) _____	
24.	Are test results available for review? <i>If option 2 is selected skip to Section E</i>	1: Yes 2: No	
25.	What are the final remarks on water quality test report?	1: Safe for Drinking 2: Unsafe	

Section E: Community Management and Sustainability (Ask if Water Source is Functional, Option 1 Selected Question 8)

Sr. #	Questions/ Instructions	Codes	Response
26.	Who is managing this water source	1: WASHCOM 2: Local Entrepreneur 3: Government 4: Water Utility 96: Others _____ (Please specify) 98: Don't know	
27.	What is monthly tariff per household? <i>Skip to Q30 if amount is 0</i>	Enter Amount in Ethiopian Birr	
28.	Are there records of tariff collection?	1: Yes 2: No	

29.	Is the tariff sufficient to cover routine maintenance?	1: Yes 2: No 98: Don't know	
30.	Does the water system manager have a bank account? <i>Verify through document review</i>	1: Yes 2: No	
31.	Are there any savings allocated for major repair/emergency costs? <i>Verify through document review</i>	Enter Saving in Ethiopian Birr	
32.	Date of last maintenance conducted	DD/MM/YY	
33.	Who conducted the maintenance?	1: Community/WASHCOM 2: Government 3: Contractor 96: Others _____ (Pease specify)	
34.	Is there a water safety plan for this water source developed? Verify through document review	1: Yes 2: No	

Section F: Accessibility Features (Observe, don't ask)

Sr. #	Questions/ Instructions	Codes	Response
35.	Is there a ramp with an appropriate gradient (1:12 or flatter)?	1: Yes 2: No	
36.	Is the surface leading to the water point smooth, firm, and non-slippery?	1: Yes 2: No	
37.	Can the water point be accessed independently by a person using a wheelchair or walking aid?	1: Yes 2: No	
38.	Is the hand pump or tap reachable for persons of short stature or using a seated position?	1: Yes 2: No	
39.	Is there tactile sign to guide visually impaired users?	1: Yes 2: No	

40.	Is there adequate lighting or daylight visibility around the water point?	1: Yes 2: No	
41.	Are there any obstructions or hazards (e.g. steep drop, open drain) near the water point?	1: Yes 2: No	
42.	Is seating or rest space available nearby for users with limited mobility?	1: Yes 2: No	

Section G: Visual Evidence

Please take clear photographs of the following (if applicable):

- Borehole head and platform
- Pump/tap/valve mechanism
- Storage tanks and meters
- Drainage or chlorination systems
- Public notices or management boards

Annex 9: Household Survey Tool

Section A: Household Profile

Sr. #	Questions/ Instructions	Codes	Response		
1	Name of respondent	Text			
2	Gender of respondent	1: Male 2: Female			
3	Age	Enter Years			
4	Is this a female-headed household?	1: Yes 2: No			
5	Number of household members	Number of Adults			
		Number of Children (under 18)			
6	Does any of the adult (18 Years and above) in household have these functional limitations? <i>Enter number of persons suffering from respective functional limitation.</i> <i>If no person, Enter 0</i>		Some difficulty	A lot of difficulty	Cannot do at all
		Seeing, even if wearing glasses?			
		Hearing, even if using a hearing aid?			
		Walking or climbing steps?			
		Remembering or concentrating?			
		With self-care, such as washing all over or dressing?			
		Communicating (understanding or being understood)?			
7	Does any of the Child (17 years and below) in household have these functional limitations? <i>Enter number of persons suffering from respective functional limitation.</i> <i>If no person, Enter 0</i>		Some difficulty	A lot of difficulty	Cannot do at all
		Seeing, even if wearing glasses?			
		Hearing, even if using a hearing aid?			
		Walking or climbing steps?			
		Remembering or concentrating?			
		With self-care, such as washing all over or dressing?			
		Communicating (understanding or being understood)?			

Section B: Socioeconomic Status

Sr. #	Questions/ Instructions	Codes	Response
8	Do you own the house you currently live in?	1: Yes 2: No	
9	What is the main construction material of house?	1: Mud/Thatched 2: Wood 3: Brick 4: Cement/Concrete 96: Other (Please specify) _____	
10	What is your household's average monthly income?	1: <2,000 ETB 2: 2,000–5,000 ETB 3: 5,001–10,000 ETB 4: >10,000 ETB	
11	What is the primary source of income for your household?	1: Farming/Livestock 2: Wage labour 3: Small business/trade 4: Remittances 5: Government support 96: Other (Please specify) _____	

Section C: Access to Water Supply

Sr. #	Questions/ Instructions	Codes	Response
12	What is your main source of drinking water? <i>If response is 4,5 or 9 skip to Question 14</i>	1: Project-installed piped supply (EU-RESET) 2: Any other piped supply 3: Borehole 4: Water trucking 5: Bottled Water 6: protected Dug Wells / spring 7: Rainwater harvesting 8: Unprotected dug well/ spring 9: River/stream/pond 96: Other (Please specify) _____	
13	Where is this water source located? <i>If response is 1 or 2 skip to Question 16</i>	1: Inside the house 2: In the yard/premises 3: Outside premises (within 500m) 4: Outside premises (>500m)	
14	How long does it take to fetch drinking water (round trip)?	1: <15 min 2: 15–30 min 3: 30–60 min 4: >1 hour	
15	Who is primarily responsible for collecting water?	1: Woman 2: Man 3: Girl 4: Boy	

	<i>Ask and skip to Question 17</i>	96: Other (Please specify) _____	
16	On average, how many hours/days is water supplied? <i>Ask if response of Q12 is 1 or 2</i>	1: <30 minutes 2: 30 minutes– 1 hours 3: >1-2 Hours 4: > More than 2 hours	
17	Is the amount of water from this source sufficient for daily needs?	1: Always 2: Sometimes 3: Rarely 4: Never	
18	Is your water from your main source available, today?	1: Yes 2: No	
19	How satisfied are you with the current water source? <i>Read the rating scale and ask respondent to rate against the options</i>	1: Very satisfied 2: Satisfied 3: Neutral 4: Dissatisfied 5: Very dissatisfied	
20	How much do you spend monthly on drinking water (including any fees or purchases)?	Enter Amount in Ethiopian Birr	
21	<i>Only Ask if Option 1 is selected in response to question 12</i> In addition to drinking, for what other purposes do you use the water supplied to your household? <i>Select All that Apply</i>	01: None 02: Cooking 03: Personal hygiene (e.g. bathing, handwashing) 04: Cleaning and household chores (e.g. washing clothes, cleaning floors) 05: Watering home garden or kitchen garden 06: Agriculture 07: Livestock or poultry care 96: Other (Please specify) _____	

Section D: Health and Service Quality

Sr. #	Questions/ Instructions	Codes	Response
22	In the past 30 days, has anyone in your household experienced the following illnesses? <i>Note All the Responses (Multiple Choice Question)</i>	1: None 2: Diarrhoea 3: Cholera 4: Typhoid 5: Skin infections 96: Other (Please specify) _____	
23	Have you noticed improvements in health	1: Yes 2: No	

	since using this water source? <i>Ask only for Project-installed piped supply in Q12</i>	98: Don't know	
24	How would you rate the quality of water? <i>Read the rating scale and ask respondent to rate against the options</i>	1: Very good 2: Good 3: Average 4: Poor 6: Very poor	
25	Are you aware of any water quality testing by WASHCOM or authorities? <i>Ask only for Project-installed piped supply in Q12</i>	1: Yes 2: No 98: Don't know	
26	Do you treat your drinking water? <i>If response is 2 skips to Section E</i>	1: Yes 2: No	
27	If yes, what method mainly you use?	1: Boil 2: Add bleach/ chlorine 3: Strain it through a cloth 4: Use a water filter (ceramic, sand, composite, etc.) 5: Solar disinfection 6: Let it stand and settle 7: A combination of the above 96: Others _____ (Please specify)	

Section E: Affordability and Time Use Impact (Only Ask if Option 1 is selected in response to question 12)

Sr. #	Questions/ Instructions	Codes		Response
28	Before the project, how much did your household spend monthly on water?	Enter Amount in Ethiopian Birr		
29	How much time (on average) has your household saved daily for water collection after the project?	1: No change 2: Less than 30 min 3: 30-60 min 4: More than 1 hour		
30	What activities have members in the household been able to focus more on since access improved?	1: No change 2: Education 3: Income generation 4: Household work	Girls	
			Boys	

	<i>Enter Separate Response for Each Group</i> <i>Enter All possible Responses-Multiple Choice Question</i>	5: Social/community involvement	Women	
			Men	

Section F: Equity, Inclusion, and Governance (Only Ask if Option 1 is selected in response to question 12)

Sr. #	Questions/ Instructions	Codes	Response
31	Do you feel your household was fairly included in the project?	1: Yes 2: No	
32	Were women/ girls in your household involved in community discussions or decision-making on the water system?	1: Yes 2: No	
33	Were persons with functional limitation in your household involved in community discussions or decision-making on the water system? <i>Ask if any person with functional limitation reported either adult or children</i>	1: Yes 2: No 97: Not Applicable	
34	Do persons with functional limitation in your household face any challenges using the water supply? <i>Ask if any person with functional limitation reported either adult or children</i>	1: Yes 2: No 97: Not Applicable	
35	Who manages the water supply system?	1: WASHCOM 2: Local Entrepreneur 3: Government 4: Water Utility 96: Others _____ (Please specify) 98: Don't know	
36	Have you experienced any issues with the water supply?	1: None 2: Water quality 3: Interrupted supply 4: Long wait time 5: Poor maintenance	

	<i>If option 1 selected, End Interview</i>	96: Others _____ (Please specify)	
37	Do you register complaint about this issue? If option 3 selected, End Interview	1: Yes, we register complaint 2: No, we didn't register complaint 3: Complaint system does not exist	
38	If yes, how much time does it usually take to resolve the issue?	1: Within A Day 2: Between 1 to 3 Days 3: Between 3 to 7 Days 4: Between 1 to 2 weeks 5: More than 2 weeks	

Annex 10: Checklists for Key Informant Interviews

Checklist for KIIs with UNICEF WASH Team

Purpose:

To gather UNICEF's perspectives on project design, coordination, technical supervision, innovation, cost-effectiveness, sustainability, and cross-sector learning under the RESET-II project.

Section A: Project Design and Relevance

1. How was UNICEF involved in the design of the RESET-II WASH component?
2. To what extent was the project aligned with UNICEF's WASH priorities and equity commitments (e.g., SDG 6, LNOB, gender, disability)?
3. How were the needs of drought-affected populations identified and integrated into the design?
4. Were contingency or crisis-responsive elements included in the planning?

Section B: Coordination and Coherence

5. How did UNICEF coordinate with other RESET implementing agencies, the EU, and sector partners (e.g., ONE-WASH)?
6. Were there any complementarities or overlaps with other WASH or humanitarian projects?
7. What role did UNICEF play in facilitating multi-sectoral collaboration (e.g., with health, education, environment)?

Section C: Technical Oversight and Effectiveness

8. How did the use of hydrogeological overlay maps and satellite-based assessments improve targeting and drilling success?
9. What was the added value of the joint venture (Aquacon Engineering and Acacia Water) for supervising drilling operations?
10. How did UNICEF ensure quality assurance and mitigate technical risks (e.g., poor contractor performance)?
11. Were there any major bottlenecks during implementation (e.g., security, procurement, contractor capacity)? How were these addressed?

Section D: Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness

12. Were the financial and human resources used efficiently in delivering the RESET-II water component?
13. Was the drilling success rate (87.5%) cost-effective compared to national benchmarks?
14. Were there any cost-saving innovations or contracting models used?
15. Did UNICEF track unit cost per borehole or cost per capita served? If so, what were the findings?

Section E: Innovation, Learning, and Sustainability

16. What lessons emerged from the RESET-II project, and how were these fed back into ongoing programming?

17. How has UNICEF supported the replication or scaling of this groundwater mapping model within Ethiopia or to other countries (e.g., Kenya, Somalia, Angola)?
18. To what extent has UNICEF integrated climate resilience and system strengthening into its post-project strategy?

Section F: Closing Reflections

19. In your view, what are the top three achievements of the RESET-II WASH component?
20. What recommendations would you give for future similar programmes in Ethiopia or comparable contexts?

Checklist for KII with Ministry of Water and Energy (MoWE)

Purpose:

To understand MoWE's role in the RESET-II project in terms of national alignment, sector strategy, coordination, institutional capacity, and sustainability outcomes.

Section A: Strategic Alignment and Relevance

1. How was MoWE involved in the design and oversight of the RESET-II water supply component?
2. Was the project aligned with national sector strategies such as the ONE-WASH Programme, Ethiopian Water Policy, and SDG 6?
3. Were the project's approaches consistent with the Climate Resilient Green Economy Strategy and national drinking water quality standards?

Section B: Institutional Coordination and Oversight

4. What was MoWE's role in coordinating across federal, regional, and woreda levels during the implementation of RESET-II?
5. How effective were coordination mechanisms (e.g. with UNICEF, RWBs, NGOs) in ensuring smooth delivery?
6. Were there challenges in managing contractor performance or supervision at the federal/regional level?

Section C: Use of Technology and Planning Tools

7. Was MoWE involved in reviewing or validating the groundwater overlay maps?
8. How did the availability of scientific mapping and drilling supervision data support or inform sector planning?
9. Has MoWE integrated any of the RESET-II tools, maps, or learnings into national databases, policies, or planning systems?

Section D: Policy Influence and Systems Strengthening

10. Were there any policy changes, technical standards, or procedural shifts made as a result of RESET-II experiences?
11. Has MoWE adopted or promoted the groundwater mapping approach for other regions or future programmes?
12. What role did the project play in strengthening the capacity of RWBs or local planning units?

Section E: Sustainability and Tariff Policy

13. From MoWE's perspective, are the project's results likely to be sustained?
14. How is MoWE supporting the institutionalization of O&M systems for deep boreholes and piped supply schemes?
15. Are current tariffs and local management arrangements (e.g., through WASHCOMs or utilities) considered adequate for long-term service delivery?

Section F: Sector-wide Learning and Scaling

16. Were lessons from RESET-II captured or disseminated by MoWE for use in other programmes?
17. Is there any cross-country or cross-regional collaboration underway (e.g. with other federal institutions or neighbouring countries)?
18. What are MoWE's recommendations for scaling this model or improving its integration in national systems?

Section G: Closing Reflections

19. What do you consider the key contributions of RESET-II to Ethiopia's WASH sector?
20. What would MoWE do differently if a similar programme were implemented again?

Checklist for KIIs with Regional Water Bureaus (RWBs)

Purpose:

To assess the involvement of RWBs in supervising field activities, supporting local water offices, managing contractors, coordinating with UNICEF and MoWE, and promoting sustainability of WASH infrastructure developed under RESET-II.

Section A: Role in Implementation and Oversight

1. What role did the Regional Water Bureau play in the implementation of RESET-II water supply interventions?
2. Were RWBs involved in contractor selection, supervision, or performance monitoring?
3. How was communication managed between RWBs, UNICEF, and woreda/zonal water offices?

Section B: Use of Groundwater Data and Mapping Tools

4. Were hydrogeological maps or RS-GIS tools shared with the RWB?
5. Were these tools used in regional planning or decision-making for water source development?
6. Has the RWB integrated groundwater mapping techniques into ongoing or future water planning strategies?

Section C: Technical Supervision and Drilling Performance

7. How would you assess the drilling supervision process during RESET-II (e.g. site verification, contractor compliance)?
8. Were there any delays, technical issues, or quality concerns during the borehole drilling process?
9. How did the RWB handle corrective actions or disputes with drilling contractors?

Section D: Capacity Building and Human Resources

10. Did any RWB staff receive training or technical support through RESET-II?

11. Were trained staff retained and deployed for ongoing regional WASH work? If yes, please provide training topic, number of participants (gender segregated) and year of training.
12. What gaps still exist in regional technical capacity for groundwater development or WASH service delivery?

Section E: Post-Construction Support and Sustainability

13. Were RWBs involved in post-construction monitoring or handover to local WASHCOMs/utilities?
14. Are there mechanisms in place to support long-term maintenance, repairs, and oversight of RESET-II boreholes?
15. Are regional funds or partnerships being mobilized to sustain services beyond the project?

Section F: Institutional Learning and Policy Uptake

16. Has RESET-II influenced any changes in the region's planning approach or investment priorities?
17. Are any of the technical tools, standards, or practices being scaled across other woredas?
18. Has the RWB shared its experience from RESET-II with other regions or at federal-level forums?

Section G: Closing Reflections

19. What do you see as the main successes and limitations of the RESET-II water supply component in your region?
20. What recommendations would you offer to improve the design and management of future groundwater-focused projects?

Checklist for KIIs Ethiopian Water Technology Institute (EWTI)

Purpose:

To explore EWTI's contributions to technical capacity building, training delivery, institutional learning, and its role in embedding groundwater mapping skills within national and sub-national systems.

Section A: Role and Involvement in RESET-II

1. How was EWTI engaged in the RESET-II project, particularly under the groundwater mapping and capacity-building components?
2. What criteria were used to select trainees and target regions for technical training?
3. Did EWTI lead or contribute to the capacity gap assessment before training was delivered?

Section B: Training Design, Content, and Delivery

4. What were the main topics covered in the training (e.g. groundwater mapping, borehole supervision, chlorination, Gender Equality and Social Inclusion responsive design and service delivery)?
5. How were training materials developed or adapted for this project? Were the materials gender transformative?
6. Was the training sessions tailored to local contexts or technical needs of specific regions?

Section C: Participation and Reach

7. How many participants were trained under the RESET-II project? From which institutions or regions?
8. Were gender or disability inclusion considerations applied during trainee selection?
9. Were trainees assessed during or after the training to measure learning uptake?

Section D: Post-Training Follow-up and Impact

10. Has EWTI tracked whether trained individuals are applying their knowledge in their current roles?
11. Are there examples of regions or institutions applying knowledge gained from RESET-II trainings?
12. Were there any challenges in post-training follow-up or coordination with regional water bureaus?

Section E: Institutional Learning and Curriculum Development

13. Has EWTI updated its internal curriculum, guidelines, or training modules based on RESET-II experience?
14. Were any RESET-II tools or hydrogeological mapping methods institutionalized at EWTI?
15. Is EWTI planning to scale or replicate these training initiatives nationally or in collaboration with other partners?

Section F: Partnerships and Knowledge Dissemination

16. What was the nature of collaboration between EWTI and UNICEF, RWBs, or other technical partners?
17. Did EWTI participate in knowledge-sharing events or technical working groups as part of RESET-II?
18. Has EWTI shared the training experience in any national or regional forums?

Section G: Closing Reflections

19. What have been the most important contributions of EWTI to the RESET-II project?
20. What are your recommendations for strengthening technical capacity and institutional learning in future groundwater-focused WASH initiatives?

Checklist for KIIs Technical Partners (Acacia Water and Aquacon Engineering)

Purpose:

To understand the technical implementation process, lessons learned, accuracy and efficiency of the hydrogeological mapping, and the supervision model's impact on borehole success and sustainability.

Section A: Engagement and Role

1. Can you briefly describe the technical partner's role in the RESET-II project?
2. How were responsibilities divided between Acacia Water, Aquacon Engineering, UNICEF, and local authorities?
3. Were you involved from the design stage, or primarily during implementation?

Section B: Hydrogeological Mapping and Ground-Truthing

4. What methodology was used to develop the hydrogeological overlay maps?
5. How were satellite and RS-GIS data validated on the ground (i.e. ground-truthing)?
6. Were local water offices or government technical teams involved in the mapping process?
Were the local community involved in the mapping or ground truthing process?

Section C: Drilling Supervision and Quality Control

7. What approach was used to supervise drilling contractors on-site?
8. How did the technical supervision contribute to the high drilling success rate (87.5%)?
9. Were there any technical or contractor-related challenges during implementation? If so, how were they addressed?
10. What technical standards or safeguards were used to ensure borehole quality?

Section D: Innovation and Efficiency

11. How did the mapping and supervision model compare in efficiency and cost to traditional drilling approaches?
12. Were there any innovations in drilling location selection, siting accuracy, or energization planning?
13. Was the shorter-than-expected total drilling depth (26% reduction) a technical decision or due to constraints?

Section E: Data Use and Knowledge Sharing

14. Were the groundwater suitability maps or drilling logs shared with MoWE, RWBs, or zonal offices?
15. Was the documentation structured in a way that allows for replication or future planning?
16. Did you contribute to any technical reports, case studies, or dissemination events as part of the project?

Section F: Sustainability and Post-Construction Considerations

17. Was there any assessment of long-term recharge, sustainability, or risk of over-extraction at the sites?
18. Were community or institutional actors trained or oriented on borehole management?
19. Were exit strategies or maintenance guidance included in your engagement?

Section G: Reflection and Recommendations

20. What were the top three technical lessons learned from the RESET-II project?
21. What would you recommend improving future groundwater mapping and supervision partnerships in Ethiopia or similar settings?

Checklist for KIIs Zonal Water Bureaus

Purpose:

To understand the zonal bureau's involvement in facilitating and verifying implementation, supporting woreda-level planning, engaging in groundwater data use, and contributing to the long-term sustainability of RESET-II-supported water supply systems.

Section A: Role in Implementation and Oversight

1. What was the role of your Zonal Water Bureau in the implementation of the RESET-II project?
2. Were you involved in verifying drilling sites, contractor performance, or site handover?
3. Did you liaise between the Regional Water Bureau and woreda offices on any technical or coordination matters?

Section B: Engagement in Planning and Groundwater Data Use

4. Were you provided access to the groundwater suitability maps or hydrogeological data developed under the project?
5. How have you used this data in local or zonal water supply planning?
6. Has the zonal team received any orientation or technical support on interpreting or applying this data?

Section C: Support to Woredas and Community Systems

7. Have you provided any technical support to woreda offices or WASHCOMs involved in operating project-installed water systems?
8. Are you involved in monitoring borehole functionality or maintenance at the zonal level?
9. Have you faced any challenges in ensuring sustainability or follow-up support post-construction?

Section D: Capacity and Coordination

10. Did any staff from your office participate in RESET-II-related training or capacity-building activities?
11. Are there capacity gaps that limit your office's ability to manage or supervise groundwater-based systems?
12. How effective was coordination with UNICEF, RWBs, and implementing partners during the project?

Section E: Sustainability and Management Support

13. Are tariff collection or O&M systems being monitored at zonal level? If so, what trends have you observed?
14. Are there zonal funds, contingency mechanisms, or technical support frameworks in place to respond to breakdowns or major repairs?
15. Have any water safety plans or management tools been institutionalized with your support?

Section F: Learning and Recommendations

16. Has your office adopted any tools or practices from RESET-II in other projects or areas?
17. What are your reflections on the sustainability and local ownership of the RESET-II water systems?
18. What recommendations would you make to strengthen the zonal role in future groundwater and climate-resilient WASH interventions?

Checklist for KIIs with Implementing Partners

Purpose:

To gather insights on the operational role of implementing partners in supporting field-level execution, community engagement, equity and inclusion, coordination with government actors, and sustainability planning.

Section A: Engagement in RESET-II

1. What specific roles and responsibilities did your organization have under the RESET-II WASH component?
2. Which woredas or clusters were you responsible for?
3. Were you involved in borehole site selection, infrastructure works, or post-construction support?

Section B: Community Engagement and Inclusion

4. How did your team engage with communities during project planning and implementation?
5. Were women, persons with disabilities, or other marginalized groups actively involved in design or decision-making?
6. What steps were taken to ensure inclusive infrastructure (e.g., accessible water points)?

Section C: Implementation Challenges and Adaptation

7. What were the main operational challenges you encountered (e.g. security, logistics, contractor coordination)?
8. How did your organization adapt or respond to these challenges?
9. Were you involved in monitoring drilling or supervising contractors? If yes, how was that managed?

Section D: Coordination with Government and UNICEF

10. How was coordination structured between your organization, UNICEF, and relevant government actors (e.g. RWBs, woredas)?
11. Did you participate in any joint planning, reviews, or learning sessions with MoWE or UNICEF?
12. Were roles and responsibilities clearly defined across partners?

Section E: Post-Construction Support and Follow-Up

13. Were you involved in supporting community water management structures (e.g. WASHCOMs)?
14. Was there any training, capacity-building, or tariff setting support provided post-construction?
15. Is your organization still active in RESET-II intervention areas, and if so, in what capacity?

Section F: Sustainability and Equity Outcomes

16. In your view, are the RESET-II water systems sustainable? Why or why not?
17. Did the project significantly reduce water collection time, cost, or improve health for communities you served?
18. Were there any equity gaps that emerged during implementation (e.g. unserved populations, accessibility issues)?

Section G: Reflections and Learning

19. What were the top three successes your organization contributed to under RESET-II?
20. What recommendations would you make for future WASH programmes in drought-affected areas?

Checklist for KIIs Sector Partners/ Donors

Purpose:

To understand how RESET-II aligned with broader sector strategies, supported coordination and value addition across actors, and contributed to learning, replication, or policy dialogue at the national or regional level.

Section A: Strategic Alignment and Coherence

1. From your perspective, how well did the RESET-II WASH component align with EU/UNICEF priorities and sector goals (e.g. SDG 6, LNOB)?
2. Did the project contribute to the objectives of the ONE-WASH Programme or other sector frameworks?
3. Was the project informed by, or linked to, other regional or national donor-funded WASH initiatives?

Section B: Coordination and Partnership Synergies

4. What coordination mechanisms were used to engage RESET-II sector actors at federal, regional, and local levels?
5. Were there specific instances of complementarity, resource-sharing, or joint implementation between RESET-II and other projects?
6. Were there any overlaps, redundancies, or operational conflicts? If so, how were they managed?

Section C: Innovation, Learning, and Scale-Up

7. How was RESET-II perceived in terms of introducing or scaling innovation (e.g., satellite-based groundwater mapping, contractor supervision models)?
8. Were there formal channels for sharing technical learning, tools, or results with the wider sector?
9. Has any learning or technical approach from RESET-II been replicated or adopted by other programmes, donors, or working groups?

Section D: Policy and System Influence

10. Did the project contribute to any policy shifts, strategic planning tools, or updates to technical guidelines?
11. Was RESET-II referenced in policy dialogue, budget discussions, or national planning processes?
12. How do you see RESET-II's contribution to climate-resilient WASH or institutional strengthening agendas?

Section E: Reflections and Sector-wide Recommendations

13. In your view, what has been RESET-II's most valuable contribution to Ethiopia's WASH sector?
14. What are the remaining challenges in harmonizing donor and government efforts in the WASH sector?
15. What are your top recommendations for strengthening multi-partner coordination and innovation in future WASH programmes?

Checklist for KIIs with Local Health Service Providers

Purpose:

To explore the perceived health impacts of RESET-II-supported water supply interventions, including changes in disease patterns, time savings for caregivers, hygiene behaviour, and integration with local health initiatives.

Section A: Linkage Between Water Access and Health

1. Were you aware of the RESET-II project activities in this community or catchment area?
2. Have any water supply systems from the project directly served your health facility or nearby households?
3. Did you notice any changes in health indicators (e.g., waterborne diseases) following the water supply improvements?

Section B: Waterborne Diseases and Service Demand

4. Have you observed any changes in the incidence of diarrhoea, cholera, typhoid, or skin infections in the past year?
5. Are there seasonal differences in disease patterns, and has the water system contributed to reducing peak caseloads?
6. Has there been a decrease in the number of patients—especially women and children—reporting preventable water-related illnesses?

Section C: Hygiene and Behavioural Changes

7. Have you observed any changes in hygiene behaviours (e.g., handwashing, safe water storage) since the project?
8. Have any community outreach, health promotion, or school health activities integrated messages around the new water supply?
9. Did the project include your facility or staff in water safety training, hygiene promotion, or risk communication?

Section D: Facility-Level Impacts (if applicable)

10. Does your health facility have reliable access to clean water as a result of RESET-II?
11. Has the water system improved infection control, service quality, or staff workload at your facility?
12. Are there any concerns with water reliability, quality, or storage at the facility?

Section E: Collaboration and Reporting

13. Were you involved in any monitoring or reporting related to the RESET-II intervention?
14. Is your facility consulted when new water points are planned or evaluated?
15. Do you share information on disease outbreaks or trends with water management stakeholders (e.g., WASHCOMs, woreda officers)?

Section F: Reflections and Recommendations

16. In your experience, what are the most significant health benefits resulting from the RESET-II water supply intervention?
17. What gaps remain in linking water infrastructure with public health outcomes?
18. What recommendations would you offer for integrating WASH and health efforts more effectively in future programmes?

Checklist for KIIs with WASH Executive Committee / Village Leaders

Purpose:

To understand the village-level governance, leadership engagement, community involvement, sustainability efforts, and perceptions of the RESET-II WASH interventions.

Section A: Community Awareness and Leadership Involvement

1. When and how were you first informed about the RESET-II WASH project?
2. What was your role in supporting or overseeing project activities in your village?

Section B: Community Engagement and Participation

3. How did the community participate in the planning and implementation of the water supply activities?
4. Were local communities involved in site selection or community mobilization? Were marginalized groups (e.g. women, persons with disabilities) actively included?
5. What mechanisms exist for gathering community feedback or resolving complaints?

Section C: Operations and Local Governance

6. Who is responsible for day-to-day operation and maintenance of the water system? Probe around his/her designation in WASHCOM, gender and social status
7. Is there a functional WASH Committee? How often do they meet? Is the meeting point safe, accessible and the time convenient for both men, women, boys, girls and PWD?

Section D: Financial Management and Sustainability

8. Does the village collect any form of tariff or user contribution?
9. Are the collected funds sufficient for regular maintenance and emergency repairs?
10. Are financial records maintained and accessible to the community?

Section E: Training, Capacity, and Future Needs

11. Have local leaders or community members received any training through RESET-II? If yes, please provide training topic, number of participants (gender segregated) and year of training.
12. What additional support (technical, financial, or institutional) is needed to sustain the water system?
13. What lessons from this project could be useful for future WASH interventions?

Section F: Reflections and Recommendations

14. What do you consider the most important benefits brought by the project?
15. What were the key challenges encountered during implementation? Probe: around affordability, accessibility, availability and water quality
16. What would you recommend for future projects in your village or similar areas?

Annex 11: Checklists for Focus Group Discussions

Checklist for FGD with Women (Caregivers / Water Users)

Purpose:

To understand how RESET-II affected women's and caregivers' daily lives through changes in access to water, time burden, household responsibilities, health outcomes, and inclusion in decision-making.

Facilitation Notes:

- Group size: 6–10 participants
- Group composition: Adult women and primary water collectors/caregivers
- Language: Use local language with trained female facilitator where possible
- Setting: Private and comfortable space within the community
- Materials: Flipchart, markers, printed maps (if needed), attendance sheet

Section A: Water Access and Use

1. What was your main source of water before the RESET-II project? What is it now?
2. How far do you travel now to fetch water compared to before? Do you feel safe when travelling to the water collection point?
3. How much time do you spend collecting water daily?
4. Is the water you receive from the project sufficient for daily needs (drinking, cooking, washing)?
5. Is the water supply available consistently? Are there times when it stops?

Section B: Impact on Daily Life and Responsibilities

6. What activities were you or your daughters unable to do before due to time spent collecting water?
7. Since the project, have you or your daughters had more time for other things? If yes, what? (Probe: education, income generation, caregiving, rest)
8. Has water access made household chores or caregiving easier? How?

Section C: Health, Hygiene, and Water Quality

9. Have you noticed any health improvements in your household (e.g. fewer cases of diarrhoea)?
10. Do you think the water from the new source is clean and safe?
11. Are there any water quality issues (taste, colour, smell)?
12. Do you treat water at home? If yes, how?

Section D: Inclusion and Participation

13. Were women in your community consulted during planning or implementation of the project?
14. Are there women in the WASHCOM or other groups managing the water point?
15. Do you feel your voice is heard when there are issues with water supply?

Section E: Reflections and Recommendations

16. What do you see as the biggest benefit of this water project for women and families?
17. Are there any challenges you still face with water supply?
18. What would you recommend improving future water projects in your community?

Checklist for FGD with WASHCOM Members

Purpose:

To understand the capacity, role, and challenges of WASHCOMs in operating, maintaining, and sustaining water supply infrastructure developed under the RESET-II project.

Facilitation Notes:

- Group size: 6–10 active WASHCOM members (ensure diversity: gender, age, background)
- Language: Local, with translated checklist if needed
- Facilitators: Use trained facilitators familiar with WASH systems
- Tools: Flipcharts, markers, copy of WASHCOM records if available

Section A: Formation and Functioning

1. When and how was your WASHCOM formed? Who supported or trained you?
2. What are your key responsibilities?
3. How often do you meet as a committee? Are the timing, location and duration (meeting length) convenient for all members?
4. Do you maintain any records (e.g., user lists, fees collected, maintenance logs)?

Section B: Operation and Maintenance

5. Is the water source under your management currently functional?
6. How do you handle regular maintenance and small repairs?
7. What do you do when a major technical fault occurs?
8. Do you have a contact or support mechanism with the government or NGO for technical issues?

Section C: Tariff and Financial Management

9. Do households in your area pay a regular water fee?
10. How much is collected per household per month?
11. Do you have a bank account to store funds?
12. Are current funds sufficient for operations and any major breakdowns?
13. Are there savings specifically set aside for emergency repairs?

Section D: Inclusion and Governance

14. Are women represented in your committee? If yes, in what roles?
15. Are persons with disabilities involved or consulted in your WASHCOM? If yes, in what roles?
16. Do all members of the community feel they can report problems or make suggestions to your committee?
17. Do you have any complaint or feedback mechanisms in place?

Section E: Training and Capacity

18. Have you received any training from RESET-II or other agencies? (Probe: water quality monitoring, recordkeeping, chlorination) If yes, please provide training topic, number of participants (gender and age segregated) and year of training.
19. Do you feel confident managing technical, financial, and user-related issues?
19. What other support or training do you think your WASHCOM needs?

Section F: Reflection and Future Support

21. What is the biggest achievement of your WASHCOM since the water system was installed? Probe for if water collection time reduced; women and girls got time for education, income generating activities, community events; health problems reduced, increased health follow ups, MHH, reduced risk of GBV
22. What are the main challenges you face in keeping the system working?

23. What would help you sustain the system long term?
24. What advice would you give to other communities forming new WASHCOMs?

Checklist for FGD with School Management Committees and Teachers

Purpose:

To understand how improved water access under RESET-II has influenced school operations, student health, hygiene behaviour, and inclusion of marginalized children.

Facilitation Notes:

- Group size: 6–10 participants (mix of school head, teachers, hygiene focal person, committee members)
- Location: A private space within the school premises
- Tools: Flipchart, markers, copy of school WASH records (if available)

Section A: Water Access and Infrastructure

1. Did your school benefit from the RESET-II water supply project (e.g. new connection, access to nearby water source)?
2. What type of water source is currently available for students and staff?
3. Is the water source reliable and functional throughout the school day?

Section B: Impact on Attendance and Learning

4. Have you observed any changes in student attendance since the water source was improved?
5. Has access to water reduced lateness or absenteeism, especially among girls?
6. Are students more attentive or healthier due to improved water and hygiene?

Section C: Hygiene Practices and Health Outcomes

7. Are students able to wash hands regularly at school?
8. Are there sufficient facilities for menstrual hygiene management (e.g. private washrooms, water supply)?
9. Have there been fewer waterborne illnesses reported at school since the project?

Section D: Inclusion of Marginalized Groups

10. Are children with disabilities able to use the school water and sanitation facilities independently?
11. Were the design or location of the facilities adapted to support access for children with special needs?
12. Were school committees or teachers consulted in the planning or placement of water infrastructure?

Section E: Involvement in Implementation and Monitoring

13. Did your school interact with the project team or local authorities during RESET-II implementation?
14. Have any teachers or school committee members received hygiene promotion or water safety training?
15. Are you involved in monitoring water supply functionality or reporting issues?

Section F: Reflections and Recommendations

16. What are the most noticeable changes the water project brought to your school?
17. What challenges remain with school WASH facilities?
18. What would you recommend for future water or hygiene projects in schools?

Checklist for FGD with Persons with Disabilities (PWDs)

Purpose:

To assess how persons with disabilities experienced the RESET-II water supply interventions, including accessibility of infrastructure, participation in community structures, and remaining social or physical barriers.

Facilitation Notes:

- Group size: 5–8 PWDs (or caregivers), ensure diversity in type of disability and gender
- Language: Use inclusive communication (with support personnel if needed)
- Venue: Physically accessible and quiet location
- Optional: Conduct separate discussions with caregivers if needed

Section A: Access to Water Before and After the Project

1. Before the project, how did you or your family members access water?
2. What challenges did you face in collecting or using water?
3. Has anything changed after the RESET-II project was implemented?
4. Is the water source now easier or more difficult to reach?

Section B: Accessibility of Water Infrastructure

5. Can you independently use the water point (e.g. reach the tap, operate the handle)?
6. Is the path to the water point smooth, safe, and accessible?
7. Are there any design elements that make it easier or harder for you to use?
 - (Probe: platform height, ramps, distance, surface, queueing arrangements)

Section C: Participation and Representation

8. Were persons with disabilities consulted or involved in project discussions?
9. Are any persons with disabilities part of the WASHCOM or other community water committees?
10. Do you feel your needs were considered during the planning or construction of the water system?
11. If there is a complaint or issue, do you know how to report it?

Section D: Impact on Daily Life

12. Has access to improved water affected your health, independence, or participation in daily life?
13. Has it made it easier for your caregiver or family to support you?
14. Has it helped with personal hygiene, household work, or attending school/work?

Section E: Recommendations and Reflections

15. What changes would make the water point more accessible for you?
16. What could be done to better involve persons with disabilities in future projects?
17. Do you have any feedback on how the community or water committee has supported you?

Checklist for FGD with Adolescent/ Youth 14 Years and Above

Purpose:

To assess time saved in water collection, changes in school attendance and study time, infrastructure inclusivity for girls, children with disabilities, and out-of-school children.

Facilitation Notes:

- Group size: 6–10 adolescents (mix of girls and boys, include out-of-school children and children with disabilities where feasible)
- Language: Use child-friendly, inclusive language; ensure local dialects are used
- Venue: Safe, private, familiar space such as school compound or community centre
- Facilitator: Preferably same-gender facilitators where culturally appropriate
- Ethical considerations: Obtain verbal assent from adolescents and consent from caregivers

Section A: Water Collection Before and After RESET-II

1. Where did your household collect water from before the new water point was installed?
2. How much time did you usually spend collecting water each day?
3. Since the new water source was built, has the time you spend collecting water changed? How?
4. Do you still help with water collection? If yes, how often and how far is it?

Section B: Impact on School and Study Time

5. Has the new water source affected your ability to attend school regularly?
6. Has your study time at home or school improved since the new water supply started?
7. For those not in school: has time saved been used for other activities (e.g. tutoring, chores, work)?
8. Are you more or less tired now after collecting water compared to before?

Section C: Inclusivity of Water Infrastructure

9. Is the water source easy for you and your friends to reach and use? Probe for safety (GBV) such as lighting, terrain and other associated risks
10. Are there children in your community who cannot use the water point easily? Why? (Probe: physical barriers, distance, crowding, stigma)
11. Are girls and children with disabilities able to use the water source comfortably?

Section D: Menstrual Hygiene (This section shall be applied only during FGD with Adolescent Girls)

13. Are there separate or private spaces for girls to manage menstruation at or near school or home?
14. Has access to water improved your ability to manage menstruation?
15. Are school toilets and washing areas safe and private for girls during their periods?
16. Do you receive any support or education on menstrual hygiene?

Section E: Perceptions and Remaining Challenges

16. How would you describe the water quality from the new source? (Taste, smell, appearance)
17. Is water always available when you need it?
18. What problems still exist in your area related to water?

Section F: Suggestions and Feedback

19. What would make water collection easier or safer for children like you?
20. What changes would help more children go to school or study more?
21. What can be done to help girls, out-of-school children, and children with disabilities use water services better?

Annex 12: Checklist for Case Studies

22. Key Areas	Description
1. Contribution to Gender Equality and Social Inclusion	
Gender-Responsive Access	How have women, girls, boys, and men from marginalized groups including persons with disabilities benefited from WASH interventions? Are facilities gender-segregated, safe, and culturally appropriate?
Inclusive Decision-Making	Are women and marginalized groups meaningfully included in WASH planning, implementation, and management? Are their voices heard and reflected in decisions?
Empowerment Outcomes	How has the programme contributed to increased confidence, leadership, or skills among women, youth, or persons with disabilities in WASH-related roles?
Disability Inclusion	Are WASH facilities designed with universal accessibility features? Are messages and training adapted to diverse needs (e.g. Braille, sign language, simplified formats)?
2. Long-Term Change and Resilience	
Lasting Benefits	What aspects of WASH improvements are still visible or functional since the RESET-II intervention? Are there observed long-term behavioural or systemic changes (e.g. hygiene practices, safe water use)?
Community Resilience	Are WASH systems or practices helping communities manage climate risks (e.g., droughts, floods)? Have new or adapted practices emerged?
Behavioural Change	Are WASH-related behaviours (e.g. handwashing, latrine use, menstrual hygiene) continuing over time? What reinforces or hinders these behaviours?
3. Sustainability of Systems and Institutions	
Community Ownership	Are community WASH committees still active? Are responsibilities clearly allocated among members (with gender balance)?
Operation and Maintenance	Are maintenance mechanisms in place and functioning (e.g. fee collection, repairs, spare part access)? Is there a local entity or person responsible?
Policy and System Integration	Have WASH practices or innovations been institutionalized within local government or community systems? Are any RESET-II tools or approaches still in use?
4. Impact on Individuals, Families, and Communities	
Household-Level Impact	How has household life changed due to improved WASH? Are there improvements in workload, time savings, education, or health?
Gendered Impact	Has women's workload related to water collection decreased? Do girls now attend school more regularly? Are there shifts in gender roles within households?
Environmental Impact	Have RESET-II interventions contributed to improved local water sources, reduced pollution, or environmental conservation?
5. Community Perceptions and Testimonies	
Community Reflections	How do different community members (women, men, youth, elders, persons with disabilities) describe the changes brought by RESET-II? Do they consider the changes lasting and meaningful?
Challenges and Recommendations	What limitations or remaining gaps do community members raise? What improvements do they suggest for the future?
Personal Stories	Document 1–2 detailed testimonials per site (ensuring diversity of voices: women, persons with disabilities, youth, etc.) that illustrate the personal journey and transformation enabled by the project.

6. Documentation and Consent	
Photos and Visuals	Take photographs of WASH infrastructure (e.g. toilets, handwashing stations, water points), accessibility features, and climate-resilient adaptations.
Environmental Context	Document the surrounding terrain or climatic challenges (e.g., flood-prone areas, drought conditions) to show how WASH facilities are adapted.
Consent and Protection	Ensure verbal or written consent for all photos, especially involving women, children, or persons with disabilities. Use standard consent forms and respect privacy.

Annex 13: Ethical Review Approval by HML-IRB

Attachments:

- Revised Informed Consent Form – Water Source Observation.pdf
- Revised Informed Consent Form – Key Informant Interviews.pdf
- Revised Informed Consent Form – Case Study Participants.pdf
- Revised Informed Consent Form – Household Survey Participants.pdf
- Revised Informed Consent Form – Focus Group Discussions.pdf
- Revised Child Assent Form.pdf
- Revised Parental Consent Form-FGDs with Children.pdf
- Revised Parental Consent Form – Case Study with Children.pdf
- Ethical Review Approval.pdf



Ethical Review Approval

To: Mussarrat Youssuf

From: HML IRB

Subject: Study #2985

Date: 30-May-2025

Dear Mussarrat Youssuf,

The protocol **Summative Evaluation of the Improving Access to Safely Managed Water Supply in the Resilience Building Programme for Ethiopia RESET-II Woredas in Ethiopia, 2985** was assessed through a research ethics review by Health Media Lab Institutional Review Board. This study's human subjects' protection protocols, as stated in the materials submitted, received research ethics review approval on 30-May-2025.

You may rely on this IRB for review and continuing ethical oversight of this study. You and your project staff remain responsible for ensuring compliance with the IRB's determinations. Those responsibilities include, but are not limited to: 1) ensuring prompt reporting to HML IRB of proposed changes in this study's design, subject risks, informed consent, or other human protection protocols and providing copies of any revised materials; 2) conducting the research activity in accordance with the terms of the IRB approval until any proposed changes have been reviewed and approved by the IRB, except when necessary to mitigate hazards to subjects; 3) promptly reporting any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others in the course of this study; and 4) notifying the IRB when your study is complete.

The approval of your study is valid through 29-May-2026, by which time you must submit a continuing review report either closing the study or requesting permission to continue for another year. Please submit your report by **[ACDUE DATE]** so that the IRB has time to review and approve your report prior to the expiration date. For instructions on how to manage an approved study refer to: [How to Manage an Approved Study](#).

Health Media Lab IRB is authorized by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Human Research Protections (IRB #00001211, IORG #0000850), and has DHHS Federal-Wide Assurance approval (FWA #00001102).

If you have any questions, please contact us at admin@hmlirb.com.

Sincerely,



D. Michael Anderson PhD, MPH
IRB Chair & Human Research Protections Director
dma@hmlirb.com

Health Media Lab, Inc.
1101 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 450 Washington, DC 20036 USA
+1 202.246.8504 info@hmlirb.com www.HMLIRB.com

Annex 14: Consent and Assent Forms

Consent Form for Household Survey Participants

*These will be translated into Ethiopian language

Dear Respondent,

Hello, my name is _____. I am part of a team doing a study to learn how water services have helped people in your area. This study is being done with support from UNICEF, the European Union, and the Ethiopian government. Your household was randomly chosen to take part in this survey.

We would like to ask you about your household's access to water, its quality, cost, and how it affects your health. The survey will take about 25 to 30 minutes.

Participation in this interview is entirely voluntary. You may choose to skip any question or withdraw from the interview at any time, without facing any negative consequences. While there are no physical risks associated with this discussion, some questions may touch upon sensitive topics and may cause discomfort. If at any point you feel uneasy, you are encouraged to refrain from responding to those questions.

Your answers will be private. We will not use your name in any report. We will keep all information safe and combine your answers with others so no one can identify you.

We may take photos or short videos of the water points and facilities (not of people). These images are only for technical reporting. We will not take your photo unless you agree.

Your responses will be written into a report, shared with UNICEF and project partners, and stored securely for future planning and learning.

There is no payment for taking part. There are no expected risks. While there may be no direct benefit to you, the findings may help improve future water services.

If you tell us something that shows a child or another person is being harmed or is in danger, we must report it to keep them safe.

If you have any questions, you can contact:

- Dr. Mussie Alemayehu: mossalex75@gmail.com | +251 914 749082
- Dr. Araya Abrha: araya.medhanyie@gmail.com | +251 933 222222
- Prof. Haftu Berhe: tiatron@gmail.com | +251 988 5769251
- Mr. Niaz Ullah Khan: niaz@awfco.net | +92 300 5111882

Consent Statement: I understand the information above. I agree to take part in the household survey.

Name: _____

Relationship to Head of Household: _____

Date: _____

Signature/Thumbprint: _____

Consent Form for FGDs

*These will be translated into Ethiopian language

NOTE FOR FACILITATOR

REMEMBER!

CONFIDENTIALITY – 1) tell participants they are NOT being asked to share information about individual issues/cases; 2) try to find a quiet/private place to have the discussion

INFORMED CONSENT – 1) explain the purpose of the activity; 2) participation is in group and voluntary

SAFETY – if you feel any staff conducting this activity or participants may be at risk, do not proceed with the activity. When probing, no information linking to individual survivors should be asked.

Conclusion: At the end of this discussion, thank the participants for their participation. Remind them to contact relevant agencies if they have any concerns.

Date: _____ Location of FGD: _____

Facilitator: _____ Note Taker: _____ Translator (if applicable): _____

Time FGD started: _____ Time FGD ended: _____

Translation used: Yes/ No

If yes, the translation was from _____ to _____

Sex of FGD participants: Female/ Male

Age of FGD participants: 10-17 years/ 18-19 years/ 20-29 years/ 30-39 years/ Over 40 years

List Other Key Demographics (caretakers, participants with physical or intellectual disabilities, etc.)

Hello, my name is _____. I am part of a team doing a group discussion to learn about your experience with water supply in your community. The discussion will take about 60 minutes. Participation in this discussion is entirely voluntary. You may choose to skip any question or withdraw from the interview at any time, without facing any negative consequences. While there are no physical risks associated with this discussion, some questions may touch upon sensitive topics and may cause discomfort. If at any point you feel uneasy, you are encouraged to refrain from responding to those questions.

We will not use your name in any report. We ask everyone in the group not to share what others say outside the discussion, but we cannot promise full privacy because other people are present. We, as the research team, will keep what you say private.

We may take photos or videos of the water facilities, not of participants. If group photos are taken, we will ask for permission first. These will only be used in the evaluation report.

We will make an audio recording of this discussion, if you agree. This helps us write your comments correctly. The audio will be stored safely and deleted after transcription.

Your responses will be written into a report, shared with UNICEF and project partners, and stored securely for future planning and learning.

There is no payment for joining. There may be no direct benefit to you, but your views can help improve services for your community.

If you tell us something that shows someone is being harmed or is unsafe, we must report it to protect them.

If you have any questions, you can contact:

- Dr. Mussie Alemayehu: mossalex75@gmail.com | +251 914 749082
- Dr. Araya Abrha: araya.medhanyie@gmail.com | +251 933 222222
- Prof. Haftu Berhe: tiatron@gmail.com | +251 988 5769251
- Mr. Niaz Ullah Khan: niaz@awfco.net | +92 300 5111882

Consent Statement: I understand the discussion purpose and agree to take part.

Name: _____

Date: _____

Signature/Thumbprint: _____

- ☐ I agree to group photos/videos being taken (optional)
- ☐ I agree to sharing group feedback with partners (optional)
- ☐ I agree to the discussion being audio recorded for transcription (optional)

Consent Form – Key Informant Interview (KII)

*These will be translated into Ethiopian language

Hello, my name is _____. We are speaking to people who know about water systems. We want to learn from your experience to see what worked well and what can be improved. The interview will take about 45 minutes.

Participation in this interview is entirely voluntary. You may choose to skip any question or withdraw from the interview at any time, without facing any negative consequences. While there are no physical risks associated with this discussion, some questions may touch upon sensitive topics and may cause discomfort. If at any point you feel uneasy, you are encouraged to refrain from responding to those questions.

Your responses will be written into a report, shared with UNICEF and project partners, and stored securely for future planning and learning.

We may include your job title or organization in the report, but only if you agree. Your name will not be used unless you give permission.

We will make an audio recording of this interview, if you agree. This helps us write your comments correctly. The audio will be stored safely and deleted after transcription.

There is no payment. The results may help improve water services in similar regions.

If you have any questions, you can contact:

- Dr. Mussie Alemayehu: mossalex75@gmail.com | +251 914 749082
- Dr. Araya Abrha: araya.medhanyie@gmail.com | +251 933 222222
- Prof. Haftu Berhe: tiatron@gmail.com | +251 988 5769251
- Mr. Niaz Ullah Khan: niaz@awfco.net | +92 300 5111882

Consent Statement:

- ☐ I agree to take part in the interview
- ☐ I agree to my job title being used in reports (optional)
- ☐ I agree to my photo being used (optional)
- ☐ I agree to the interview being audio recorded for transcription (optional)

Name: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Consent Form – Water Source Observation

*These will be translated into Ethiopian language

Hello, my name is _____. As part of the study, we would like to visit and observe how the water source is working. This will help us understand the condition of the facility and whether it is working well.

We may take photos or short videos of the water facility only, not of individuals, unless you give separate permission. The visit will take about 45 to 60 minutes.

Participation in this interview is entirely voluntary. You may choose to skip any question or withdraw from the interview at any time, without facing any negative consequences. While there are no physical risks associated with this discussion, some questions may touch upon sensitive topics and may cause discomfort. If at any point you feel uneasy, you are encouraged to refrain from responding to those questions.

We will not collect names or personal details during the observation.

Your responses will be written into a report, shared with UNICEF and project partners, and stored securely for future planning and learning.

There is no payment. This observation may not directly benefit you, but the findings may help improve future projects.

If you have any questions, you can contact:

- Dr. Mussie Alemayehu: mossalex75@gmail.com | +251 914 749082
- Dr. Araya Abrha: araya.medhanyie@gmail.com | +251 933 222222
- Prof. Haftu Berhe: tiatron@gmail.com | +251 988 5769251
- Mr. Niaz Ullah Khan: niaz@awfco.net | +92 300 5111882

Consent Statement:

- ☐ I agree to observation of the water source
- ☐ I agree to use of photos of the facility (optional)
- ☐ I agree to use of videos of the facility (optional)
- ☐ I agree to use of my personal photos/videos along with the facility (optional)

Name of Community Contact: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Consent Form – Case Study

*These will be translated into Ethiopian language

Hello, my name is _____. We would like to hear your personal story about how water services have affected your life or community. This case study will help us understand the real-life impact of the project. The discussion will take about 45 to 60 minutes.

Participation in this interview is entirely your choice. You can skip any question or stop at any time without any consequence. There is no physical risk, but some questions might make you feel shy or uncomfortable. If at any point you feel uneasy, you are encouraged to refrain from responding to those questions.

With your permission, we may take a photo of you or your surroundings for the report. This is optional.

We will make an audio recording of this interview, if you agree. This helps us write your comments correctly. The audio will be stored safely and deleted after transcription.

Your responses will be written into a report, shared with UNICEF and project partners, and stored securely for future planning and learning. If you prefer, we will not use your real name in any story or report.

There is no payment. There may not be direct benefits for you, but your story can help others understand the value of water services.

If you have any questions, you can contact:

- Dr. Mussie Alemayehu: mossalex75@gmail.com | +251 914 749082
- Dr. Araya Abrha: araya.medhanyie@gmail.com | +251 933 222222
- Prof. Haftu Berhe: tiatron@gmail.com | +251 988 5769251
- Mr. Niaz Ullah Khan: niaz@awfco.net | +92 300 5111882

Consent Statement:

- ☐ I agree to share my story
- ☐ I agree to use of a made-up name (optional)
- ☐ I agree to my photo being used (optional)
- ☐ I agree to the discussion being audio recorded for transcription (optional)

Name: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Parental Consent Form for Focus Group Discussion

*These will be translated into Ethiopian language

Hello, my name is _____. I am part of a team doing a study to learn how water services have helped people in your community. We are supported by UNICEF, the European Union, and the Ethiopian government. We are inviting your child to take part in a group discussion to understand their experience.

We will talk with children about their access to water, hygiene practices, and any changes they've noticed. The discussion will take about 30 to 45 minutes.

Participation in this discussion is entirely voluntary. You and your child may choose to skip any question or withdraw from the interview at any time, without facing any negative consequences. While there are no physical risks associated with this discussion, some questions may touch upon sensitive topics and may cause discomfort. If at any point your child feels uneasy, your child is encouraged to refrain from responding to those questions.

We will protect your child's privacy. We won't use their name in any report. We ask other children to respect privacy, but we cannot promise full confidentiality in a group setting. Our team will encourage respectful behaviour.

Your child responses will be written into a report, shared with UNICEF and project partners, and stored securely for future planning and learning.

We will not take photos or videos of your child unless you give clear permission. These will be used only in reports or presentations.

We will make an audio recording of this interview, if you agree. This helps us write your comments correctly. The audio will be stored safely and deleted after transcription.

There is no payment. There may not be a direct benefit for your child, but their views may help improve future water services.

If your child shares anything that shows someone is in danger, we must report it to protect them.

If you have any questions, you can contact:

- Dr. Mussie Alemayehu: mossalex75@gmail.com | +251 914 749082

- Dr. Araya Abrha: araya.medhanyie@gmail.com | +251 933 222222
- Prof. Haftu Berhe: tiatron@gmail.com | +251 988 5769251
- Mr. Niaz Ullah Khan: niaz@awfco.net | +92 300 5111882

Parental Consent Statement: I have read and understood the information above. I give permission for my child to participate in the group discussion.

Name of Parent/Guardian: _____

Name of Child: _____

Date: _____

Signature/Thumbprint: _____

- ☐ I give permission for my child to appear in a group photo (optional)
- ☐ I give permission for my child's views to be used in reports (without name)
- ☐ I agree to the discussion being audio recorded for transcription (optional)

Parental Consent Form for Case Study

*These will be translated into Ethiopian language

Hello, my name is _____. I am part of a team doing a study to learn how water services have helped people in your community. We are supported by UNICEF, the European Union, and the Ethiopian government. We would like to speak to your child individually to hear about their personal experience with water access.

This interview will take about 30 to 45 minutes and will be done in a quiet, safe place.

Participation in this interview is entirely voluntary. You and your child may choose to skip any question or withdraw from the interview at any time, without facing any negative consequences. While there are no physical risks associated with this discussion, some questions may touch upon sensitive topics and may cause discomfort. If at any point your child feels uneasy, your child is encouraged to refrain from responding to those questions.

Your child responses will be written into a report, shared with UNICEF and project partners, and stored securely for future planning and learning. We will not use their real name unless you and your child say it is okay. We may write a story about your child's experience, but it will not include anything that can identify them unless agreed.

We may take your child's photo with your permission. This will only be used in the evaluation report or presentations.

We will make an audio recording of this interview, if you agree. This helps us write your comments correctly. The audio will be stored safely and deleted after transcription.

There is no payment. There may not be a direct benefit for your child, but their story may help improve water services for others.

If your child says something that shows someone is being harmed or unsafe, we will report it to help keep them safe.

If you have any questions, you can contact:

- Dr. Mussie Alemayehu: mossalex75@gmail.com | +251 914 749082
- Dr. Araya Abrha: araya.medhanyie@gmail.com | +251 933 222222
- Prof. Haftu Berhe: tiatron@gmail.com | +251 988 5769251
- Mr. Niaz Ullah Khan: niaz@awfco.net | +92 300 5111882

Parental Consent Statement: I have read and understood the information above. I give permission for my child to participate in the case study.

Name of Parent/Guardian: _____

Name of Child: _____

Date: _____

Signature/Thumbprint: _____

- ☐ I give permission for my child's photo to be used in the report (optional)
- ☐ I give permission for my child's story to be shared using a made-up name
- ☐ I agree to the interview being audio recorded for transcription (optional)

Child Assent Form – Focus Group Discussions with Adolescents (14–17 years)

*These will be translated into Ethiopian language

Hello, my name is _____. We are doing a group discussion to learn how young people like you use water and how it affects daily life. We are working with UNICEF, the EU, and the government. We would like you to join a small group to talk about water and hygiene in your school or community. This will take about 30 to 45 minutes.

Participation in this discussion is entirely voluntary. You may choose to skip any question or withdraw from the interview at any time, without facing any negative consequences. While there are no physical risks associated with this discussion, some questions may touch upon sensitive topics and may cause discomfort. If at any point you feel uneasy, you are encouraged to refrain from responding to those questions.

We will not write your name in our report. We will ask everyone to keep the discussion private, but we cannot promise that others will not talk about it. We will not take your photo unless you agree. Your responses will be written into a report, shared with UNICEF and project partners, and stored securely for future planning and learning.

We will make an audio recording of this discussion, if you agree. This helps us write your comments correctly. The audio will be stored safely and deleted after transcription.

You will not get money for joining. What you share may help improve water services for other young people.

If you have any concern/ questions, you can contact:

- Dr. Mussie Alemayehu: mossalex75@gmail.com | +251 914 749082
- Dr. Araya Abrha: araya.medhanyie@gmail.com | +251 933 222222
- Prof. Haftu Berhe: tiatron@gmail.com | +251 988 5769251
- Mr. Niaz Ullah Khan: niaz@awfco.net | +92 300 5111882

Do you agree to take part in this group discussion?

Name: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

- ☐ I agree to be part of this group discussion.
- ☐ I agree to have my photo taken for the report (optional)
- ☐ I agree to the discussion being audio recorded for transcription (optional)

Child Assent Form – Case Study Interview with Adolescents (14–17 years)

*These will be translated into Ethiopian language

Hello, my name is _____. We would like to talk with you one-on-one about your experience with water in your school or community. We are working with UNICEF, the EU, and the government to learn how water services affect young people.

This talk will take about 30 to 45 minutes. It will happen in a private place where you feel safe. Participation in this interview is entirely voluntary. You may choose to skip any question or withdraw from the interview at any time, without facing any negative consequences. While there are no physical risks associated with this discussion, some questions may touch upon sensitive topics and may cause discomfort. If at any point you feel uneasy, you are encouraged to refrain from responding to those questions.

We won't use your name in any report. We might write a story about your experience, but only with your permission. We will not take your photo unless you say yes. Your responses will be written shared with UNICEF and project partners and stored securely for future planning and learning.

We will make an audio recording of this interview, if you agree. This helps us write your comments correctly. The audio will be stored safely and deleted after transcription.

There is no reward or payment. Your story might help others improve water services in your area.

If you have any questions, you can contact:

- Dr. Mussie Alemayehu: mossalex75@gmail.com | +251 914 749082
- Dr. Araya Abrha: araya.medhanyie@gmail.com | +251 933 222222
- Prof. Haftu Berhe: tiatron@gmail.com | +251 988 5769251
- Mr. Niaz Ullah Khan: niaz@awfco.net | +92 300 5111882

Do you agree to be part of this interview?

Name: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

- ☐ I agree to take part in the interview.
- ☐ I agree to have my photo used in the report (optional)
- ☐ I agree to share my story with a made-up name
- ☐ I agree to the interview being audio recorded for transcription (optional)

Annex 15: RESET-II Logframe Targets and Achievements

(verified during evaluation)

Level / Indicators	Baseline	Target	Achieved (Project Final Report)	Verified (Evaluation)	Comments by Evaluators
Overall Objective: Contribute to strengthening economic opportunities and resilience of vulnerable communities through improved water access in 41 woredas	0	20% increase by 2020	56.7% of target 82,000	38.9% of target are currently using six functional boreholes; additional 15.9% of target expected after post-construction of two other boreholes	Beneficiaries also supported in livestock rearing and timesaving for livelihoods; however, water safety remains a major concern. The project produced hydrological maps for 39 woredas are used as one of the planning tools along with other techniques, however, there is no significant evidence that the project created hydrological maps have been used for drilling the boreholes and indirectly benefited the users in other areas.
Purpose / Specific Objective: Improve access to safe and sustainable water supply for drought-affected populations in 16 woredas	0	82,000 people	46,470 people	31,817 current users; additional 13,000 users after pending completion	Delays in post construction work due to reliance on government and other financing
Output 1.1: Hydrogeological maps produced	2	41	39 completed	39 verified via KIs	Maps recognized as a planning tool but no strong evidence they guided drilling decisions

Output 2.1: Test productive boreholes drilled	0	16	16	14 productive, but 7 had poor yield (<5 L/s) or water quality problems	50% unsuitable for post-construction due to fluoride/salinity and low discharge
Output 2.2: Water systems constructed and functional	0	14	7	6 functional systems constructed including one borehole (Mubarek) saline and unsuitable for drinking	Major gap from assumption of govt-financed post-drilling works
Output 2.3: Drilling success rate	30–45%	80%	87.5%	87.5% verified across 10 visited sites	Strong technical achievement compared to national average in terms of productive well but only 73.9% of planned depth was achieved (3,932 meters out of planned 5,320 meters) because of limited drilling capacity of some contractors.
Output 3.1: Knowledge dissemination and capacity building	0	20 organizations reached	58 organizations (138 individuals) sensitized; 60 shared results online (2020 workshop)	Awareness confirmed via KIIs, but no workshop reports available to verify participation	Verification gap due to missing documentation
Output 3.2: Government staff trained in mapping techniques	0	5 staff	92 staff trained (87 male, 5 female)	Confirmed via KIIs, but no participant list or training report available	Overachievement in numbers, but weak verification and limited coverage of water quality/ climate-smart approaches

Annex 16: Analysed Household Data Tables

Household Profile			
Gender of Respondent			
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Male	Female
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	95%	5%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	70%	30%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	80%	20%
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	65%	35%
Afar/Adear	Hado	75%	25%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	80%	20%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	95%	5%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	90%	10%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	85%	15%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	90%	10%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		78%	23%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		90%	10%
Overall		83%	18%

female-headed household			
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	15%	85%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	20%	80%
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	30%	70%
Afar/Adear	Hado	40%	60%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	35%	65%

SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0%	100%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	5%	95%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	15%	85%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	15%	85%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		23%	77%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		10%	90%
Overall		18%	82%

Percentage of Household Members			
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Adults (above 18)	Children
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	52%	48%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	44%	56%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	51%	49%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	68%	32%
Afar/Adear	Hado	39%	61%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	45%	55%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	66%	34%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	46%	54%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	31%	69%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	56%	44%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		48%	52%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		48%	52%
Overall		48%	52%

Household size			
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Average	Percentage
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	8.9	12%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	6.95	9%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	9.2	12%

Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	3.95	5%
Afar/Adear	Hado	6.4	8%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	11.2	15%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	7.05	9%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	6.95	9%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	9.4	12%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	5.4	7%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		7.8	62%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		7.2	38%
Overall		7.54	100%

Percentage of Household and Adults with Functional Limitations			
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Adults with Functional Limitation	HH with Adults having functional limitations
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0.0%	0.0%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	1.6%	5.0%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0.0%	0.0%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	1.9%	5.0%
Afar/Adear	Hado	0.0%	0.0%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	1.0%	5.0%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	1.1%	5.0%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	4.7%	15.0%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	11.9%	30.0%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	3.3%	10.0%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		0.7%	2.5%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		4.7%	15.0%
Overall		2.2%	7.5%

Percentage of Household and Children with Functional Limitations			
--	--	--	--

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Children with Functional Limitation	HH with Children having functional limitations
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0.0%	0.0%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	3.8%	15.0%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0.0%	0.0%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0.0%	0.0%
Afar/Adear	Hado	0.0%	0.0%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0.0%	0.0%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0.0%	0.0%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	1.3%	5.0%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	2.3%	15.0%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0.0%	0.0%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		0.6%	2.5%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		1.3%	5.0%
Overall		0.9%	4%

Functional Limitations Adults							
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Seeing, even if wearing glasses	Hearing, even if using a hearing aid	Walking or climbing steps	Remembering or concentrating	With self-care	Communicating
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Afar/Adear	Hado	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	43%	29%	14%	29%	14%	14%

SNNP/Bolosso Sore	Legama	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	50%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		38%	31%	8%	23%	15%	15%
Overall		44%	25%	13%	19%	13%	13%

Functional Limitations Children							
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Seeing, even if wearing glasses	Hearing, even if using a hearing aid	Walking or climbing steps	Remembering or concentrating	With self-care	Communicating
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0%	67%	0%	0%	33%	0%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Amhara/Mertolemaria m	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Afar/Adear	Hado	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0%	0%	33%	67%	67%	33%
SNNP/Bolosso Sore	Legama	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		0%	67%	0%	0%	33%	0%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0%	0%	50%	50%	50%	25%
Overall		0%	29%	29%	29%	43%	14%

Socioeconomic Status				
Own the House				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	100%	0%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	85%	15%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	80%	20%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	70%	30%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	60%	40%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	65%	35%	100%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	100%	0%	100%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	95%	5%	100%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	85%	15%	100%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	85%	15%	100%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		77%	23%	100%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		91%	9%	100%
Overall		83%	18%	100%

Main construction material of house						
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Mud/Thatched	Wood	Brick	Cement/Concrete	Other
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	70%	30%	0%	0%	0%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	65%	35%	0%	0%	0%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Afar/Adear	Hado	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	65%	35%	0%	0%	0%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%

Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources	25%	75%	0%	0%	0%
Overall	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%

Monthly Household Income (ETB)						
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	<2000	2000-5000	5001-10,000	>10,000	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	20%	45%	15%	20%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	30%	25%	45%	0%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	5%	45%	35%	15%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	0%	90%	10%	0%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	90%	10%	0%	0%	100%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	65%	30%	5%	0%	100%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0%	50%	40%	10%	100%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	50%	45%	0%	5%	100%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	95%	5%	0%	0%	100%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		41%	36%	18%	6%	100%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		53%	33%	11%	4%	100%
Overall		46%	35%	15%	5%	100%

Primary source of income								
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Farming/Livestock	Wage labour	Small business/trade	Remittances	Govt. support	Employment	Other
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	60%	0%	0%	0%	25%	5%	10%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	90%	5%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Afar/Adear	Hado	95%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	95%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	70%	15%	0%	0%	0%	15%	0%

Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	85%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		88%	4%	1%	0%	4%	2%	2
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		88%	5%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4
Overall		88%	5%	1%	0%	3%	3%	3

Access to water supply

Types of Water sources

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Project- installed piped supply (EU- RESET)	Rainwater harvesting	River/stream /Pond	Unprotected dug well/ spring	Water trucking	Any other piped supply	Bottled water	Protected dug well/ spring	Other	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemar	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	60%	5%	0%	10%	0%	25%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0%	20%	80%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0%	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	0%	0%	0%	100%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0%	0%	45%	0%	0%	55%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		68%	4%	22%	2%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0%	0%	36%	5%	35%	24%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Overall	41%	3%	28%	3%	14%	12%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Users	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Nonusers	0%	4%	47%	5%	24%	20%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Water source location

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Outside premises (>500m)	Outside premises (within 500m)	In the yard/premises	Inside the house	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	N/A				
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	95%	5%	0%	0%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	60%	40%	0%	0%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	70%	10%	20%	0%	100%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	67%	33%	0%	0%	100%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	70%	30%	0%	0%	100%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	75%	25%	0%	0%	100%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	N/A				
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		88%	9%	3%	0%	100%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		71%	29%	0%	0%	100%
Overall		83%	15%	2%	0%	100%
Users		89%	11%	0%	0%	100%
Nonusers		77%	19%	4%	0%	100%

Time to fetch water

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	<15 min	15–30 min	30–60 min	>1 hour	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0%	45%	55%	0%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0%	45%	50%	5%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	5%	65%	30%	0%	100%

Time to fetch water						
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	<15 min	15–30 min	30–60 min	>1 hour	Total
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0%	20%	60%	20%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	13%	0%	0%	88%	100%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	10%	15%	30%	45%	100%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	20%	50%	30%	0%	100%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	5%	20%	35%	40%	100%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	40%	60%	0%	0%	100%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		3%	30%	34%	34%	100%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		19%	36%	24%	21%	100%
Overall		9%	33%	30%	29%	100%
Users		1%	30%	41%	27%	100%
Nonusers		8%	23%	39%	30%	100%

primarily responsible for collecting water						
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Woman	Man	Girl	Boy	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	40%	35%	0%	25%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	65%	0%	35%	0%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	45%	5%	45%	5%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	85%	0%	15%	0%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	31%	19%	13%	38%	100%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	8%	17%	42%	33%	100%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	45%	5%	35%	15%	100%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	80%	0%	20%	0%	100%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	N/A				
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		62%	9%	18%	10%	100%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		50%	6%	31%	13%	100%

Overall	58%	8%	22%	11%	100%
Users	66%	10%	17%	7%	100%
Nonusers	51%	7%	27%	15%	100%

hours/day is water supplied						
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	<30 minutes	30 minutes– 1 hours	>1-2 Hours	> More than 2 hours	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0%	76%	18%	6%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A				
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	25%	38%	0%	38%	100%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	N/A				
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama					
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		0%	15%	3%	82%	100%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		11%	16%	0%	74%	100%
Overall		2%	15%	3%	80%	100%
Users		0%	10%	4%	87%	100%
Nonusers		8%	33%	0%	58%	100%

water from this source sufficient for daily needs						
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	55%	35%	10%	0%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	55%	45%	0%	0%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0%	65%	30%	5%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	0%	5%	75%	20%	100%

Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	5%	60%	35%	0%	100%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	15%	10%	5%	70%	100%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0%	20%	30%	50%	100%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		36%	35%	25%	4%	100%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		16%	20%	9%	55%	100%
Overall		28%	29%	19%	25%	100%
Users		39%	30%	26%	5%	100%
Nonusers		20%	28%	14%	38%	100%

water from your main source available, today				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	100%	0%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	50%	50%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	100%	0%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	50%	50%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	100%	0%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	90%	10%	100%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	70%	30%	100%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	100%	0%	100%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	100%	0%	100%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	100%	0%	100%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		82%	18%	100%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		93%	8%	100%
Overall		86%	14%	100%
Users		82%	18%	100%
Nonusers		89%	11%	100%

satisfied with the current water source							
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0%	70%	0%	0%	30%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	10%	35%	5%	45%	5%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	10%	90%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0%	20%	35%	35%	10%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	0%	65%	0%	35%	0%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0%	0%	15%	85%	0%	100%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	25%	5%	5%	5%	60%	100%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0%	40%	10%	50%	0%	100%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	100%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0%	0%	0%	95%	5%	100%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		3%	47%	9%	33%	8%	100%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		6%	11%	4%	56%	23%	100%
Overall		5%	33%	7%	43%	14%	100%
Users		5%	68%	6%	12%	9%	100%
Nonusers		4%	8%	8%	64%	17%	100%

Average monthly spending on drinking water (including any fees or purchases)		
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Total ETB
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	300
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	1355
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	50
Afar/Adear	Hado	591
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	137.5
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	960
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	248.5
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	112.5

SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	405
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		405.58
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		431.5
Overall		415.95
Users		555.12
Nonusers		319.24

Other purposes do you use the water supplied to your household - multiple choice questions

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Cooking	Personal hygiene (e.g. bathing, handwashing)	Cleaning and household chores	Watering home garden or kitchen garden	Agriculture	Livestock or poultry care	None	Other
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	100%	100%	100%	0%	5%	95%	0%	0%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	100%	50%	30%	0%	0%	30%	0%	0%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	100%	100%	75%	15%	10%	90%	0%	0%
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0%	0%	42%	0%	0%	0%	58%	0%
Afar/Adear	Hado	100%	100%	90%	5%	0%	5%	0%	0%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		85%	79%	75%	5%	4%	50%	9%	0%

Health and service quality

illnesses in past 30 days - multiple choice questions

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Diarrhoea	Cholera	Typhoid	Skin infections	Other	None
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	50%	0%	15%	0%	0%	45%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	90%
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%	80%
Afar/Adear	Hado	100%	0%	30%	55%	0%	0%

Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	30%	0%	5%	0%	0%	65%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	25%	0%	20%	5%	25%	30%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	40%	0%	10%	0%	0%	55%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	15%	15%	0%	5%	5%	75%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0%	0%	5%	0%	20%	50%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		32%	0%	12%	9%	0%	63%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		20%	4%	9%	3%	13%	53%
Overall		27%	2%	11%	7%	5%	59%
Users		29%	0%	11%	13%	0%	67%
Non-Users		25%	0%	13%	2%	19%	53%

improvements in health since using project installed water source

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	100%	0%	0%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	100%	0%	0%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	100%	0%	0%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	42%	58%	0%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	100%	0%	0%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		91%	9%	0%	100%

Quality of water

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	20%	80%	0%	0%	0%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	5%	45%	0%	25%	25%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	25%	70%	5%	0%	0%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0%	10%	65%	20%	5%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	0%	0%	90%	10%	0%	100%

Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0%	5%	10%	85%	0%	100%
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	30%	45%	0%	5%	20%	100%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	5%	45%	5%	10%	35%	100%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0%	0%	0%	35%	65%	100%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		8%	35%	28%	23%	5%	100%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		9%	48%	1%	13%	30%	100%
Overall		9%	40%	18%	19%	15%	100%
Users		12%	50%	33%	4%	1%	100%
Non-Users		6%	32%	7%	31%	25%	100%

Percentage of HH aware of any water quality testing by WASHCOM or authorities

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0%	60%	40%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	30%	10%	60%	
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	5%	45%	50%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	100%	0%	0%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	100%	0%	0%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		44%	27%	29%	100%

treatment of drinking water

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0%	100%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	45%	55%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0%	100%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	60%	40%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	0%	100%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0%	100%	100%

SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	5%	95%	100%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	15%	85%	100%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	15%	85%	100%
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0%	100%	100%
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		18%	83%	100%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		9%	91%	100%
Overall		14%	86%	100%
Users		15%	85%	100%
Non-Users		14%	86%	100%

Method of water treatment										
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Boil	Add bleach/ chlorine	Strain it through a cloth	Use a water filter (ceramic, sand, composite, etc.)	Solar disinfection s	Let it stand and settle	A combination of above	Other	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SNNP/Dasenec h	Oldemo	33%	56%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	0%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Amhara/Mertol emariam	Gunaguna/Seg no Gebeya	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	100 %	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	33%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	100 %	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Method of water treatment										
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Boil	Add bleach/ chlorine	Strain it through a cloth	Use a water filter (ceramic, sand, composite, etc.)	Solar disinfection s	Let it stand and settle	A combination of above	Other	Total
SNNP/Bolosso Sore	Legama	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		14%	81%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	100%
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		71%	0%	0%	29%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Overall		29%	61%	0%	7%	0%	0%	4%	0%	100%
User		0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Non-User		50%	31%	0%	13%	0%	0%	6%	0%	100%

Affordability		
Before the drilling of water project monthly spending on water (Average)		
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Total ETB
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	120
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	2,480
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	258
Afar/Adear	Hado	3,120
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A
Overall		1,418

Time saved after the project						
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	No change	Less than 30 min	30-60 min	More than 1 hour	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	40%	20%	40%	0%	100%

Time saved after the project						
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	No change	Less than 30 min	30-60 min	More than 1 hour	Total
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	83%	8%	0%	8%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Overall		17%	4%	5%	74%	100%

Activities improved after using project water source- multiple choice question						
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	No change	Education	Income generation	Household work	Social/community involvement
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0%	20%	90%	35%	10%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	40%	0%	0%	60%	0%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0%	45%	70%	95%	15%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	75%	0%	0%	8%	17%
Afar/Adear	Hado	0%	35%	90%	10%	40%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Overall		10%	15%	38%	26%	11%

change in Education - multiple choice question					
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Girls	Boys	Women	Men
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0%	100%	0%	0%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A			
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	89%	67%	0%	0%
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	N/A			
Afar/Adear	Hado	0%	0%	100%	0%

Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A			
Overall		40%	50%	35%	0%

change in income generation - multiple choice question

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Girls	Boys	Women	Men
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0%	11%	28%	44%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0%	14%	36%	64%
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Afar/Adear	Hado	0%	0%	100%	44%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Overall		0%	8%	56%	50%

change in Household work - multiple choice question

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Girls	Boys	Women	Men
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0%	0%	100%	0%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	17%	0%	83%	0%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	53%	0%	95%	5%
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0%	0%	100%	0%
Afar/Adear	Hado	0%	0%	100%	0%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Overall		31%	0%	94%	3%

change in Social/community involvement - multiple choice question

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Girls	Boys	Women	Men
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0%	0%	0%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0%	0%	100%	33%
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	50%	0%	50%	0%
Afar/Adear	Hado	0%	0%	100%	100%

Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Overall		7%	0%	80%	73%

Equity, Inclusion & governance				
Household fairly included in project				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	100%	0%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	100%	0%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	100%	0%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	33%	67%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	100%	0%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A		
Overall		90%	10%	100%

women/ girls in your household involved in community discussions				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	100%	0%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	90%	10%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	100%	0%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	25%	75%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	100%	0%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A		
Overall		88%	12%	100%

persons with disabilities in your household involved in community discussions				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	N/A		
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	100%	0%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	N/A		

Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	N/A		
Afar/Adear	Hado	N/A		
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A		
Overall		100%	0%	100%

persons with functional limitation in your household face any challenges using the water supply

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	N/A		
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	67%	33%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	N/A		
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	N/A		
Afar/Adear	Hado	N/A		
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A		
Overall		67%	33%	100%

who manages the water supply system

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	WASHCOM	Local Entrepreneur	Government	Water utility	others	Don't know	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0%	0%	70%	0%	0%	30%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemar iam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A						
Overall		88%	0%	9%	0%	0%	4%	100%

experienced any issues with the water supply

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	None	Water quality	Interrupted supply	Long wait time	Poor maintenance	Others	Total
----------------	--------	------	---------------	--------------------	----------------	------------------	--------	-------

Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0%	0%	10%	60%	30%	0%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemar iam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0%	0%	58%	0%	42%	0%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A						
Overall		0%	24%	59%	7%	10%	0%	100%

register complaint about this issue

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Complaint system does not exist	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	5%	95%	0%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	30%	70%	0%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	55%	45%	0%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemar iam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	92%	8%	0%	100%
Afar/Adear	Hado	0%	0%	100%	100%
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Overall		32%	44%	24%	100%

time does it usually take to resolve the issue

Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Within A Day	Between 1 to 3 Days	Between 3 to 7 Days	Between 1 to 2 weeks	More than 2 weeks	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Amhara/Mertolemar iam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0%	0%	0%	36%	64%	100%

Afar/Adear	Hado	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Overall		0%	0%	12%	15%	73%	100%

Annex 17: Analysed Water Source Observation Tables

Infrastructure					
Estimated Beneficiary Households					
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Estimated Beneficiary households	Average HH size	Total number of beneficiaries	
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	350	8.9	3,115.0	
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0	7.0	7,000.0	
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	9.2	16,800.0	
Amhara/Mertolemaria m	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	520	4.0	2,054.0	
Afar/Adear	Hado	200	6.4	1,280.0	
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	140	11.2	1,568.0	
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0	7.1	-	Under construction , when this will be completed the estimated beneficiaries are 4500
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0	7.0	-	This is not functional due to high fluoride content
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0	9.4	-	This is not functional
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0	5.4	-	Under construction , when this

					will be completed the estimated beneficiaries are 8500
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources	1210				
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources	0				
Overall	1210				

Depth of the Water Bore (in feet)		
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Depth of Water Bore
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	264
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	200
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	232
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	300
Afar/Adear	Hado	200
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	110
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	100
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	178
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	228
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	180
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		1306
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		686
Overall		1992

Water Source Functional Today					
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Standby only	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	1	0	0	1

SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0	1	0	1
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	1	0	0	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	1	0	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	1	0	0	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	1	0	0	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0	1	0	1
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0	1	0	1
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0	1	0	1
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0	1	0	1
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		5	1	0	6
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	4	0	4
Overall		5	5	0	10

Hours Operated Daily						
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	<1 Hours	1-3 Hrs	4-8 Hrs	>8 Hrs	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0	0	1	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A				
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	0	0	1	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0	0	1	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	0	0	1	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0	1	0	0	0
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	N/A				
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore					
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule					
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama					
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		0	1	2	2	4
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	0	0	0	0
Overall		0	1	2	2	4

Bulk Water Meter Installed				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total

Bulk Water Meter Installed				
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0	1	0
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A		
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	1	0
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	1	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	1	0	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0	1	0
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	N/A		
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore			
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule			
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama			
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		2	3	2
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	0	0
Overall		2	3	2

Meter Functioning and in Use				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	N/A		
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo			
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)			
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	1	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	1	0
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	N/A		
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka			
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore			
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule			
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama			
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		1	1	2
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources				
Overall		1	1	2

Water Production		
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Gallon Per Minute
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	400
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	10
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	500
Afar/Adear	Hado	20
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	420
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	N/A
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		1350
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0
Overall		1350

Energization System							
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	None	Manual	Solar	Grid Electricity	Generator	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0	0	1	0	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0	0	1	0	0	1
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	0	0	0	1	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0	0	0	1	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	0	1	0	0	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0	0	0	0	1	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0	0	1	0	0	1
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	1	0	0	0	0	1
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	1	0	0	0	0	1
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0	0	1	0	0	1
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		0	0	3	1	2	6
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		2	0	2	0	0	4
Overall		2	0	5	1	2	10

Condition of Energization System					
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Fully Functional	Partially Functional	Not Functional	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	1	0	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0	0	1	1
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	1	0	0	1
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	1	0	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	1	0	0	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0	1	0	0
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0	0	1	1
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	N/A			
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule				
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama				
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		4	1	1	6
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		1	0	1	2
Overall		5	1	2	8

Chlorinator Installed on Water				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0	1	0
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0	1	0
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	1	0
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0	1	0
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	1	0
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0	1	0
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0	1	0
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0	1	0
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0	1	0

SNNP/Bolosso Sore	Legama	0	1	0
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		0	6	6
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	4	4
Overall		0	10	10

Chlorinator regularly applied and recorded				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	N/A		
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo			
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)			
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya			
Afar/Adear	Hado			
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek			
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka			
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore			
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule			
SNNP/Bolosso Sore	Legama			
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources				
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources				
Overall				

Technical Condition

Condition of Borehole Superstructure					
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	1	0	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	1	0	0	1
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	0	1	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	1	0	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	1	0	0	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0	1	0	1

SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0	1	0	1
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0	0	1	1
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0	0	1	1
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	1	0	0	1
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		4	1	1	6
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		1	1	2	4
Overall		5	2	3	10

Pump or Tap Condition							
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Fully Functional	Minor Issues	Major Issues	Not Working	No Pump or tap Install	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	1	0	0	0	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0	1	0	0	0	1
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	0	0	0	1	1
Amhara/Mertolemaria m	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeyam	1	0	0	0	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	0	0	1	0	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	1	0	0	0	0	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0	0	0	1	0	1
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0	0	0	0	1	1
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0	0	0	1	0	1
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0	1	0	0	0	1
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		3	1	0	1	1	6
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	1	0	2	1	4
Overall		3	2	0	3	2	10

Storage Tank Condition						
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	No Storage Tank	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0	0	1	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0	1	0	0	1

Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	1	0	0	0	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0	1	0	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	0	0	1	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0	0	0	1	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	1	0	0	0	1
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	1	0	0	0	1
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	1	0	0	0	1
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0	0	1	0	1
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		1	2	1	2	6
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		3	0	1	0	4
Overall		4	2	2	2	10

Visible Leakage or Spillage				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	1	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	1	0	1
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	1	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	1	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	1	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	1	0	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0	1	1
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0	1	1
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0	1	1
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0	1	1
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		4	2	6
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	4	4
Overall		4	6	10

Drainage around Water Point					
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Well Maintained	Poorly Maintained	No Drainage System	Total

Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	1	0	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	1	0	0	1
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	1	0	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0	0	1	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	0	1	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0	0	1	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0	0	1	1
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0	0	1	1
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0	0	1	1
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0	0	1	1
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		2	1	3	6
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	0	4	4
Overall		2	1	7	10

Wastewater Safely Disposed				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0	1	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	1	0	1
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	1	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	N/A		
Afar/Adear	Hado			
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek			
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka			
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore			
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule			
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama			
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		1	2	3
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	0	0
Overall		1	2	3

Water Quality

Water Testing								
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Monthly	Quarterly	Bi-Annually	Annually	Never	Don't Know	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		0	1	1	0	3	1	6
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	0	0	0	3	1	4
Overall		0	1	1	0	6	2	10

Last Water Quality Test Conducted		
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	DD/MM/YY
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	2025-04-01
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	
Afar/Adear	Hado	
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	2025-07-12
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	N/A
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		
Overall		

Facilitated the Water Quality Test							
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	WASHCOM	NOWE/RWB/ MOWE/RWB	WATER UTILITY	UNICEF/ PARTNER NGO	OTHER	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	1	0	0	0	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A					
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)						
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya						
Afar/Adear	Hado						
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	1	0	0	0	0	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	N/A					
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore						
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule						
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama						
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		2	0	0	0	0	2
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall		2	0	0	0	0	2

Test Results Available for Review				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0	1	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A		
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)			
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya			
Afar/Adear	Hado			
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	1	0	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	N/A		
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore			
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule			
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama			

Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources	1	1	2
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources	0	0	0
Overall	1	1	2

Finals Remarks on Water Quality Test Report				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Safe for Drinking	Unsafe	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	N/A		
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo			
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)			
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya			
Afar/Adear	Hado			
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0	1	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	N/A		
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore			
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule			
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama			
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		0	1	1
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	0	0
Overall		0	1	1

Community Management

Managing this Water Source							
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	WASHCOM	Local Entrepreneur	Government	Water Utility	OTHER	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	1	0	0	0	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A					
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	1	0	0	0	0	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	1	0	0	0	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	1	0	0	0	0	1

Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	1	0	0	0	0	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	N/A					
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore						
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule						
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama						
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		5	0	0	0	0	5
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	0	0	0	0	0
Overall		5	0	0	0	0	5

Monthly Tariff Per Household		
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Amount
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	300
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	1355
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	50
Afar/Adear	Hado	0
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	Tariff is 15ETB per cow, 15 per goat 15ETB and 50ETB per Camel. The mean monthly income is 35,000ETB. Minimum collection is 20,000ETB while maximum is 50,000 ETB
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	N/A
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		1705
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0
Overall		1705

Have Records of Tariff Collection				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	1	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A		
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	1	0	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	1	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	N/A		
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	1	0	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	N/A		
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore			
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule			
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama			
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		4	0	4
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	0	0
Overall		4	0	4

Tariff Sufficient to Cover Routine Maintenance					
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0	1	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A			
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	1	0	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0	1	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	N/A			
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0	1	0	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	N/A			
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore				
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule				
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama				

Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources	0	4	0	4
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources	0	0	0	0
Overall	0	4	0	4

Water System Manager have a Bank Account				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0	1	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A		
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	1	0	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	N/A		
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	1	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	1	0	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	N/A		
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore			
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule			
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama			
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		2	2	4
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	0	0
Overall		2	2	4

Savings Allocated for Major Repair/Emergency Costs		
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Amount
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	1500
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	100000
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	N/A

Afar/Adear	Hado	0
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	1000
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	N/A
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		102500
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0
Overall		102500

Last Maintenance Conducted		
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	DD/MM/YY
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	2024-10-15
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	2025-07-15
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	2024-12-02
Afar/Adear	Hado	2025-07-12
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	2025-07-12

Conducted the Maintenance						
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Community/WASHCOM	Government	Contractor	Other	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0	1	0	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A				
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	1	0	0	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	1	0	0	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	0	1	0	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	1	0	0	0	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	N/A				

Conducted the Maintenance						
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Community/WASHCOM	Government	Contractor	Other	Total
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore					
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule					
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama					
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		2	2	1	0	5
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources						0
Overall		2	2	1	0	5

Water Safety Plan for this Water Source Developed				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	1	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	N/A		
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	1	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0	1	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	1	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	1	0	1
SNNP/Damot Pula	Warite Balaka	N/A		
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore			
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule			
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama			
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		2	3	5
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	0	0
Overall		2	3	5

Accessibility Features

Ramp with an appropriate Gradient				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	1	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0	1	1
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	1	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0	1	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	1	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	1	0	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0	1	1
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0	1	1
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0	1	1
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0	1	1
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		2	4	6
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	4	4
Overall		2	8	10

Surface Leading to the Water Point Smooth, Firm, and Non-Slippery				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	1	0	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0	1	1
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	1	0	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0	1	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	1	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	1	0	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0	1	1
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0	1	1
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0	1	1
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0	1	1
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		3	3	6

Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources	0	4	4
Overall	3	7	10

Water Point Accessed independently by a Person Using a Wheelchair or Walking Aid				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0	1	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0	1	1
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	1	0	1
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0	1	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	1	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	1	0	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0	1	1
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0	1	1
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0	1	1
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0	1	1
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		2	4	6
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	4	4
Overall		2	8	10

Hand Pump or Tap Reachable for Persons of Short Stature or Using a Seated Position				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0	1	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	1	0	1
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	1	1
Amhara/Mertolemaria	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0	1	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	1	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	1	0	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0	1	1

Hand Pump or Tap Reachable for Persons of Short Stature or Using a Seated Position				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0	1	1
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0	1	1
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0	1	1
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		2	4	6
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	4	4
Overall		2	8	10

Tactile Sign to Guide Visually Impaired Users				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0	1	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	0	1	1
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	1	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	0	1	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	1	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0	1	1
SNNP/Damot Pula	Warite Balaka	0	1	1
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0	1	1
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0	1	1
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0	1	1
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		0	6	6
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	4	4
Overall		0	10	10

Adequate Lighting or Daylight Visibility around the Water Point				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0	1	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	1	0	1

Adequate Lighting or Daylight Visibility around the Water Point				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	1	0	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	1	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	1	0	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0	1	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0	1	1
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0	1	1
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	1	0	1
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0	1	1
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		4	2	6
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		1	3	4
Overall		5	5	10

Any Obstructions or Hazards near the Water point				
Region/ Woreda	Kebele	Yes	No	Total
Somali/Mieso	Hawanile	0	1	1
SNNP/Dasenech	Oldemo	1	0	1
Somali/Liben	Buntkeren (Deka Suftu Town)	0	1	1
Amhara/Mertolemariam	Gunaguna/Segno Gebeya	1	0	1
Afar/Adear	Hado	0	1	1
Somali/Moyale	Mubarek	0	1	1
SNNP/Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	0	1	1
SNNP/Hammer	Erbore	0	1	1
Oromia/Rayitu	Kara Tule	0	1	1
SNNP/Boloso Sore	Legama	0	1	1
Kebeles with Project Installed Water Sources		2	4	6
Kebeles without Project Installed Water Sources		0	4	4
Overall		2	8	10

Annex 18: Evaluation Reference Group and Young Evaluators

Government of Ethiopia:

1. Habtemariam Tilahun (CEO, Hydrology and Basin Department)
2. Muhammedsalih Boru (Expert)
3. Senait Tesema (Expert)
4. Nibret Adela (Expert)

Donor (EU)

5. Jallela Teriessa
6. Abiy Tesfaye

UNICEF

7. Kabuka Banda
8. Haimanot Assefa
9. Therese Marie Bostrup
10. Maryamawit Assefa – RG Secretary
11. Dr. Mussarrat Youssuf – RG Chair

AWF Young Evaluators

1. Ms Maham Faraz Abbasi
2. Ms Ema Eman Fatima
3. Ms Aleem Feroz

Annex 19: ToR for Final Evaluation of EU-RESET Project

Improving Access to Safely Managed Water Supply in the Resilience Building Programme for Ethiopia RESET-II Woredas, implemented by UNICEF

Type of Contract (tick the appropriate box)	Consultant Contract	Individual Contractor	Institutional Contract (LTA)	TA
Title of the evaluation	Summative evaluation of the 'Improving access to safely managed water supply in the resilience building programme for Ethiopia RESET-II woredas, implemented by UNICEF' project.			
Purpose	This final evaluation is conducted to contribute to accountability and learning by providing an assessment of the results achieved. The evaluation will look at what was done including challenges faced and the mitigations that were employed. The evaluation is expected to identify key lessons from design and implementation of the project results, which can inform its responsiveness and relevance to national need.			
Expected cost	Negotiable - subject to qualifications and experience.			
Location	Ethiopia (Amhara, Afar, Oromia, Somali, and SNNPR)			
Estimated Duration	65 Days (over 4 months)			
Estimated Start Date	March 2025			
Reporting to	UNICEF Ethiopia Evaluation Manager			
Grant reference and WBS				
PCR, IR and Activity	Evaluation			
Type	☒ Evaluation (an assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme, or policy)			
Date of Preparation of TOR	January 2025			

Background

Ethiopia is a rapidly urbanizing society, with a 2022 projected population size of 105,166,458 (49.9 per cent female and 50.1 per cent male)¹, which is rapidly eroding the adequacy of basic services and infrastructure in urban areas and compounding the effects of hazards and threats such as climate change². The major types of shocks and crises impacting Ethiopia include (1) effects of climate change; (2) conflict, insecurity, and social unrest; (3) disease outbreaks and public health emergencies. Although the proportion of Ethiopia's urban population living in slums declined from 74 per cent in 2014/15 to 63 per cent in 2018/19³, recent crises have spurred major population shifts (e.g., displacement of crisis-affected populations to urban areas) that will have a direct impact on the wellbeing of children, youth, and women. In 2024, OCHA estimates that there are at least 4.4 million displaced people⁴. A more nuanced socioeconomic analysis of Ethiopia is available in the UNICEF Country Programme Development process document synthesizing evidence⁵, but it is characterized by lack of up-to-date data.

A 2019 Mini DHS assessment of access to improved water source depicted vast differences by (1) household wealth quintile (lowest quintile: 37.2%; highest: 92.5%); (2) region (lowest in Emerging Regions: Somali (47.1%), Afar (54.5%), Amhara (65%), Oromia (65.2%), Gambella: 69.2%). There are critical gaps related to an equitable safe water supply in emergency and non-emergency settings. Ethiopia's potable water supply per capita in EFY2020/21 (19.36 litres per person per day), stood below the World Health Organization (WHO) standard of 50-100 litres of water per person per day. Refugees face more dire standards (limited to an average of 14 litres per person per day) lower than the UNHCR camp standard of 20 litres per person per day.

The impacts of climate change are exacerbating WASH and WRM development challenges. Ethiopia is one of the most vulnerable countries to climate variability and climate change due to its high dependence on rain-fed agriculture and natural resources, and relatively low adaptive capacity to deal with these expected changes.⁶ Flood impacts are already severe, especially in lowland areas, due to naturally high rainfall intensity and steep topography, as well as upper basin land use changes and deforestation. The interaction between upper basin land use changes that cause flooding and resulting reduction in groundwater recharge requires water resources management through cross-country partnerships as part of the WASH sector strategy.

Drought is one of the major natural disasters affecting the livelihood of Ethiopians, resulting in water insecurity which in turn causes disruption of livelihoods and loss of life. A significant proportion of the Ethiopian population still lacks access to clean water, even though Ethiopia successfully achieved the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) target of halving the number of people without access to improved

¹ Central Statistical Agency (2013): Population Projections for Ethiopia, 2007-2037 [Table A7.5.4 Projected Population Size of Ethiopia by Five Year Age Group, Sex, Urban and Rural: Medium Variant: 1 July 2022]. <https://www.statsethiopia.gov.et/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/ICPS-Population-Projection-2007-2037-produced-in-2012.pdf>

² UNICEF (2024): Climate Landscape Analysis for Children (CLAC) in Ethiopia (draft). Prepared by OneWorld Sustainable Investments (OneWorld).

³ FDRE (2023): Progress and Challenges in the Implementation of the Selected Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Next Steps.

⁴ OCHA (2024): 2024 Humanitarian Needs Overview: Humanitarian Programme Cycle 2024, Issued February 2024.

⁵ Evidence Synthesis Report Ethiopia. Revised Draft, April 2024. (UNICEF, Ethiopia)

⁶ Climate Risk Profile: Ethiopia (2021): The World Bank Group

drinking water. At the national level, 60 to 80 per cent of communicable diseases are attributed to limited access to safe water, and inadequate sanitation and hygiene services.

Exacerbating the challenges, financing gap in the water and sanitation sector limits growth and sustainability. Financing challenges, ranging from the need for large capital investments (for new infrastructure or manufacturing) to the lack of adequate household finance to pay for WASH products, are key barriers to achieving universal and sustainable WASH services. There is inadequate financing available to the WASH sector due to (1) insufficient overall government budget and allocation to the sector, (2) an ineffective spending plan that prioritizes new infrastructure, (3) limited ability of many users to pay full cost-recovery rates for WASH services, and (4) inadequate private sector investments. In general, revenues generated from user fees are insufficient to cover major mechanical or systems failure, but no other source of reliable funding has been developed to cover these costs.⁷

The challenges are greatest in the lowland parts of Ethiopia due to the complex geology and hydrogeology of the areas, which do not easily allow the development of productive groundwater sources. In addition, most regions of Ethiopia lack detailed hydrogeological maps that can be used as quick reference for siting water wells.

As a result, the drilling of negative wells is the main challenge in groundwater development. However - by using different technologies and following the regional groundwater flow, a few high yielding water sources can be successfully developed.

Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 6: Ensure access to water and sanitation for all by 2030, aims to ensure the availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all. This includes providing access to safe and affordable drinking water, adequate sanitation, and hygiene, improving water quality by reducing pollution, increasing water-use efficiency, implementing integrated water resources management, and protecting water-related ecosystems. The necessity of SDG 6 stems from its critical role in promoting health and well-being by preventing waterborne diseases, supporting economic growth through efficient water management, ensuring environmental sustainability by maintaining ecosystems, and fostering social equity by reducing inequalities in access to water and sanitation. By addressing these areas, SDG 6 seeks to create a sustainable and equitable future for everyone.

UNICEF advocates that children need WASH to survive and thrive both in times of stability and crisis, in urban and rural communities, and in every country around the world. The human rights to water and sanitation are at the core of the UNICEF mandate for children. To inform its organization-wide contribution to achieving SDG 6, UNICEF has developed the Strategy for Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (2016-2030)⁸ designed to inform and support UNICEF's core planning and strategy processes, and to guide the implementation of our programmes. This will be met under two overarching goals; By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all, and by 2030, achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and end open defecation, paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations. More specifically, UNICEF's core accountability will be to act where children do not have even a basic level of service.

The GOE identifies water and sanitation as a priority for achieving sustainable economic growth, poverty reduction, and targeted health and social outcomes; water is identified as a critical priority in all regions and for all sectors. To showcase its commitment and mainstream efforts related to the WASH sector the services are articulated in the country's Ten Years Development Plan (2021–2030). The principal objectives of the water resources development plan in this commitment are to ensure equitable provision and accessibility of potable water, sanitation and hygiene services that meet quality standards;

⁷ *[ETHIOPIA Global Waters Strategy Country Plan 2023](#)

⁸ [UNICEF-Strategy-for-WASH-2016-2030.pdf](#)

and to enhance the development and utilization of the river basin and irrigation resources of the country. The main targets laid out to achieve these objectives includes reaching 100 per cent access to safe drinking water in both rural and urban areas, with increasing water quantity available and increasing access to piped water. It also sets goals of 100 cities having sewerage systems, all rural residents having toilets, and all education and health facilities having water and sanitation services.⁹

Implementation of the Ten Years Development Plan is coordinated through the One Wash National Program II (OWNP II), which is a sector wide approach with the broad objectives of achieving water, sanitation, and hygiene results in Ethiopia through official policies, strategies and development plans. It is a flagship Government programme in which different actors came together and agreed to address water supply, sanitation and hygiene as an integrated package. The approach brought together four national ministries (Water, Irrigation and Electricity; Health; Education; and Finance and Economic Cooperation), private, local, and multinational actors to achieve e increased coverage of improved and sustainable water supply and sanitation services. The OWNP rests on three overarching pillars of: (i) creating an enabling environment and good governance; (ii) maximizing availability and efficient use of human and financial resources to create demand for better WASH services; and (iii) capacity development for improved delivery of WASH services at all levels. The programme has four components: Rural and Pastoral WASH; Urban WASH; Institutional WASH; and Programme Management and Capacity Building with the objective of contributing towards improving the health and well-being of populations in rural and urban areas of Ethiopia.¹⁰

UNICEF supports the Government of Ethiopia to improve water security through the One Wash National Programme (OWNP) and other regular and emergency development activities. Yet whilst emergency support is critical, it is also vitally important that resilient WASH development programming takes place in water insecure areas to break the cycle of emergencies. UNICEF has prioritized the implementation of resilient WASH programming by constructing large multi-village water supply systems, by drilling deep boreholes in different region of the country through expansion of existing water sources to enable access to sustainable water supplies, with the generous support from the EU Delegation to Ethiopia.

Evaluation object (The project under evaluation)

In partnership with UNESCO and the European Union Joint Research Centre (EU-JRC), UNICEF has used satellite images in conjunction with conventional exploration techniques to reduce the time and resources required for groundwater feasibility studies previously. UNICEF is continuing building on this success by expanding the scale of the works with the EU-funded project titled “Improving Access to Safely Managed Water Supply in the Resilience Building Programme for Ethiopia RESET II Woredas¹¹”, implemented between 13 December 2017 and 12 December 2023. The project budget is EUR 4,854,149. UNICEF has worked with other stakeholders including Acacia Water¹², GW4E consortium, and Aquacon.

The EU resilience building project aimed at increasing access to safe and sustainable water for the drought affected people in RESET-II clusters by producing hydrogeological maps at woreda level and

⁹ Ten years development plan: A pathway to prosperity 2021-2030, Federal democratic republic of Ethiopia Planning and development commission

¹⁰ One WASH national programme: A multi-sectoral SWAP. Phase II programme document, November 2018

¹¹ A woreda is a district in Ethiopian administration.

¹² https://en.acaciawater.com/nw-29143-7-3756804/nieuws/hydrogeological_mapping_for_climate_resilient_wash_in_ethiopia.html?page=1

recommend drilling sites which UNICEF and other partners can use for developing groundwater resources. The specific objectives of the project were:
 Create detailed 39 groundwater potential maps that will cover the selected eight cluster regions.
 Identify 16 optimal areas for drilling (two sites per Cluster), using these maps and geophysical field investigation.

Locate 16 optimal borehole sites and recommend the type of drilling methodology to be employed.
 Build the capacity of Federal Ministry of Water, Irrigation and Electricity (MoWIE)¹³, Ethiopian regional governments, and NGOs to use overlay analysis techniques for groundwater potential mapping in Ethiopia.

The project aimed to improve access to safe and sustainable water supply for 82,000 drought-affected populations in 16 selected woredas. Initially Woreda based hydrological maps were produced for all 8 EU RESET-II project in 5 regions, namely Amhara, Afar, Oromia, Somali, and SNNPR. The 8 clusters are:

Wag Himra (Amhara)
 Afar (Afar)
 Siti (Somali)
 Liben (Somali)
 Bale (Oromia)
 Borena (Oromia)
 Wolayta (SNNPR)
 South Omo (SNNPR)

In the period from July 2018 to May 2020 phase I of the project was implemented with the title 'Groundwater mapping for climate resilient WASH in arid and semi-arid areas of Ethiopia (GW4E)'. The project created harmonized geological maps, groundwater suitability maps and socio-economic maps on a scale of 1:250,000 for the above-mentioned clusters. These were mainly based on existing maps, satellite data and well data acquired from public sources and supplied by the Central Statistical Agency, the Ministry of Water, Irrigation and Electricity (MoWIE) and the EU Joint Research Centre (JRC). The groundwater suitability maps were made by GIS overlay analysis of basic data using weighting factors defined by the GW4E Peer Review Committee. Field work was conducted to validate the maps.

In phase II zonal consultation meetings were held with local stakeholders comprising Regional and Zonal Water Bureaus, Woreda WASH departments, community leaders and NGOs. During these consultations stakeholders discoursed on priority kebeles and villages for intervention, actual status of WASH systems, conflict areas and IDP sites. Based on the discussions target kebeles where the drilling was expected to be most successful were selected. Around these kebeles and villages detailed geophysical surveys, water sampling and analyses and local water balance calculations were carried. This led eventually to the identification of drilling sites for the target kebele of villages. The GW4E team validated and marked all sites in the field in the presence of local stakeholders. For all target kebeles or villages 1:50,000 hydrogeological maps and 1:10,000 drilling maps were prepared. The project plan also included ground truthing based on the drilling of 16 deep test borehole sites in SNNP, Somali, and Afar regions, selected after the field hydrogeological and geophysical studies.

Drilling contractors were engaged by the respective Regional Water Bureaus while UNICEF engaged a joint venture (Aquacon Engineering and Acacia Water) for supervising the drilling.

¹³ Currently renamed Ministry of Water and Energy

Knowledge management has been an integral component of the EU RESET-II project where multiple strategies were employed. Trainings (on-the-job, and off-the-job) were held at multiple points of the project lifecycle, all maps and well data gathered have been organized in an open-source database and handed over to MoWIE, and project results were disseminated through workshops and a public webservice system, the GW4E viewer.

The planned activities and indicators per specific objective are detailed in Annex 2 while the project's log frame is in Annex 3. The main partners engaged in the project were the following:

Organization	Role	Remark
European Union through overarching EU RESET-II program	Funding organization	
UNICEF Ethiopia	Implementing agency	
Ministry of Water, Irrigation and Energy (Now Ministry of Water and Energy)	Government Counterpart/ Primary duty bearer	
Regional and Zonal water bureaus	Primary duty bearers	
Acacia Water BV	Implementing partner	
AQUACON Engineering PLC	Implementing partner	
CORDAID	Implementing partner	
CARE	Implementing partner	
Action contre la Faim	Implementing partner	
Vita Ethiopia	Implementing partner	
Danish Church Aid	Implementing partner	
Caritas Germany	Implementing partner	
Save the Children	Implementing partner	
GW4E consultant consortium	Implementing partner	Members Organizations: EU joint research centre, Acacia water BV, AQUACON Engineering PLC Additional team members from: Addis Ababa University, Mekelle university, and Field Ethiopia

Purpose of the evaluation

After the closure of the project, a final evaluation is needed to support the dual purpose of accountability and learning by assessing the intended and unintended results achieved through the project. The evaluation is expected to identify key lessons from design and implementation of the project, which can inform its responsiveness and relevance to national needs and to inform UNICEF's and partners' way forward. The evaluation will also look at the challenges faced and the mitigation strategies that were employed. In addition, the project was a proof of concept looking to implement an innovative approach using an array of advanced technologies and experts to establish efficient water access. Therefore, lessons from its outcomes can be used nationally at scale. UNICEF and WASH sector bureaus will use the data to plan and monitor ground water exploration and development using advanced technologies. The data, information and knowledge products will be useful to strengthen monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in the water resources management work process.

The primary users of the evaluation findings will be UNICEF and its implementing partners, including the WASH sector bureaus. These stakeholders will use the insights gained to inform future project designs, improve implementation strategies, and enhance overall future projects' effectiveness.

The secondary users include other governmental agencies, non-governmental organizations, and donors involved in water resource management and resilience building. They can leverage the evaluation findings to shape policy, inform strategic planning, and foster collaboration across the sector. The evaluation's findings will also be valuable for academic and research institutions focusing on water management and development, providing them with case studies and data for further analysis and study.

Evaluation objectives

The overall objective of this evaluation is to assess, draw lessons and document the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the project "Improving Access to Safely Managed Water Supply in the Resilience Building Programme for Ethiopia RESET II Woredas" during 2018-2023 and provide evidence and concrete recommendations. The result of project evaluation is expected to draw key learnings and challenges of this innovative project that will help to build the body of knowledge to be applied in the sector at scale.

The specific objectives are:

- Evaluate the extent to which the project design and implementation addressed the specific water access needs of drought-affected populations and aligned with national priorities.
- Analyse how well the project complemented other initiatives in the water sector, identifying synergies and conflicts with other projects or policies.
- Assess the efficiency of resource utilization in achieving project outputs and determine if similar results could have been achieved with fewer resources
- Determine the extent to which the project achieved its objectives, outputs, and outcomes, including the impact of advanced technology on water access.
- Evaluate the likelihood of the project's benefits lasting beyond its period and identify measures contributing to sustainability.
- Document key lessons from the project's design and implementation, including challenges faced and mitigations employed.
- Provide data and insights to UNICEF and WASH sector bureaus to enhance future project designs, implementation strategies, and monitoring mechanisms.

Contribution to Sustainable Development Goals (SDG)

Goal 6: Clean water and sanitation

Evaluation scope

Temporal Scope: The evaluation covers the whole project implementation period from 13 December 2018 – 12 December 2023.

Geographic scope: Geographically, the survey will target five regions of Ethiopia in which the project has been implemented: Afar, Amhara, Oromia, SNNP¹⁴, and Somali and fourteen EU reset supported programme woredas in these five regions. A representative sample of the sites where post drilling construction has been conducted, currently 7 sites, need to be included as well.

No	Region	No. of woredas
1	Afar	2
2	Amhara	1
3	SNNP (now split into four regions: Sidama, Central Ethiopia, South Ethiopia, and Southwest Ethiopia regions)	4
4	Oromia	3
5	Somali	4
	Total	14

Thematic scope: The evaluation will encompass several key thematic areas, starting with the proof of concept, which establishes the feasibility and foundational principles of the project. The results achieved will be assessed to highlight the tangible outcomes and successes realized through the implementation. Furthermore, the assessable effect on the population and environment in the target areas will meticulously be evaluated, demonstrating the project's benefits and potential drawbacks. Lastly, knowledge management efforts from the project to sustain the gains from the intervention through integration into the practices, strategies, and policies of the target area will be assessed.

The institutional scope covers respective RWBs, Woredas (and the Ministry of Water and Energy), to which it is anticipated that data collection specific to respective bureaus and project woredas will be collected and analysed on achievements and challenges related to implementation of project core ideas, including issues related to gender and equity. During the evaluation, data will be collected from members of the beneficiary community, the regional water and energy bureaus, the woreda water and energy offices, and the local government offices at state regional and woreda levels. Sufficient and structured efforts will be made in the data collection to equitably engage girls, women, and persons with disabilities of all ages across the strata of beneficiary communities.

Evaluation questions and criteria

In line with the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, impact and sustainability, the RESET-II evaluation proposed to address the following key, indicative evaluation questions. However, the evaluation team is required to look at the below proposed criteria and questions, review these thoroughly and propose the final criteria and questions for evaluation under a comprehensive evaluation matrix (to be attached with the inception report).

¹⁴ Now further split to four regions: Sidama, Central Ethiopia, South Ethiopia, and Southwest Ethiopia regions

RELEVANCE

To what extent is the RESET-II project design and implementation relevant in increasing access to safe and sustainable water for drought affected people, considering responsiveness to specific and evolving local needs changing in times of crisis?

To what extent the project addressed WASH relevant gaps for children, especially the most marginalized such as children with disabilities, girls, and out-of-school children, in the current context?

COHERENCE

To what extent is the project aligned with EU and UNICEF priorities with respect to securing equitable access to water?

How has the project approach facilitated linkages and multiplied value between sectors and actors to accelerate access to safe and sustainable water?

How well does the project complement other initiatives in the same sector working to provide secure water access to vulnerable populations, such as the ONE-WASH UNICEF program?

Are there any synergies or conflicts with other projects or policies?

EFFICIENCY

To what extent have the outputs of the project been achieved with the appropriate number of resources (funds, expertise, time, procedures, rules and regulations, administrative costs, etc.)?

Were financial and human resources used optimally to deliver the project, and were there cost-effective alternatives that could have achieved similar or better results?

How has the project result's approach facilitated linkages and multiplied value between sectors and actors to accelerate access to safe and sustainable water?

Was the project implemented within the planned timeframe, and if not, what were the reasons for any delays or cost overruns?

EFFECTIVENESS

To what extent has the project achieved its preset objectives, outputs, and outcomes among the target population?

What were the key enabling or hindering factors affecting the successful implementation of WASH interventions, and how were challenges addressed?

To what extent did the use of advanced technology aid the efforts to improve access to safe and sustainable water supply for drought-affected populations in the selected woredas?

How has the combination of different mappings and capacity building of local authorities made a difference (and are likely to be making a difference in the coming years) to the water supply in drought affected areas?

SUSTAINABILITY

Will the benefits of the project last after the end of the RESET-II project period?

What benefits of the RESET-II project are likely to last in the lives of individuals, families, communities, and the broader environment? Have lessons learned through monitoring been sufficiently incorporated continuously to inform better achievement of results and sustainability of the project?

Which measures that have been put in place are actively contributing to the sustainability of the project?

Are the gains made through this project, especially the use of innovative approaches and laying the ground for local capacity to utilize these technologies, scalable at large?

IMPACT:

To what extent and which intended and unintended long-term results have been achieved by the project?

To what extent has the EU-RESET project contributed to sustained improvements in the desired outcomes, in the lives of the intended beneficiaries, especially to the men, women, girls and boys from the marginalized sections of the society and those with disabilities?

To what extent in what ways has the project influenced gender equality, social inclusion, and the empowerment of marginalized groups (e.g., women, persons with disabilities) in terms of access to and decision-making over WASH services?

To what extent has the project intentionally or unintentionally influenced systems and policies in different sectors to support safely managed water supply?

How has the project impacted local governance, institutional capacity, and community ownership in managing WASH infrastructure and services?

What unintended positive or negative impacts (e.g., environmental effects, economic benefits, displacement of vulnerable groups) have resulted from the project?

CROSS-CUTTING AREAS:

The evaluation team must consider to what extent and how gender, disability, environment and climate change were mainstreamed and addressed by the intervention and the results of this. It shall furthermore consider whether the relevant SDGs and their interlinkages were identified; the principle of Leave No-One Behind and the rights-based approach were followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the project and monitoring.

Methodology

Evaluation Approach

The expected overall methodological approach for the evaluation is mixed method — qualitative data collection, and analysis of available (secondary) quantitative data, through a non-experimental evaluation design. The evaluation must be utilization-focused aiming to inform decision making and possible national use of innovative approaches. The evaluation team is expected to come up with a robust methodology in consultation with the evaluation section and the programme team.

Consideration when designing the evaluation method is to employ context conscious innovative participatory evaluation methods where adolescents and youth, girls, and women the group affected by water collection get the opportunity to participate throughout the evaluation process i.e., planning, implementation, and recommendation. It is proposed that they can be involved in all aspects of the evaluation as advisors, peer researchers, documenters, active respondents, reviewers, and change agents. However, there are ethical considerations that need to be thought when determining how best to engage adolescents in the process. Recent guidance from UNICEF's Evaluation Office on Adolescent Participation in Monitoring and Evaluating UNICEF Programming needs to be consulted. This guidebook provides concrete tools and suggestions for youth participatory evaluation, along with practical examples from UNICEF Country Offices.

Methods and Data Collection

The main elements of the methodology and data collection methods will be further developed during the inception phase in consultation with the key stakeholders and in line with the agreed evaluation questions (including assumptions to be assessed, indicators, data collection tools and analysis approach) and analytical framework while adhering to the UNEG Norms and Standards¹⁵, as well as UNICEF ethical guidelines¹⁶. The evaluation might also identify knowledge gaps which could be addressed with studies or research, which could be added as part of this evaluation or can be done in separate research.

¹⁵ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

¹⁶ <https://qdc.unicef.org/resource/unicef-procedure-ethical-standards-research-evaluation-data-collection-and-analysis>; <https://www.unicef.org/media/reporting-guidelines>

Nevertheless, depending on the approach chosen, it is expected that the evaluation team will use at least one or several of the following data collection methods with both duty bearers and right holders: Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with implementing partners, government counterparts and key stakeholders as key informants (KIs) including UNICEF programme teams – both during the inception and the data collection phases

Individual interviews with community leaders, community knowledge bearers and key stakeholders at local level, including WASH sector professionals

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with community members including women and girls (who are disproportionately affected by accessibility of WASH services), youth, WASH committees, ethnic minorities, and other key right holders. It is also expected that child- and adolescent-friendly methods be used with rights-holders.

Observation methods with clear and explicit criteria and data collection tools to see products put out from the innovative hydrogeological mapping and infrastructure development

Secondary analysis of programme planning documents and project proposals/concept notes, monitoring and financial data (at output level, targets achieved) mainly from implementing partners reports and field visits monitoring, training manuals and other relevant toolkits, relevant law and government policies and strategies, UNICEF strategic documents available UNICEF and publicly available sectoral research reports and studies and national data (data from national database managed by the Ministry of Water and Energy as well as Regional Education Bureaus)

The project initially collected data from the target woredas to establish baselines. The selection of EU clusters and their component woredas was based on their vulnerabilities to recurrent climate impacts, particularly drought, the frequency of nutrition-related emergencies, and the repeated launch of humanitarian response programs by the humanitarian community. Consequently, the majority of baselines for the project indicators were either zero or very low. Throughout the project's implementation, monitoring data was continuously collected to track the achievement of targets within the key technical, accountability, and financial parameters. These data, along with updates from national databases pertinent to this intervention, are readily available for secondary analysis. In addition, the Consultant shall carry out a literature review on the processes which were used to produce outputs such as the hydrogeological mapping using remote sensing, geophysical surveying, and GIS during the implementation of the project.

Primary sources of information are expected to be right owners, government counterparts at federal level, regional state levels, zones and woreda levels, and partner organizations. Field work is to be conducted on the ground in a participatory way engaging all relevant stakeholders (communities benefiting from the project of increased water provision, local authorities, regional authorities) allowing for a transparent way of working including a validation process. Focus group discussions with various groups including ethnic minorities and e.g., agro-pastoralists and pastoralists, both sex and age disaggregated, are to be conducted for selected sites, as well as interviews with local knowledge bearers. All consultations will be documented in writing, and where the people accept, with photographs and/or video of proceedings. The opinion/suggestions made by the community/affected groups shall be incorporated in the final reports. Site surveys and visits shall provide objective data on the sites. Information shall be illustrated by maps showing the location and distribution of environmental features and project footprint/associated infrastructures.

Considering time, budget, and security constraints, it will not be possible for the evaluation team to visit all of the woredas/sites which are part of the EU RESET project. Sampling of evaluation target woredas will be at the discretion of the consultancy firm. Nevertheless, it is important to consider the representativeness of samples, which will be discussed further with the ERG during inception phase, and the 7 sites where post-drilling construction are to be included. The woredas which benefited from the project in 5 regions of Ethiopia are presented in the following table.

Region	Zone	Woreda	Keble	Post-drilling construction
Afar	Zone 1	Adear	Hado	
Afar	Zone 1	Dewe	Halbi	
Somali	Siti	Erer	Erer	
Somali	Siti	Mieso	Hawanile	Yes
Somali	Liben	Moyale	Mubarek	Yes
Somali	Liben	Liben	Deka Suftu1 Deka Suftu2	Yes (in Dekasuftu and Bundada IDP cam)
SNNP	South Omo	Dasenech	Omorate Oldemo	Yes (in Oldemo)
SNNP	South Omo	Hammer	Erbore	Yes
SNNP	Wolayita	Damot Pulsa	Warite Balaka	Yes
SNNP	Wolayita	Boloso Sore	Legama	Yes
Oromia	Borena	Guchi	Guchi 1 Guchi 2	
Oromia	East Bale	Dawe Kachen	Dibe Mole	
Oromia	East Bale	Rayitu	Kere Tule	
Amhara	East Gojjam	Enerji Enauga	Mertolemariam	
Amhara	South Wollo	Sayint	Guameda	

Data Analysis

The data analysis methods expected are mainly narrative and thematic analysis (and possibly content analysis) of the primary data collected through KIIs and FGDs, as well as descriptive analysis of secondary data¹⁷. The bidding company are expected to suggest data analysis methods to answer the evaluation question in their proposal, and to refine them during the inception phase.

The consulting firm will review the documentation related to the results of the EU Reset project. The firm can propose additional evaluation questions and may suggest a different design method and tools to answer the proposed evaluation questions. The team will propose a provisional methodological design within the bid (including detailed cost estimates). The methodological design will include: an evaluation framework; a strategy for collecting and analysing data; a series of specifically designed tools; and a detailed work plan and considerations of the context of the study areas during inception report development after selection.

Limitations

The evaluation team can experience challenges with sampling or difficulties in accessing certain areas, which may impact the evaluation's geographic scope. To curve the effects of geographical access the evaluation team will work closely with UNICEF program colleagues on the ground to determine areas relevant to the evaluation while safeguarding data collection staff.

Results, especially from the capacity building, might not be yet immediately visible, which can affect the assessment of the actual results achieved by the project.

The implementation has been carried out across regions and woredas and with partnership at federal and regional levels. In the framework of this evaluation, however, it will be impossible to cover all the woredas and actors and representativity and generalizability of findings and recommendations will have to be carefully considered. The consultants should ensure that they sample from the projects zones

¹⁷ "Taxonomy for Defining and Classifying UNICEF Research, Evaluation & Studies", UNICEF Office of Research, September 2014,

where construction to connect the water sources developed in this project have been connected to water schemes as well as where these have not yet been done.

Risks and risks mitigation

The current situations of conflict and climatic crisis in the country represent a risk for programme delivery, and hence to evaluation as well. Accessibility to certain areas might be/become an issue. The mapping of interventions will help in eventually redirecting the fieldwork, and secondary data and remote interviews should help cover eventually inaccessible areas.

Moreover, the changed situation in the country is a threat to the efforts to accelerate progresses in the safely managed water supply, and this should be taken appropriately in consideration of the performance of the project during the implementation period.

The evaluation team will have to elaborate on limitations and risks during the inception phase and reflect their considerations in the inception report.

Dissemination

All the key stakeholders will be involved and engaged in the evaluation process from the outset. This will help strengthen the ownership of the evaluation process. At the end, a workshop with key stakeholders will be organized to disseminate the evaluation findings and recommendations. Ensuring participation and inclusion of all key stakeholders to whom the recommendations are addressed, will help in co-creating the recommendations and develop the Evaluation Management Response (EMR). A larger event with secondary users will also be organized. Creative dissemination methods such as the use of performing arts will be considered to disseminate findings to the larger audience.

As a standard process, the evaluation report will be uploaded in EISI, and at UNICEF Ethiopia website and SharePoint sites. UNICEF will encourage partners to disseminate it on their websites and social media.

Under the expert direction of UNICEF communication section, and guided by the needs of management, the education and child protection sections, videos will be produced, for communicating visually and effectively to various audiences (including youth, persons with hearing impairment, non-readers, etc.). Ideally young activists will be involved as well in the dissemination of findings and recommendations to peers and to the communities of rights holders.

Ethical approval

The evaluation team is expected to refer to [UNEG ethical guidance to evaluation](#)¹⁸ as guiding principle to ensure quality of evaluation process. Ethical clearance is to be obtained from an internationally recognized Ethical Review Board (based in Ethiopia or abroad) prior to training and fieldwork implementation and in line with the international standards¹⁹. UNICEF evaluation section will facilitate ethical clearance through existing LTA at Regional Office level, upon the submission of inception report and necessary annexes by the evaluation team directly to the ethical review board (through their website).

For data collection in Ethiopia, in addition to the regional ethical approval by UNICEF, if it is advised by the programme (WASH) team to get an authorization from a federal or regional ethical review board/committee, the firm needs to manage that ethical clearance process and the related costs.

Guiding Principles

It is vital that the Evaluation consultants at all levels fully comply with the precautionary measures and ethical standards put in place by UNICEF and the Government of Ethiopia to protect the women and children we serve. It is of utmost importance to follow the rules of informed consent, anonymity and that

¹⁸ <https://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866>

¹⁹ <https://www.unicef-irc.org/research/ethical-research-and-children/>

the 'do no harm' principle consistently guides this evaluation. The bidding consultants should ensure that a detailed description of measures will be implemented to protect the women, children, and stakeholders we serve.

Some of the documents to guide Evaluation Consultants can be found on the links below:

- United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System
- UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations
- UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system
- [UNEG Gender and Human Rights Guidelines](#)
- [UNICEF Guidance on Gender Integration in Evaluation](#)
- UNICEF procedure for ethical standards in research, evaluation, data collection and analysis
- UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards²⁰
- UNICEF guidance on external academic publishing
- UNICEF Guidance on Gender Integration in Evaluation
- UNICEF Guidance Note: Adolescent participation in UNICEF monitoring and evaluation
- GEROS Quality Assessment System
- Disability-inclusive evaluations in UNICEF: Guidelines for achieving UNDIS standards

In addition, the evaluators will be expected to submit evidence of completion of the UNICEF Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA) training found here:

<https://agora.unicef.org/course/info.php?id=7380>

UN Secretary General's Bulletin on Special measures for protection from sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse

United Nations Protocol on Allegations of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse Involving Implementing Partners

Below are additional links only accessible to UNICEF Staff. They will be shared once a consultancy firm has been chosen.

- UNICEF Style Book 4.0
- UNICEF Brand book
- Universalia Checklist for Inception Report
- [Universalia Checklist for Final Evaluation Report](#)
- GEROS Checklist for Final Evaluation Report

Tasks with timeline

Task	Expected duration	Tentative timeline after contract signature	Tentative evaluation service provider's workload (in days)	Deliverables	Responsibility
Kick off and scoping discussions	2-3 days (as needed by the ET)	1 week	7	-	Evaluation manager with evaluation team
Inception report	Two weeks	3 weeks	7	Inception Report	Consultants
Endorsement of inception report ²¹	Three weeks	6 weeks			Evaluation manager / RO / reference group

²⁰ The final report is expected to meet the UNEG Evaluation reports standards as well as benchmarks used in UNICEF's Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System (GEROS)

²¹ In case the report is not accepted, an additional commenting process might be necessary.

Field work and preliminary analysis	Four weeks	10 weeks	21		Consultants
Preliminary findings and co-creation of recommendations workshop	One day	11 weeks	1	Presentation	Consultants
Draft report	Three weeks	14 weeks	21	Draft reports	Consultants
Quality assurance ²²	Two weeks	16 weeks			Evaluation manager / RO
Commenting process from all stakeholders	Two weeks	18 weeks			Evaluation manager to coordinate
Response to the comments / Final report / summary report/Copy editing and design ²³ A power point presentation of the evaluation; Two-pagers for each region; draft working paper for submission to a journal, 5 graphic interchange format (GFI) and 2 infographics	Two weeks	20 weeks	14	Final reports' PowerPoints	Consultants
Dissemination workshop by MoWE and UNICEF - Evaluation report presentation and management response	One day	20 weeks		Workshop	Evaluation manager to coordinate
			65 days		

Estimated duration of contract

5 months

Expected Deliverables and payments

The following are expected to be submitted by the consultant based on the agreed upon timeframe. All deliverables will be produced in English.

Deliverables

The following are expected to be submitted by the consultant based on the agreed upon timeframe. All deliverables will be produced in English.

Inception Report

The firm will prepare, submit, and present a brief inception report which details understanding of the task and how the evaluation questions will be addressed. This will ensure that the consultant, UNICEF, and major stakeholders have a shared understanding of the evaluation. The inception report is expected to reflect and elaborate on scope of work, approach, methodology, design, analysis, ethical considerations (and eventually sampling procedures and sample size). It is expected to include annexes such as an evaluation matrix (which questions will be answered, how, what are the data sources), data

²² In case the quality is not satisfactory, the process might take longer, and the company is to invest extra time.

²³ In case the quality is not satisfactory, the process might take longer, and the company is to invest extra time.

collection tools, received ethical clearance, clear descriptions of activities, work plan with a proposed schedule of tasks, and timeframe. The report will be discussed and agreed upon with UNICEF and key stakeholders. An outline for a standard UNICEF evaluation inception report can be found in Annex 4.

Fieldwork debriefings and draft evaluation report

Immediately following the fieldwork, UNICEF expects a debriefing on preliminary findings and recommendations. This is to receive immediate feedback after data collection before diving in data analysis to clarify vague areas if any. The firm is expected to submit a draft evaluation report of maximum 50 pages (excluding annexes) for review and comments by UNICEF. UNICEF will share the draft report to all relevant stakeholders. Comments from the stakeholders will then be collected and provided to the firm for incorporation or amendment, as deemed necessary.

Final report

A final report, which has incorporated all the valuable comments of all the reviewers will be submitted to UNICEF. The content, structure and quality of the report should meet the requirements of UNICEF (see Annex 5). A power point presentation of the evaluation will also be submitted.

The structure is expected to be as follows: executive summary; background, evaluation object, purpose scope and objectives, methodology, findings, conclusions, lessons learned, recommendations. UNICEF evaluation reports are expected to comply with and are assessed through the [GEROS](#) Quality Assessment System²⁴, the evaluation team is expected to familiarize themselves and comply with the expected standards.

Other deliverables

Two- pagers for each region; 1-2 draft working papers made ready for submission to a journal²⁵; 5 graphic interchange format (GFI) and 2 infographics.

Please find here the link to UNICEF guidance on external academic publishing (January 2017)²⁶.

In summary the firm is expected to

- Develop an inception report with high standard methodologies.
- Finalize data collection tools.
- Conduct data collection.
- Data entry, cleaning, and analysis.
- Write preliminary and final comprehensive report (including 4 pages executive summary).
- Consult with UNICEF and other partners throughout the different stages of the assessment.
- Ensure high-quality implementation is achieved.
- Produce brief learning documents which include knowledge gaps and proposed kinds of research.
- Following the completion of data collection, cleaned raw data should be submitted to UNICEF.
- The firm will develop a PowerPoint presentation including the main findings.

Payment

The schedule of the payments will be as follows:

- 40 % on submission of final inception report
- 30 % on submission and approval of the draft report
- 30 % after submission and approval of the final report and other deliverables by UNICEF.

The Team Leader of the consultants that will be awarded the evaluation contract is expected to assure the quality of the key milestone documents delivered. At the UNICEF level, the evaluation manager assures a first level of quality assurance of key deliverables (mainly inception and final reports) and shares them with the Regional Office for a second level of quality assurance. Once the deliverables are

²⁴ <https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/global-evaluation-reports-oversight-system-geros>

²⁵ The firm is encouraged to reach out to UNICEF staff to make them part of the working papers.

²⁶ <https://www.unicef-irc.org/files/upload/documents/UNICEF-External-Publishing.pdf>

cleared, they are shared with the ERG for commenting and advising, as well as with other bodies such as the Programme Management Team (PMT) — inception report— and Country Management Team (CMT) — draft report. The ambition is to be able to attain UNICEF best evaluation standards.

Governance of the evaluation, reporting and supervision

The consulting firm will be contracted by UNICEF Ethiopia and UNICEF will facilitate all interaction between other relevant stakeholders and the consulting firm.

The UNICEF Ethiopia Evaluation Manager will be the supervisor of this evaluation with support from the rural WASH team. The team leader from the consultant will liaise with UNICEF Evaluation Section for this specific assignment and regularly update progress and for all important matters related to the assessment throughout the period of its implementation.

UNICEF will facilitate contacts with the local authorities and institutions in the districts to share information on the activities carried out as part of the assessment.

The Contractor should take in consideration that its proposed team shall be available during the assignment. This assignment requires a full presence in Ethiopia of the international team leader for the whole duration of his deployment.

Evaluation criteria of proposals

Technical: 70 per cent

Technical Evaluation Criteria*	Score
Proposed Methodology and Approach Overall response and understanding of ToR clearly explaining the evaluation approach to cover the evaluation objectives Proposed methodology and workplan (with an emphasis on child-sensitive, youth-friendly, and gender transformative evaluation approaches) Using context conscious, innovative, participatory, and child-friendly evaluation methods (with an emphasis on children's participation) Ability to engage young evaluators/students for specified tasks related to evaluation	40
Experience of Company and Key Personnel Organizational capacity to deliver the work - previous work history with UNICEF evaluations (a good GEROs score will be an advantage) The strength of the proposed team including the related experience of lead and key local consultants Level of expertise with conducting evaluation involving adolescents – demonstrable expertise from previous evaluations will be an advantage	30
Total	70

* Only proposals which receive a minimum of 50 points will be considered further

Financial – 30 per cent

Expected Skill and Qualification

Firms should demonstrated experience in conducting qualitative and quantitative evaluations as well as participatory research and that they can meet the following requirements:

A minimum of 5 years' experience conducting evaluations and related to groundwater provision, natural resources management and livelihoods in the WASH sector in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Significant experience working with Ethiopian firms – particularly in providing technical quality assurance.

Experience conducting research studies in Ethiopian lowlands will be a clear advantage.

The evaluation firm will have to assure to avoid any possible conflict of interest (for example by avoiding hiring evaluators who have been involved in the planning or implementation of the project). Moreover,

the contractors are required to clearly identify any potential ethical issues and approaches, as well as the processes for ethical review and oversight of the evaluation process in their proposal.

Team composition

Ideally the team is mixed in terms of gender, age, cultural backgrounds, thematic and language skills, international and national experts. The team should have experience covering evaluation, WASH, climate and environment and gender. The table below sets out the tentative workload of the different specialists, as well as the required skills for the team members. The team should have experience covering evaluation, groundwater resources mapping, and development.

Team leader	65 days	The team leader must be an experienced evaluator and have an advanced degree (at least master, PhD preferred) in a Social Science and at least 10 years of experience conducting evaluations in this area. The team leader should be fluent in written and spoken English.
Thematic expert	40 days	The expert should have at least a master's degree and experience in water resources development and management
Sociologist	20 days	The expert should have at least a bachelor's degree (master's preferred) and experience in research in gender and stakeholder analysis and participation in development projects
Text and video editor	15 days	The editor should have experience in editing content for publication and dissemination, text and video.
Young evaluators/ Students	30 days	The young evaluators should be University students or recent graduates from faculties of sociology, anthropology, water and energy development who have qualitative research methodologies in their curriculum of study and preferably have data collection experience. The evaluator should demonstrate capacity in interacting with communities, adolescents, children; proficiency in English along with knowledge of local languages spoken in the targeted regions; and cultural sensitivity.

Amount budgeted in AWP for this activity (US \$)

General Conditions: Procedure and Logistics

The following conditions of work apply:

- The firm will not be provided lodging and/or meals.
- The firm will work from its own office facilities.
- UNICEF will not pay DSA in addition to the contract value to the consultants of the firm.
- The firm should provide its own materials, i.e., computer, office supplies, etc.
- The firm isn't authorized to have access to UNICEF transport.
- Flight costs of the consultants working for the firm would be covered by firm.
- Other transport costs of the consultants working for the firm would be covered by firm.
- Policy both parties should be aware of

- Under the consultancy agreements, a month is defined as 21 working days, and fees are prorated accordingly. Consultants are not paid for weekends or public holidays.
- All remuneration must be within the contract agreement.
- No contract may commence unless the contract is signed by both UNICEF and the consultant or contractor.
- For international consultants outside the duty station, signed contracts must be sent by fax or email. Signed contract copy or written agreement must be received by the office before Travel Authorization is issued.
- No consultant may travel without a signed travel authorization prior to the commencement of the journey to the duty station.
- Consultants will not have supervisory responsibilities or authority on UNICEF budget.

Intellectual property rights

All intellectual property rights in the work to be performed under this agreement shall be vested in the Government of Ethiopia and UNICEF including without limitations, the right to use, publish, translate, sell, or distribute, privately or publicly, any item or part thereof. The GoE and UNICEF hereby grant to the Recipient Organization a non-exclusive royalty-free license to use, publish, translate, and distribute, privately or publicly, any item or part of the work to be performed under this Agreement for non-commercial purposes. Neither the Recipient Organization nor its personnel shall communicate to any other person or entity any confidential information made known to it by (GoE and UNICEF) during the performance of its obligations under the terms of this Agreement nor shall it use this information to private or company advantage. This provision shall survive the expiration or termination of this Agreement.

The core reports will be issued by the steering committee for the research noting in the acknowledgements sections institutions and persons who have made major contributions to their authorship.

Data collected for the research is the property of the Government of Ethiopia/UNICEF country program. Master versions of the data, coding protocols and programming code permitting replication of results of core evaluation reports will be kept by the program. Copies of the data will be distributed to researchers with the permission of the evaluation steering committee with a view to helping to disseminate learning derived from the data sets.

18. Reporting and Supervisor

UNICEF Evaluation Manager will supervise the team and shall be assisted by the WASH section in coordinating various evaluation activities. QA support will be provided by the Evaluation Reference Group.



Annex 2: Project Outputs

Project purpose /Specific objective	Indicators	Activities
Results/output (I): Woreda-based hydrogeological maps are produced for all 8 EU RESET-II project clusters	1.1 Number of EU RESET-II woreda with groundwater suitability maps	Activity 1.1: Produce remote sensing and GIS overlay analysis report and maps for 39 woredas. Activity 1.2: Conduct ground verification of RS-GIS based on overlay analysis output. Activity 1.3: Produce woreda-based hydrogeological and groundwater suitability maps
Results/ output (II): 16 test productive boreholes drilled based on the recommendation of the study.	2.1 Number of wells drilled. 2.2 Percentage increase in drilling success rate 2.3 Number of water systems constructed and functioning.	Activity 2.1: Drill 16 boreholes in the eight clusters Activity 2.2: Construction water supply distribution system in all productive boreholes Activity 2.3: Advocate and support RWB in the construction of water schemes connected to the newly drilled water points
Results/ output (III): Knowledge gained from the hydrogeological study is documented and disseminated among the main WASH stakeholders in Ethiopia	3.1 Number of institutions and organizations who aware and have access to the results of the groundwater mapping study. 3.1? Number of government staff trained in mapping techniques	Activity 3.1: Conduct training for government staff on groundwater feasibility studies and cloud-based groundwater data management systems Activity 3.2: Provide training and support communities on scheme management, and sanitation and hygiene promotion activities Activity 3.3: Document and disseminate lessons learned from the project among main WASH stakeholders Activity 3.4: Conduct annual sustainability checks of all UNICEF supported water supply and sanitation projects to document key areas of improvement and lessons learned

Annex 3: Project Log frame

Result Level	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement			Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
		Indicator	Baseline	Target		
Overall objective	Contribute to the specific RESET-II objective “strengthening economic opportunities and resilience of the most vulnerable communities to human induced and natural disaster crises, through measures that will increase livelihoods and employment, and better access to basic services, in specially selected areas (clusters of woredas) which are known to be drought prone and food insecure.” by improving access to safe and sustainable water supply in 41 RESET-II woredas.	% increase in the number of people who have access to safe and sustainable water supply in the EU-RESET-II woredas.	0	20 % increase by 2020	-Project Annual Progress and Final Reports -Well drilling reports -WS system construction business plan	-The security situation in the target areas/the country as whole remains the same -There will not be extreme climate-related emergency or natural disaster -Government implementing partners allocate budget and manage the construction of water supply systems on the productive boreholes - Price escalation (inflation) doesn't limit the number of wells to be drilled - Key stakeholders actively engage in the project and make use of the groundwater maps
Specific objective	To improve access to safe and sustainable water supply for 82,000 drought affected population in 16 selected woredas.	No of new users of safe and sustainable water supplies in the RESET-II woredas	0	82,000 by 2020	-Project Progress and Final Reports -UNICEF and RWB annual sustainability check Monitoring Report	-100 % drilling success rate -All the budget required for post drilling construction is secured from the government timely

Result Level	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement			Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
		Indicator	Baseline	Target		
Result 1	Woreda based hydrogeological maps are produced for all EU-REST-II project woredas	No. of EU-RESET-II woreda with ground water suitability maps.	2	41	-Hydrological maps and reports -Project final report	- The partnership with EU-JRC continues as is. -Well experienced contractor is available to take the assignment
Result 2	16 test productive boreholes drilled based on the recommendation of the study	No of wells drilled No of water systems constructed and functioning % increase in drilling success rate	0 0 30-45%	16 by 2020 16 by 2020 At least 80%	Annual Progress Reports of the project – well completion reports	- Capable drilling contractors are available to construct the boreholes - Price escalation (inflation) doesn't limit the number of wells to be drilled.
Result 3	Knowledge gained from the hydrogeological study is documented and disseminated among the main WASH stakeholders in Ethiopia.	No of institutions and organizations who are aware and have access to the results of the groundwater mapping study No of government staff trained in mapping techniques	0 0	20 government organizations and institutions by 2020 At least 5 experts are trained by 2020	Annual Progress Reports of the project Project Final Report /Post training assessment	-The government selects the right persons for the training and retains them apply and they knowledge and skill from training in their daily work
Activities		Means to achieve activities				Pre-conditions required
R1 Activity 1	Produce remote sensing and GIS overlay analysis report and maps for 39 woredas	Sub-Agreement 1 - Geohydrological mapping contract			Annual Progress and Final Report of the project	All the required budget is secured timely
R1 Activity 2	Conduct ground verification of RS-GIS based on overlay analysis output	Sub-Agreement 1 - Geohydrological mapping contract			Annual Progress and Final Report of the project	Same as above

Result Level	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement			Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
		Indicator	Baseline	Target		
R1 Activity 3	Produce woreda based hydrogeological and groundwater suitability maps	Sub-Agreement 1 - Geohydrological mapping contract			Annual Progress and Final Report of the project	Same as above
R2 Activity 1	Drilling of 16 boreholes in the eight clusters	Sub-Agreement 2 – Drilling contract			Annual Progress and Final Report of the project	Same as above
R2 Activity 2	Construction water supply distribution system in all productive boreholes	Design and construction of water supply systems through MoWIE and regional water bureaus			Annual Progress and Final Report of the project	Same as above
R2 Activity 3	Advocate and support RWB in the construction of water schemes connected to the newly drilled water points	Design and construction of water supply systems through MoWIE and regional water bureaus			Annual Progress and Final Report of the project	Same as above
R3 Activity 1	Conduct training for government staff on groundwater feasibility studies and cloud-based groundwater data management systems	Sub-Agreement 3 – Capacity Building contract			Annual Progress and Final Report of the project	Same as above
R3 Activity 2	Provide training and support communities on scheme management, and sanitation and hygiene promotion activities	Sub-Agreement 3 – Capacity Building contract			Annual Progress and Final Report of the project	Same as above
R3 Activity 3	Document and disseminate lessons learned from the project among main WASH stakeholders	Sub-Agreement 3 – Capacity Building contract			Documentation and reports	Same as above
R1-R3 Activity 1	Annual sustainability check of all UNICEF supported water supply and sanitation projects to document key areas of improvement and lessons learned	Sub-Agreement 3 – Capacity Building contract			Annual Progress and Final Report of the project	Same as above

Annex 4: Proposed Table of Contents for an Inception Report

1. Introduction
2. Evaluation Context
 - 2.1 National Context
 - 2.2 UNICEF Programme under evaluation in Country/Region
 - 2.3. Theory of Change and results framework of programme and approach under evaluation
3. Evaluation Purpose
4. Evaluation Objectives
5. Evaluation Scope (Thematic, Geographic Scope, Chronological Scope)
6. Evaluation Framework
7. Methodology
 - 7.1 Evaluation Approach
 - 7.2 Data collection methods and tools
 - 7.3 Sampling strategy
 - 7.4 Data analysis and quality assurance
8. Dissemination and Communications Strategy
9. Evaluation Workplan
10. References
11. Annexes
 - 11.1. List of Acronyms
 - 11.2. Evaluation Matrix (with details on criteria, questions, indicators, data sources etc.)
 - 11.3. Ethical Review Process
 - 11.4. Data Collection Tools
 - 11.5. ToR

Annex 5: Table of contents for a final evaluation report

List of Acronyms

Title page

Table of contents

Executive Summary, including the purpose of the evaluation, key findings, conclusions and recommendations in priority order (3-4 pages)

Background/context of the evaluation, including a description of project interventions,

Log frame/results matrix (Theory of Change)

Purpose and objectives of the evaluation

Scope of the evaluation

Limitations and mitigation strategies

Evaluation criteria and key questions

Methodology (including ethical review)

Findings per criteria

Lessons learned

Conclusions and recommendations, explicitly linked to the findings

For every child,
trusted evidence driving impact



For further information, please contact:
UNICEF

Ethiopia Country Office
UNECA Compound, Zambezi Building, Box 1169
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

-  www.unicef.org/ethiopia
-  linkedin.com/company/unicef-ethiopia/posts
-  x.com/#!/UNICEFethiopia
-  youtube.com/user/unicefethiopia

© United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
October 2025