Appendix 2

Governance Research on Water Systems (GROWS)

Monitoring, Evaluation, & Learning Plan for the Field Evaluation (Activity 2)

January 2019

Introduction

Overview

The Governance Research on Water Systems (GROWS) Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) Plan was created by Global Partners for Development (GPFD) and approved by the Global Environment and Technology Foundation (GETF) and The Ohio State University (OSU). This Plan is intended to standardize GROWS data collection, analysis, and reporting such that data collection is efficient, data analysis is robust, and data reporting has accuracy, validity, and integrity.

This Plan is a living document that allows for institutional knowledge to accrue and plans to shift over time. Building a system of institutional learning is seldom as linear as initially designed, and this standardized MEL Plan is intended to help managers continually learn about and from the internal and external realities of the GROWS program, thus building an iterative learning process into GROWS systems.

The goal of the GROWS project is to identify and disseminate innovative governance models and tools that will help accelerate eliminating extreme poverty in sub-Saharan Africa.

"Governance, as defined by the United Nations Development Programme, refers to the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country's affairs at all levels. It involves the process and capacity to formulate, implement and enforce public policies and deliver services."[1]

This Plan will provide a structure for collecting, analyzing, and reporting on primary data in accordance with the field evaluation detailed in Activity 2 of the implementation plan. Data from Activity 2 will be extrapolated to provide insights on four main governance outcomes: 1) accountability; 2) transparency; 3) trust; and 4) equity.

Through Activity 2, GPFD will conduct a mixed-methods assessment using a quantitative difference-in-difference methodology as well as qualitative results from focus groups and surveys to determine the added value of using a private operator in addition to traditional service providers on governance outcomes. In this case, "service providers" refers to up to three water system governing bodies – the local government, the Community-Owned Water Supply Organization (COWSO), and the private operator.

This quasi-experimental assessment will capitalize on both OSU's existing relationship

---

[1] United Nations Development Programme, 'Governance for sustainable human development: A UNDP policy document', UNDP, <http://mirror.undp.org/magnet/policy/glossary.htm>, accessed 15 January 2019.

with the World Bank and the opportunity to take advantage of a unique private sector project in Tanzania being conducted in collaboration with the Ministry of Water. This assessment will be conducted on approximately 10-15 sites in Singida Rural District receiving new water systems from the World Bank. Approximately half will have a private sector operator, and the other half will not, thus naturally delineating treatment and control groups.

Ultimately, the results from this project should provide data to guide the creation of stronger accountability loops that will lead to improved governance structures for sustainable rural water services, especially those that plan to utilize multiple service providers.

GROWS MEL Team:

Program Design & Implementation Managers (Global Environment & Technology Foundation and The Ohio State University): Plan approval; Report approval; MEL results dissemination

GPFD Principal Investigator (Director of Programs & Evaluation): Plan development; Data collection and report planning; Staff training; Staff oversight; Report editing and approval

In-Country Manager (Monitoring & Evaluation Manager, GPFD Tanzania): Staff training; staff oversight; Data collection and reporting management

Enumerator(s) (GPFD): Data collection

Indicators – Introduction

Monitoring and evaluation indicators were developed in order to further define impact on four main outcomes: accountability, transparency, trust, and equity. Many of these indicators will be disaggregated by governance structure (i.e. COWSO, village leadership, and private operator), gender, type of user, etc. The indicators are separated into quantitative and qualitative categories.

Quantitative indicators will provide numerical data, usually through multiple-choice survey responses and the analysis of existing official documents. For this study, quantitative data will be gathered for water users only. "Water users" will consist of heads of household and members of the household who routinely collect water. "Type of user" will disaggregate data received based on the category in which the respondent falls.

Qualitative data will provide semi-structured information on individual perceptions, opinions, feelings, and stories that allow for more elaborate insights on the questions of interest, usually through open-ended survey questions and focus group discussions. Qualitative data will be gathered for water users and non-water users to garner information on how issues related to accountability, transparency, trust, and equity may determine participation in the system. These focus groups will be further divided by gender and minority affiliation as well. Service provider focus groups will also be congregated when appropriate.

Accountability Indicators

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) defines accountability as "the systems, procedures and mechanisms that ensure that public officials and institutions perform their stated duties and uphold their responsibilities to the public while imposing restraints on their power and authority and providing for redress or sanction when these duties and responsibilities are not met."[2]

As it relates to GROWS research, indicators of high accountability will show that providers are willing to accept responsibility for their actions and act in such a way that ensures system reliability. In order to ensure this, there must be internal and external structures in place that promote accountability among providers and between providers and users. This study will measure the mechanisms in place to ensure accountability as well as the degree to which users perceive that water system providers are accountable to them. This analysis will also measure levels of community engagement and the extent to which providers are responsive to user feedback. Measures of accountability will also include the accountability of users in their payments for water use.

Quantitative indicators for this outcome will include:

1. Number of times per year feedback is requested through official channels
2. Number of recorded feedback communications from user to provider
3. Number of recorded feedback communications from provider and user to government

---

[2] United States Agency for International Development, 'USAID Strategy on Democracy, Human Rights and Governance', USAID, Washington, D.C., June 2013, p. 19, <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1866/USAID-DRG_fina-_6-24-31.pdf>, accessed 15 January 2019.

4. Percentage of users who provided feedback
5. Percentage of users aware of opportunities to provide feedback
6. Number of user complaints about a service per 1,000 households served
7. Percentage of official records on actions taken by providers
8. that included information about who is responsible for those actions
9. Number of times accountability is mentioned in written employee policies
10. Number of times per year plans are updated in response to user feedback
11. Percentage of total amount owed that is remitted to the provider
12. Percentage of community members who consistently use the water service
13. Number of days system was unavailable to consumers
14. Number of days between system problem and resolution

Qualitative indicators for this outcome will include:

15. Description of how problems with the system are handled
16. Descriptions of the means by which feedback is obtained from users
17. Perception of how feedback is received and used by providers
18. User perception of willingness and ability to pay for water
19. Perception of providers on whether or not there is full water coverage and full payment by water users in the system

Transparency Indicators

USAID describes proper transparency as creating **"**an environment where governments and public officials engage in the clear disclosure of rules, plans, processes and actions in a form that is readily accessible to all. Transparency promotes accountability by providing the public with information about what the government is doing".[3]

For the purposes of GROWS research, transparency will be further defined as the consistent availability of information to the public regarding all financial, political, and managerial transactions related to water systems so that these actions are open to public scrutiny and stakeholder engagement. This study will measure the mechanisms in place to ensure transparency and perceived levels of provider openness among users.

Quantitative indicators for this outcome will include:

1. Number of official communication structures that promote two-way communication between users and providers
2. Number of public communications to users from providers
3. Number of public communications that included information about how money is spent

Qualitative indicators for this outcome will include:

4. Descriptions of the means by which information is shared with users
5. Perceptions of the accessibility and usability of shared information

Trust Indicators

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development explains that "trust is important

---

[3] Ibid, p. 38.

for the success of a wide range of public policies that depend on behavioural responses from the public. Trust is necessary to increase the confidence of investors and consumers. Trust is essential for key economic activities, most notably finance. Trust in institutions is important for the success of many government policies, programmes and regulations that depend on cooperation and compliance of citizens".[4]

This study will further define trust as confidence in the reliability of water service providers to fully maintain systems and to be motivated by the best interest of the end user in mind. Trust will also be defined as confidence in the reliability and perceived security of technology associated with the water systems. Indicators related to willingness to pay are included because perceptions of fairness, process legitimacy and credibility matter in people's willingness to pay for a good or service.[5]

Quantitative indicators for this outcome will include:

1. Percentage of users who feel that their concerns are consistently addressed
2. Percentage of users who trust that the technology associated with the water systems is secure and reliable
3. Percentage of users who think the cost of water from the system is fair
4. Percentage of users who think that their payments for water are used appropriately
5. Percentage of users who expect the system to be working one year from now
6. Percentage of users who agree or strongly agree that they trust system management
7. Percentage of users who trust that proper monitoring of service providers by service authorities takes place
8. Percentage of users who trust that proper monitoring of water systems by service providers takes place

Qualitative indicators for this outcome will include:

9. Comments on trust from non-users related to: reliability and security of technology associated with the water systems; cost of water from the system; providers, etc.
10. Requests for how much users/non-users would trust various statements from providers and why. If they do not trust the statement, what would they assume was true instead?
11. Stories on what past experiences may influence how trusting people are of current providers and how they think providers could become more trustworthy

Equity Indicators

The World Bank states that equity means "that individuals should have equal opportunities to pursue a life of their choosing and be spared from extreme deprivation in outcomes".[6]

---

[4] Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 'Trust in Government', OECD, Paris, 2018, <http://www.oecd.org/gov/trust-in-government.htm>, accessed 15 January 2019.

[5] The World Bank Group, 'World Development Report: Governance and the law', ch. 6, World Bank, Washington, D.C., 2017, p. 171, <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/25880/9781464809507_Ch06.pdf?sequence=43&isAllowed=y>, accessed 16 January 2019.

[6] World Bank Group, 'World Development Report: Equity and development', World Bank, Washington, D.C., 2006, p. 2, <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/435331468127174418/pdf/322040World0Development0Report02006.pdf>, accessed 16 January 2019.

This Plan defines equity as equality of opportunity as well as equality of outcomes associated with not only use of the water system but also level of participation in the governance of that system.

Quantitative indicators for this outcome will include:

1. Number of times equity is mentioned in written in employee policies
2. Percentage of women who feel that the system serves their daily needs
3. Degree to which feedback participation of women mirrors the participation of men
4. Degree to which participation of disadvantaged or minority groups mirrors the percentage of this group in the total population

Qualitative indicators for this outcome will include:

5. Perceptions on how management would react to varying feedback from diverse sources (disaggregated by COWSOs, providers, government)
6. The effects of existing incentives and requirements for equity and how this can be improved

Data Collection and Reporting

GPFD will collect data and report to GETF and OSU on the following schedule, which may be updated at any time with the approval of GPFD and GETF:

1) Submit MEL Plan – January 2019
2) Develop Data Collection Tools – February 2019
3) Begin Baseline Interviews – March 2019
4) Complete Baseline Interviews – April 2019
5) Submit Baseline Report – June 2019
6) Begin Midline Surveys – November 2019
7) Complete Midline Surveys – December 2019
8) Submit Midline Report – February 2020
9) Submit Qualitative Data Collection Tools – April 2020
10) Hold Focus Groups – June 2020
11) Begin Endline Surveys – November 2020
12) Complete Endline Surveys – December 2020
13) Submit Endline Report – January 2021

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION	
Data collection methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Village Leadership Survey; COWSO Survey; Private Operator Survey; Water User Focus Group Discussions (Male, Female); Non-Water User Focus Group Discussions (Male, Female); Service Provider Focus Groups; Local Government Records; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records
Data sources:	Village leadership; COWSOs; Private operators; Randomly selected water system users; Randomly selected community members in focus groups; Provider focus groups; Local government records; COWSO records; Private operator records
Description of data sources:	Type of "water user" will be defined as either the head of household or the individual responsible for collecting water in households that use the water at least once per week.
Frequency and timing of data acquisition:	One baseline and two follow-up surveys as well as one set of focus groups will be conducted. Exact schedules will be determined at a later date.
Individual responsible for providing reports:	Amy Holter, Director of Programs & Evaluation, GPFD
Location of data storage:	Data will be collected via the Mobenzi software and Stata will be used for data analyses. Both systems will be password-protected and will not be shared outside the team. There will be no paper-based data collection.

DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Data quality assessment:	Data quality will be assessed within each report. GETF, OSU, and GPFD will approve any changes to the original MEL Plan based on discussions of these issues.
Known data limitations and significance:	GPFD, GETF, and OSU acknowledge that there will be many contributing factors that may minimize their ability to attribute significant changes to a specific governing policy due to the fact that the data will be highly tied to complex and ever-changing political and social realities.
Actions taken or planned to address data limitations:	GPFD's team will be diligent in making note of any and all changes within the communities that may also contribute to changes in the results of their analyses.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING	
Data analysis:	Data in Mobenzi will be sent to Excel and analyzed using Stata. A difference-in-difference analysis will be completed after each follow-up survey.
Data reporting:	After each round of surveys, GPFD will submit a report following data cleaning, analysis, and interpretation. This report will include relevant information on the following: • Introduction and summary of findings • Methodology, including any data collection challenges and successes, lists of informants, etc. • Results of data analysis • Discussion of results • Conclusion • Photos
Review of data:	All reports will be reviewed by the GETF and OSU teams, and comments will be submitted back to GPFD.

Indicator Protocol

Indicators with an * are fully qualitative

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #1: Number of times per year feedback is requested through official channels	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of times per calendar year that feedback from all water users is requested over a defined period of time. This includes formal requests for verbal, written, or electronic feedback methods.
Unit of Measure:	Number of requests
Disaggregated by:	Anonymity of feedback; requests from government, private operator, or COWSO; method of feedback requested.
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the number of times governance bodies act upon their interest to garner feedback from water users.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Village Leadership Survey; COWSO Survey; Private Operator Survey; Water User Focus Group Discussions; Local Government Records; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records
Data Sources:	Key informants from village leadership; Key informants from COWSOs; Private operators; Local government records; COWSO records; Private operator records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make recording feedback either more necessary or more difficult.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #2: Number of recorded feedback communications from user to provider	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of times per calendar year that feedback from all water users is formally recorded on paper or electronic records for a set period of time by providers. This includes official records of verbal, written, or electronic feedback methods.
Unit of Measure:	Number of times records are updated
Disaggregated by:	Private operator and COWSO; method of feedback recorded; gender; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the number of times providers make record of feedback from water users.
Data Collection Methods:	COWSO Survey; Private Operator Survey; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records
Data Sources:	Key informants from COWSOs; Private operators; Randomly selected water system users; COWSO records; Private operator records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make requesting feedback either more necessary or more difficult.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #3: Number of recorded feedback communications from provider and user to government	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of times per calendar year that feedback from all water users and providers is formally recorded on paper or electronic records for a set period of time by government. This includes official records of verbal, written, or electronic feedback methods.
Unit of Measure:	Number of times records are updated
Disaggregated by:	Anonymity of feedback; feedback from private operator, COWSO, or user; method of feedback recorded; gender; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the number of times government makes record of feedback from water users and providers.
Data Collection Methods:	Village Leadership Survey; COWSO Survey; Private Operator Survey; Local Government Records
Data Sources:	Key informants from village leadership; Key informants from COWSOs; Private operators; Randomly selected water system users; Local government records; COWSO records; Private operator records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make recording feedback either more necessary or more difficult.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #4: Percentage of users who provided feedback	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of distinct users who provide any recorded feedback within a calendar year divided by the number of distinct water users who used water within the same year.
Unit of Measure:	Number of users who provide any recorded feedback
Disaggregated by:	Anonymity of feedback; recorded by government, private operator, or COWSO; method of feedback recorded (verbal, written, or electronic); gender; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the percentage of water users who provide feedback to those who govern the water system.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Village Leadership Survey; COWSO Survey; Private Operator Survey; Local Government Records; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records
Data Sources:	Key informants from village leadership; Key informants from COWSOs; Private operators; Randomly selected water system users; Local government records; COWSO records; Private operator records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make providing or recording feedback either more necessary or more difficult.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #5: Percentage of users aware of opportunities to provide feedback	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of distinct users who are aware of any current or past opportunities for providing feedback at the time of the survey (or since the previous survey).
Unit of Measure:	Number of users who are aware of opportunities for feedback
Disaggregated by:	Opportunities from government, private operator, or COWSO; method of feedback requested; gender; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the percentage of water users who are aware of opportunities to give feedback to those who govern the water system. It will be used in concert with the number of users who decided to provide feedback.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Water User Focus Group Discussions
Data Sources:	Randomly selected water system users
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make learning of opportunities for feedback either more necessary or more difficult.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #6: Number of water user complaints about a service per 1,000 households served	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of user complaints about the water service made and/or received via verbal, written, or electronic methods within one year on average for every 1,000 households served.
Unit of Measure:	Number of complaints
Disaggregated by:	Complaints to government, private operator, or COWSO; whether or not the complaint was addressed; whether it was addressed by the government, private operator, or COWSO; type of user; gender
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the number of times water users complain about the water service as an indicator of service reliability and quality.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Village Leadership Survey; COWSO Survey; Private Operator Survey; Local Government Records; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records
Data Sources:	Key informants from village leadership; Key informants from COWSOs; Private operators; Randomly selected water system users; Local government records; COWSO records; Private operator records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make submitting a complaint either more necessary or more difficult.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #7: Percentage of official records that included information about who is responsible for actions taken by the providers	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The percentage of official records that include what individual or body (name and/or title) was responsible for actions taken by providers since the last survey divided by the total number of actions taken. "Actions taken" refer to any change to physical infrastructure, methods for user water collection, or pricing related to the water system.
Unit of Measure:	Number of records naming parties responsible for actions taken; number of records of actions taken
Disaggregated by:	Records from government, private operator, or COWSO
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information whether or not individual(s) are held to account for specific actions taken by water service providers.
Data Collection Methods:	Local Government Records; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records
Data Sources:	Local government records; COWSO records; Private operator records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make recording responsible parties either more necessary or more difficult.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #8: Number of times accountability is mentioned in written employee policies	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of times written staff orientations, employee handbooks, or other employee policies mention "accountability", "culpability", or "responsibility" by name or by topic.
Unit of Measure:	Number of mentions of accountability
Disaggregated by:	Government, private operator, or COWSO
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the number of times providers seek to ensure their employees understand the importance of accountability in their jobs.
Data Collection Methods:	Local Government Records; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records
Data Sources:	Local government records; COWSO records; Private operator records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any issues they come across in accessing these documents.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #9: Number of times plans are updated in response to user feedback	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of times since previous survey that plans were updated based on user feedback. "Updates" can include large, long-term updates to policy or short-term changes in plans in order to respond to a maintenance request.
Unit of Measure:	Number of plan updates
Disaggregated by:	Government, private operator, or COWSO; method of feedback received.
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the number of times governance bodies act upon the feedback they receive from water users.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Village Leadership Survey; COWSO Survey; Private Operator Survey; Water User Focus Group Discussions; Local Government Records; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records
Data Sources:	Key informants from village leadership; Key informants from COWSOs; Private operators; Randomly selected water system users; Local government records; COWSO records; Private operator records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make responding to feedback either more necessary or more difficult.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #10: Percentage of users who pay in full for their water use	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of water users who pay in full and on time divided by the number of water users who retrieve water over the past two weeks.
Unit of Measure:	Number of users who pay in full and on time; number of water users
Disaggregated by:	Type of payment model (mobile, cash, electronic)
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the percentage of users who uphold their end of the "deal" with water providers by paying in full and on time.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; COWSO Survey; Private Operator Survey; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records
Data Sources:	Key informants from COWSOs; Private operators; Randomly selected water system users; COWSO records; Private operator records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that make accessing data more difficult or would have made water user payment in full more difficult.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #11: Percentage of total amount owed that is remitted to the provider	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The amount of money received from water users over the past two weeks divided by the amount of money that should have been received within the same time frame given the amount of water used.
Unit of Measure:	Water used; amount of money received
Disaggregated by:	No disaggregation
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on accountability of water users on the whole to provide appropriate payment to providers for water service.
Data Collection Methods:	COWSO Records; Private Operator Records
Data Sources:	COWSO records; Private operator records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that make accessing data more difficult or would have made water user payment in full more difficult.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #12: Percentage of community members who consistently use the water service	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of households who use the water system at least once per week divided by the total number of households in the catchment area.
Unit of Measure:	Number of households that use water; number of households
Disaggregated by:	N/A
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the percentage of households served by the water system
Data Collection Methods:	Key informants from village leadership; COWSO Survey; Private Operator Survey; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records; Government Records
Data Sources:	Key informants from COWSOs; Key informants from government; Private operators; COWSO records; Private operator records; Government records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that make it more or less likely that households will use the water – i.e. seasonality, other available sources, extreme weather incidents, etc.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #13: Number of days the system was unavailable for use by consumers	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of days since the previous survey that the borehole was unavailable for use by consumers with the meter showing close to zero water supplied.
Unit of Measure:	Number of days
Disaggregated by:	N/A
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on whether or not the service providers are holding up their end of the deal for consumers
Data Collection Methods:	COWSO Records; Private Operator Records; Government Records
Data Sources:	COWSO records; Private operator records; Government records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any reasons why there might be an understanding between service providers and users for the system not to operate on certain days.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #14: Number of days between system problem and resolution	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of days between when a technical problem is reported by users or COWSOs and the problem is resolved by government or private operator since the previous survey
Unit of Measure:	Number of days
Disaggregated by:	N/A
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the reliability of service providers to ensure water is available to users as quickly as possible when there is a problem
Data Collection Methods:	Key informants from village leadership; COWSO Survey; Private Operator Survey; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records; Government Records
Data Sources:	Key informants from COWSOs; Key informants from government; Private operators; COWSO records; Private operator records; Government records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating specifics of situations reported.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #15: Descriptions of how problems with the system were handled	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	Conversations about whether or not problems arose, how they were resolved, how long they took to correct, etc.
Unit of Measure:	N/A
Disaggregated by:	Gender; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide descriptive information on how service providers dealt with technical or managerial problems related to the system
Data Collection Methods:	Water User Focus Group Discussions (M,F); Non-Water User Focus Group Discussions (M,F); Service provider focus groups
Data Sources:	Randomly selected community members; Government; Private operators; COWSOs
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #16: Descriptions of the means by which feedback is obtained from users	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	This will be an open discussion on the ways in which feedback is and has been obtained from users and non-users about the water service, the clarity of instructions for how to provide feedback, and the ability and interest of water users in providing that feedback
Unit of Measure:	N/A
Disaggregated by:	Users and non-users; gender; reference to government, private operator, COWSO; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator will allow us to delve into the details of how users and non-users perceive opportunities or lack thereof to provide feedback to service providers
Data Collection Methods:	Water User Focus Group Discussions (M,F); Non-Water User Focus Group Discussions (M,F)
Data Sources:	Randomly selected community members
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	These conversations may veer in ways that the organizer did not expect, and these shifts will be welcome (as long as relevant) and recorded.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #17: Perception of how feedback is received and used by providers	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	This discussion will relate to perceptions of community members regarding how potential or actual feedback is perceived and used by providers
Unit of Measure:	N/A
Disaggregated by:	Users and non-users; gender; reference to government, private operator, COWSO; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator will allow us to delve into the details of what users and non-users perceive think happens to their feedback when it is received, which may give hints as to why community members do or do not provide feedback.
Data Collection Methods:	Water User Focus Group Discussions (M,F); Non-User Focus Group Discussions (M,F)
Data Sources:	Randomly selected community members
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	These conversations may veer in ways that the organizer did not expect, and these shifts will be welcome (as long as relevant) and recorded.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #18: User perception of willingness and ability to pay for water	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	Discussions related to perceptions of community members' willingness and ability to pay for water as well as various types of savings and payment schemes created to enable community members to afford to consistently pay for water. Discussions may also touch upon other reasons why community members may not use water aside from financial limitations
Unit of Measure:	N/A
Disaggregated by:	Gender; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This discussion will allow researchers to further delve into the topics of whether or not current governance structures ensure that water prices are set at a level that is accessible to community members and community perceptions of the importance of paying for clean water services.
Data Collection Methods:	Water User Focus Group Discussions (M,F); Non-User Focus Group Discussions (M,F)
Data Sources:	Randomly selected community members
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	These conversations may veer in ways that the organizer did not expect, and these shifts will be welcome (as long as relevant) and recorded.

ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATOR #19: Perception of providers on whether or not there is full water coverage and full payment by water users in the system	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	This topic will allow providers to discuss whether or not users are paying for their water in full and if not, why not. It will also allow them to discuss coverage of the water system and whether or not they perceive that all users are covered within the system
Unit of Measure:	N/A
Disaggregated by:	Government, private operator, or COWSO
Justification and Management Utility:	This discussion will allow researchers to further delve into the topic of provider satisfaction with water transactions in the community and whether or not users and providers are remaining accountable to one another.
Data Collection Methods:	Provider Focus Groups
Data Sources:	Provider representatives
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	These conversations may veer in ways that the organizer did not expect, and these shifts will be welcome (as long as relevant) and recorded.

TRANSPARENCY INDICATOR #1: Number of official communication structures that promote two-way communication between users and providers	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of communication structures (physical and technological)/systems (planned events) that were set up by official providers that allow for communication from providers to users and from users to providers since the previous survey.
Unit of Measure:	Number of communication structures/systems
Disaggregated by:	Government, private operator, or COWSO
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on how accessible two-way communication is between users and providers. In this way, researchers will learn how much information providers could be sharing with users and how users could respond with questions or concerns.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Village Leadership Survey; COWSO Survey; Private Operator Survey; Water User Focus Group Discussions; Provider Focus Groups; Local Government Records; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records
Data Sources:	Key informants from village leadership; Key informants from COWSOs; Private operators; Randomly selected water system users; Local government records; COWSO records; Private operator records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make setting up two-way communication either more necessary or more difficult.

TRANSPARENCY INDICATOR #2: Number of public communications to users from providers	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of public communications between providers and users regarding the water system since the previous survey. "Public" is defined as something that is open for access by anyone in the community.
Unit of Measure:	Number of communications
Disaggregated by:	Government, private operator, or COWSO; method of communication (written, verbal, electronic)
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on how frequently governance bodies are communicating with users about the water system.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Village Leadership Survey; COWSO Survey; Private Operator Survey; Water User Focus Group Discussions; Provider Focus Groups; Local Government Records; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records
Data Sources:	Key informants from village leadership; Key informants from COWSOs; Private operators; Randomly selected water system users; Local government records; COWSO records; Private operator records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make public communication either more necessary or more difficult.

TRANSPARENCY INDICATOR #3: Number of public communications that included information about how money is spent	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of public communications between providers and users regarding how money collected through the water system is spent since the previous survey. "Public" is defined as something that is open for access by anyone in the community.
Unit of Measure:	Number of communications
Disaggregated by:	Government, private operator, or COWSO; method of communication (written, verbal, electronic)
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on how frequently governance bodies are communicating with users about how their payments for water are being used.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Village Leadership Survey; COWSO Survey; Private Operator Survey; Water User Focus Group Discussions; Provider Focus Groups; Local Government Records; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records
Data Sources:	Key informants from village leadership; Key informants from COWSOs; Private operators; Randomly selected water system users; Local government records; COWSO records; Private operator records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make communicating how funds are spent either more necessary or more difficult.

TRANSPARENCY INDICATOR #4: Descriptions of the means by which information is shared with users	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	Discussions about the ways in which information is shared with users, how accessible it is, how clear it is, and how consistent it is.
Unit of Measure:	N/A
Disaggregated by:	Gender; user and non-user; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the content of communications to users from providers and how people perceive those communications.
Data Collection Methods:	Water User Focus Group Discussions; Provider Focus Groups
Data Sources:	Key informants from village leadership; Key informants from COWSOs; Private operators; Randomly selected community members
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Focus group leaders should note the sensitivity of a topic about government communications and transparency and respect that people may not want to discuss this candidly.

TRANSPARENCY INDICATOR #5: Perceptions of the accessibility and usability of shared information	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	Discussions about the ways in which information is shared with users, how accessible it is, how clear it is, and how consistent it is.
Unit of Measure:	N/A
Disaggregated by:	Gender; user and non-user; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the content of communications to users from providers and how people perceive those communications.
Data Collection Methods:	Water User Focus Group Discussions; Water Non-User Focus Group Discussions; Provider Focus Groups
Data Sources:	Key informants from village leadership; Key informants from COWSOs; Private operators; Randomly selected community members
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Focus group leaders should note the sensitivity of a topic about government communications and transparency and respect that people may not want to discuss this candidly.

TRUST INDICATOR #1: Percentage of users who feel that their concerns are consistently addressed	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of users who feel that their concerns are always or usually addressed by operators divided by the total number of users surveyed.
Unit of Measure:	Number of users
Disaggregated by:	Government, private operator, or COWSO; gender; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on how consistently operators are meeting the needs of users and reacting productively to their concerns.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Water User Focus Group Discussions
Data Sources:	Randomly selected water system users
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make responding to concerns either more difficult or more necessary.

TRUST INDICATOR #2: Percentage of users who trust that the technology associated with the water systems is secure and reliable	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of users who trust that the technology associated with the water system will not be problematic for them and will keep their information secure divided by the total number of users surveyed.
Unit of Measure:	Number of users
Disaggregated by:	Gender; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This serves to provide information about whether or not users trust the technology used by providers as an indicator of their trust in the provider.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Water User Focus Group Discussions
Data Sources:	Randomly selected water system users
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make using the technology more necessary or more difficult.

TRUST INDICATOR #3: Percentage of users who think the cost of water from the system is fair	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of users who respond that they are very willing or willing to pay for the water at its current cost divided by the number of users surveyed.
Unit of Measure:	Number of users
Disaggregated by:	Gender; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on users' willingness to pay as an indicator of their trust that the providers are setting a fair price for water.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Water User Focus Group Discussions
Data Sources:	Randomly selected water system users
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make paying for water at its current rate either more necessary or more difficult.

TRUST INDICATOR #4: Percentage of users who think that their payments for water are used appropriately	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of users who understand why they must pay for water and trust that what they pay for water is used to benefit them divided by the number of users surveyed.
Unit of Measure:	Number of users
Disaggregated by:	Gender; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on users' trust that the funds they provide for water are necessary to maintain the system and are in fact used to do so.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Water User Focus Group Discussions
Data Sources:	Randomly selected water system users
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make understanding how funds are used more difficult.

TRUST INDICATOR #5: Percentage of users who expect the system to be working one year from now	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of users who expect that the water system will be working well in one year from the survey divided by the number of total users surveyed.
Unit of Measure:	Number of users
Disaggregated by:	Gender; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the percentage of users who have enough trust in the system that they expect it to work over the relatively long-term.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users
Data Sources:	Randomly selected water system users
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make system reliability over the long-term more unlikely.

TRUST INDICATOR #6: Percentage of users who trust system management	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of users who agree or strongly agree that they consistently trust information they receive from providers divided by the total number of users surveyed.
Unit of Measure:	Number of users
Disaggregated by:	Gender; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the percentage of users who trust their water service providers and the information they receive from them.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users
Data Sources:	Randomly selected water system users
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	

TRUST INDICATOR #7: Percentage of users who trust that proper monitoring of private operators by service authorities takes place	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of users who strongly agree or agree that they trust that government authorities properly monitor private operators divided by the total number of users surveyed.
Unit of Measure:	Number of users
Disaggregated by:	Gender; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the percentage of users who trust that government is acting responsibly in its oversight role.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; COWSO Survey; Private Operator Survey; Water User Focus Group Discussions
Data Sources:	Key informants from COWSOs; Private operators; Randomly selected water system users
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any concerns regarding users' discomfort with discussing government reliability.

TRUST INDICATOR #8: Percentage of users who trust that proper monitoring of water systems by service providers takes place		
DESCRIPTION		
Precise Definition(s)	The number of users who strongly agree or agree that they trust that service providers properly monitor water systems divided by the total number of users surveyed.	
Unit of Measure:	Number of users	
Disaggregated by:	Private operator or COWSO; gender; type of user	
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the percentage of users who trust that the water system will be maintained properly by the service providers.	
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Water User Focus Group Discussions	
Data Sources:	Key informants from village leadership; Randomly selected water system users	
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES		
Notes on Baselines/Targets:		
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make trusting that proper maintenance will take place more difficult.	

TRUST INDICATOR #9: Comments on trust from non-users related to: reliability and security of technology associated with the water systems; cost of water from the system; providers, etc.

DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	Request comments from non-users on technology, cost, provider maintenance, and other factors that might impact why people do not use the system.
Unit of Measure:	N/A
Disaggregated by:	Government, private operator, or COWSO; gender
Justification and Management Utility:	This conversation should allow researchers to determine why non-users choose not to use or are otherwise barred from using the system.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Non-User Focus Group Discussions
Data Sources:	Randomly selected water system non-users

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	

TRUST INDICATOR #10: Requests for how much users/non-users would trust various statements from providers and why. If they do not trust the statement, what would they assume was true instead?

DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	Comments on when users and non-users trust information from providers and why.
Unit of Measure:	N/A
Disaggregated by:	Government, private operator, or COWSO; gender; user, non-user; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide examples of how people respond to information provided by responders and the extent to which they trust that information.
Data Collection Methods:	Water User Focus Group Discussions; Water Non-User Focus Group Discussions
Data Sources:	Randomly selected community members
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors should make every effort to provide a safe environment for individuals as they discuss somewhat difficult topics. Collectors should not push participants to discuss more than they are comfortable with.

TRUST INDICATOR #11: Stories on what past experiences may influence how trusting people are of current providers and how they think providers could become more trustworthy	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	Discussions about past experiences and how these might color current trust of providers as well as suggestions for how users and non-users might develop their trust for existing providers
Unit of Measure:	N/A
Disaggregated by:	Government, private operator, or COWSO; gender; user, non-user; type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This discussion will foster useful feedback for existing providers on how they can build trust among community members.
Data Collection Methods:	Water User Focus Group Discussions; Water Non-User Focus Group Discussions
Data Sources:	Randomly selected community members
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors should make every effort to provide a safe environment for individuals as they discuss somewhat difficult topics. Collectors should not push participants to discuss more than they are comfortable with.

EQUITY INDICATOR #1: Number of times equity is mentioned in written employee policies	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of times written staff orientations, employee handbooks, or other employee policies mention "equity" or "equality" by name or by topic. This may also include directions not to discriminate, etc.
Unit of Measure:	Number of mentions of equity
Disaggregated by:	Government, private operator, or COWSO
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on the number of times providers seek to ensure their employees understand the importance of treating everyone fairly and equally in their jobs.
Data Collection Methods:	Local Government Records; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records
Data Sources:	Local government records; COWSO records; Private operator records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any issues they come across in accessing these documents.

EQUITY INDICATOR #2: Percentage of women who feel that the system serves their daily needs	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of women who believe that the system serves their daily needs divided by the number of total women surveyed.
Unit of Measure:	Number of women
Disaggregated by:	Type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on whether or not women feel that the system is set up in a way that benefits them and suits their needs.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Water User Focus Group Discussions
Data Sources:	Randomly selected water system users
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note of any specifics detailed by surveyed individuals.

EQUITY INDICATOR #3: Degree to which feedback participation of women mirrors the participation of men	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of women participating in feedback opportunities versus the number of men since the previous survey
Unit of Measure:	Number of women; number of men
Disaggregated by:	Type of user
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on whether or not women choose to provide feedback at the same rate as men.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Water User Focus Group Discussions; Local Government Records; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records
Data Sources:	Randomly selected water system users; Local government records; COWSO records; Private operator records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make providing feedback either more necessary or more difficult for women or men.

EQUITY INDICATOR #4: Percentage of disadvantaged or minority groups using the system	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	The number of citizens with disabilities or other minority groups using the system divided by the number of disadvantaged or minority groups in the total population.
Unit of Measure:	Number of citizens with disabilities or other minority groups
Disaggregated by:	Type of user; Minority classification
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on whether or not the system is set up to serve all people regardless of ability, race, class, religion, tribe, etc.
Data Collection Methods:	Water Governance Assessment Survey for Users; Water User Focus Group Discussions; Local Government Records; COWSO Records; Private Operator Records
Data Sources:	Key informants from village leadership; Key informants from COWSOs; Private operators; Randomly selected water system users; Local government records; COWSO records; Private operator records
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors will make a note indicating any extenuating circumstances that would make access to the system by minorities either more necessary or more difficult.

EQUITY INDICATOR #5: Perceptions on how service providers would react to varying feedback from diverse sources	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	Descriptions of how various groups would feel providing feedback to service providers and how they anticipate providers reacting to their feedback
Unit of Measure:	N/A
Disaggregated by:	Government, private operator, or COWSO; Gender; Minority affiliation
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide information on how people would expect their feedback to be accepted and used based on differences in gender or minority affiliation.
Data Collection Methods:	Water User Focus Group Discussions; Water Non-User Focus Group Discussions
Data Sources:	Randomly selected community members
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors should make every effort to provide a safe environment for individuals as they discuss somewhat difficult topics. Collectors should not push participants to discuss more than they are comfortable with.

EQUITY INDICATOR #6: The effects of existing incentives and requirements for equity and how this can be improved	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s)	A conversation on whether or not the system is meeting the needs of all community members and ideas for various ways governing bodies could improve equity of systems if necessary.
Unit of Measure:	N/A
Disaggregated by:	Gender; Minority affiliation
Justification and Management Utility:	This indicator serves to provide descriptive information grassroots ideas for improving access to services by women and minorities.
Data Collection Methods:	Water User Focus Group Discussions; Water Non-User Focus Group Discussions; Service provider focus groups
Data Sources:	Randomly selected community members; Service providers from government, COWSOs, and private operator
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES	
Notes on Baselines/Targets:	
Other Notes:	Data collectors should make every effort to provide a safe environment for individuals as they discuss somewhat difficult topics. Collectors should not push participants to discuss more than they are comfortable with.