

Every day. In times of crisis. For our future.



Photo By: Hannah Maule-ffinc



Operation and Maintenance Financing for School WASH Facilities in Kenya

2016

Acknowledgements

This briefer is based on a 2014 global study by Save the Children and UNICEF on the Operation and Maintenance Financing of WASH facilities in schools. The study was coordinated by Susan Davis, with assistance from Seung Lee, Mohini Venkatesh, and Stephen Sara at Save the Children USA; and Murat Sahin and Greg Keast from UNICEF.

The briefer was written by Mohini Venkatesh, Stephen Sara, and Nanditha Gopal. Copy-editing and formatting was done by Frannie Noble. Our thanks to colleagues associated with the study and Christie Chatterley for reviewing the briefer.

Special thanks to the following contributors from Kenya: Cherio Onacha; Tobias Omondi, and Jacquelyn Haver from Save the Children; Alex Mwaki from Care International; The National Ministry of Health representatives and officials from 10 schools in Nairobi.

For more information, please contact: Mohini Venkatesh (mvenkatesh@savechildren.org)

June 2016

Operation and Maintenance Financing for School WASH Facilities in Kenya

Kenya

Kenya is situated in East Africa, with a surface area of 580,370 km² and a total population of 45.55 million people. It is a lower middle income country (GDP/capital 1,358.3 US\$) (World Bank, 2014). Since the 2010 Constitution of Kenya came into full effect in 2013, the country has transitioned to devolved governance where counties are newly responsible for the implementation of national policies for education, urban development and other sectors. The country is divided into 47 counties, including the capital, Nairobi. Sub-counties are decentralized units of each county and are headed by a sub-county administrator. The country is mostly rural, with agriculture a large part of the economy.

Kenya has an 8-4-4 education system, launched in 1985 and designed to provide eight years of primary education for 6 to 13 year-old children, four years of secondary education for 14 to 17 year-old children and four years of university (tertiary education).

I. Executive Summary

This case study on the financing for the operation and maintenance (O&M) of school WASH facilities in Kenya, is based on a review of documents, key informant interviews and visits to 10 schools in Nairobi.

Kenya invests in WASH in schools mainly through the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST), which funds the construction of WASH facilities and supports O&M through its Free Primary Education (FPE) grant to government schools. In Nairobi, MoEST is supported by the City County and its water company, the Nairobi City Water and Sewerage Company (NCWSC), for installations and water, waste disposal and hygiene services in schools. In the future as the Kenyan government authority further devolves to counties, local governments are expected to increase contributions for school WASH. The Ministry of Health (MoH) is responsible for monitoring school WASH facilities. Development partners invest in school WASH constructions, hygiene promotion, and promote school level Boards of Management (BOMs) and health clubs.

Many good practices for WASH in schools were found in this study, such as the presence of supportive national policies, plans and a school grant system. The 2009 *National School Health Policy* recommends better resource management for WASH O&M, and a WASH budget line for schools. The national FPE grant to schools increased its General Purpose Account (GPA) by 77 percent in 2014. This account includes budget lines to support maintenance, water, electricity and support staff. In addition, it includes new line items for environment and sanitation and contingencies for sanitary towels and supplies which total to 65 KSh/student/year. The *National Education Sector Plan (NESP) 2013-2018* recommends a further increase to the FPE grant allocations, as the current budget does not meet the needs of schools despite the 2014 increase. Almost all schools reported that it is their responsibility to conduct O&M of WASH facilities, and most schools had a custodian (security) paid from the school budget, who helped with cleaning WASH facilities and the school.

There are, however, areas for improvement in the current resource setting to ensure effective maintenance of school WASH facilities. The *National School Health Policy* and *Guidelines* do not recommend funding streams such as the FPE grant for schools and local governments to plan and budget school WASH activities. The policy also lacks guidance on how much to budget for various items (e.g. labor, consumables, spare parts). Indeed, the *NESP 2013-2018* recommends a review of the school health policy. Local county governments now manage primary schools, but are still at the inception of investing in school WASH and incorporating policies such as the *National School Health Policy* in to their plans. Although the NCWSC provides water, sanitation, and maintenance services, it is unable to meet needs of all schools; thus supply is irregular and maintenance is not timely. The City County extends its waste collection services to schools, though schools find it expensive and prefer to bury or burn their waste. County and sub-county government offices as yet do not consistently train and support schools to maintain their facilities. County departments of education and health are expected to monitor school facilities, but health monitoring is not regular and education monitoring does not include WASH. As the promised 2014 FPE funding increases were

awaited during this case study, the situation remained that schools, unless supported by NGOs, found their budgets restrictive to plan for WASH activities. All the schools visited were unable to hire janitors and some were unable to pay water bills. They rely on their custodians to take up cleaning and waste disposal responsibilities, though this is not consistent. Local governments and the MoEST provided soap and sanitary pads to schools, though without trained BOMs and health clubs, supervision of WASH facilities on a regular basis was limited.

Recommendations made by key informants to improve the O&M of WASH facilities in Kenyan schools are as follows. These need to be discussed among stakeholders in Kenya to determine next steps.

- Review and operationalize national policies and plans for school WASH in counties, with details outlined on

funding streams and agencies responsible for specific activities.

- Ensure school costs for WASH O&M are met between the FPE and local government allocations. Refer to estimated costs, such as in this and the SWASH + study to determine funds needed. Ensure local governments fund hygiene promotion, monitoring of WASH facilities by BOMs and health clubs, and small repairs.
- Build the capacity of school principals and BOMs to manage O&M of WASH facilities, and plan and budget for WASH activities. Develop accompanying guides for counties to train schools.
- Empower children and school health clubs to promote hygiene and proper use of WASH facilities in schools.

Table 1: Key Indicators for WASH, Education, Finance and Gender

WASH Indicators	%
Estimated urban population coverage, improved drinking water sources ¹ (2015)	82
Estimated rural population coverage, improved drinking water sources ¹ (2015)	57
Estimated urban population coverage, improved sanitation facility ¹ (2015)	31
Estimated rural population coverage, improved sanitation facility ¹ (2015)	30
Estimated water coverage in schools ² (2013)	42
Estimated sanitation coverage in schools ² (2013)	20
Estimated urban sanitation coverage in schools ² (2013)	55
Estimated rural sanitation coverage in schools ² (2013)	40
Education Indicators	%
Total net enrolment rate, primary, both sexes ⁵ (2014)	88.2
Primary education attainment rate ³ (2010)	66
Finance Indicators⁴	%
Government expenditure on primary education as % of GDP (2006)	3.81
Expenditure on primary as % of total government expenditure (all sectors – 2006)	13.50
Expenditure on primary as % of total government expenditure on education (2006)	54.11
Government expenditure per primary student (2006)	117.1 US\$
Aid Indicators³	US\$
Total aid to education (2012)- Kenya	147 million
Total aid to basic education (2012)- Kenya	71 million
Gender Parity Index (GPI) Indicators	Integer
Gender parity index of the primary attainment rate – poorest children ³ (2010)	0.88
Gender parity index of the primary attainment rate – richest children ³ (2010)	1.08
Total net enrolment rate, primary, gender parity index ⁴ (2012)	1.04

¹ UNICEF/WHO - Progress on sanitation and drinking water, 2015

³ UNESCO - EFAGMR, 2015

⁵ MoEST- Basic Education Statistical Booklet, 2014

* Note: the discrepancy in sanitation coverage in schools and urban/rural sanitation coverage in schools is because of different data sources used for estimates.

² UNICEF - Advancing WASH in Schools Monitoring, 2015

⁴ UNESCO - Education data set, 2015

2. Methods

- **A documentation review** included a desk review of relevant national government documents, websites, Save the Children desk review responses and development partner documents and websites (see references for a detailed list).
- **Key informant interviews with government and development partners**, including officials from the Ministry of Health and Save the Children, Kenya.
- **School visits, comprising interviews, observation surveys and local shop visits:** Interviews and observation surveys were done at 10 purposefully selected government primary schools in urban areas of Nairobi (see map). All schools were single-shift and included children from kindergarten to grade 8. Data was collected in September 2014. The student population at each school ranges from 400 and 2067, with a median school size of 1,064 students.

Five of the 10 schools were supported by Save the Children between 2011 and 2014. This support consisted primarily of renovations to school toilets, provision of running water supply and a functioning sewer system. In these schools, children were mobilized and educated on health and hygiene and BOMs were activated to support WASH and health issues. Conversion rate used: 1 KES = 0.01096 US\$ (Source: Oanda Currency Converter, Oct 5, 2014).

3. Resource Setting for WASH in Schools

3.1 Agencies Investing in WASH Facilities in Schools

The Ministry of Environment Water and Natural Resources (MEWNR), through its eight regional water service boards (since the 2002 Water Act) and companies, ensure water and sewer services in Kenya. Since the devolution to counties, however, the Water Act and MEWNR are being reviewed. In Nairobi, the City County and its subsidiary, the NCWSC, support the MoEST which is responsible for WASH installations, water, waste disposal and hygiene services. The MoH supports monitoring school WASH facilities. NGOs provide occasional support for construction and rehabilitation of facilities, and activate BOMs and student bodies to maintain their facilities.



Map of Kenya highlighting Nairobi City.

Construction and Rehabilitation

- The construction of water points, handwashing facilities and toilets in schools is the responsibility of the national MOEST and the City County in Nairobi. When the MOEST approves a school for new construction or rehabilitation of WASH facilities, it sends funds to schools. The school then oversees the WASH construction by hiring local contractors. The minimum requirements for toilet facilities in Kenya are pit latrines with soak pits, but schools in Nairobi have flushing or pour flush toilets. Key informants reported that the student to toilet ratio in Nairobi schools was as high as 60:1 and there was a need for more facilities. However, due to low prioritization for WASH in schools, tight infrastructure budgets are mainly focused on classrooms, especially in informal urban settlements and districts with low resources (UNICEF et al, 2014).
- Other than government service providers, development partners, including NGOs, provide support for construction and rehabilitation of school WASH facilities. The main development partners supporting school WASH facilities include UNICEF, DFID, World Bank, CIDA, the Government of the Netherlands, CARE and Save the Children (UNICEF, 2014). Save the Children reported spending 78,903 US\$ on water and toilet system installations and rehabilitations across six schools in 2013.

Water, waste disposal and hygiene services

- In Nairobi, the NCWSC provides water and sewage services in the city county. NCWSC responsibilities include testing and treating water, taking meter readings, maintenance of sewage systems, and ensuring regular supply of safe water to all institutions, including primary schools (NCWSC, 2015). The Nairobi City County Waste Disposal Service collects waste from the community and schools for a fee.
- The Nairobi City County provided free soap and disinfectants to schools in 2014. The MOEST supports menstrual hygiene management through the provision of free sanitary towels every school term (three times a year). With the new FPE budgets that include hygiene supplies, there is indication that schools will need to purchase sanitary towels and soap from 2015 forward (MOEST, 2015).



A visitor checks a water storage tank installed by Save the Children. Photo Credit: Save the Children.

Maintenance and Monitoring

- The NCWSC provides free repair and maintenance services to schools (NCWSC, 2015). However, key informants reported that schools often prefer to undertake the repairs by hiring a local technician due to long wait times and delays with NCWSC services.
- The MoEST along with the MoH have established monitoring processes for schools. Sub-county education officers mainly focus on teaching and learning, while sub-county health officers inspect health facilities including WASH in school facilities. Key informants reported though that health inspections often do not occur, and when they do, no follow-up action is taken. The national EMIS also does not capture data on the functionality or cleanliness of WASH facilities in schools.
- NGOs often do not invest in monitoring the maintenance of WASH facilities. Instead, they tend to focus their efforts on activating student councils and the SMC to come up with solutions for routine monitoring of facilities. Case-study schools developed monitoring systems where school health club managers (teachers) ensured the facilities are clean and functional.

3.2 Policies and Plans for WASH in Schools

Kenya's *National School Health Policy* (MoH, MoEST, 2009), its *National School Health Guidelines* (MoPHS, MoE, 2009) and the (draft) *National School Health Strategy Implementation Plan 2011-2015* (MoH, MoEST, 2011) are the main documents that provide guidance on WASH standards and activities for schools. The documents recommend that national ministries (e.g. MOEST and MOH) coordinate maintenance of school WASH facilities with local governments and schools. However, since the 2013 devolution, the *Policy* and *Plan* have not been updated and reflected in county and sub-county policies and plans, and therefore wider implementation is limited. The financial responsibilities of each agency are also not clearly outlined. The draft *Plan* includes indicative budget amounts for activities, but neither document refers to funding streams such as the FPE grant or other revenue sources to plan and budget school WASH activities. As a result, budgeting for O&M for WASH is left to the discretion of school and local government.

Figure 1: Excerpts of WASH in School Guidelines Listed in Kenya's National School Health Policy

<p><i>Toilets and waste management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sanitation facility standards to be regularly updated and made sensitive to different geographies and users. • School management shall ensure that the environment around schools remains healthy, providing sufficient and strategically located litter bins, garbage disposal pits, incinerators and that there is proper management of liquid waste. <p><i>Hygiene facilities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School managements and parents shall provide adequate ablution facilities for boys and girls as per regulations. Facilities shall be designed and constructed for different age groups and special needs. • Hand washing facilities including soap shall be provided in each school and within the vicinity of the toilet/latrine. • Where the school has a kitchen, appropriate food safety measures and adequate waste disposal shall be ensured. <p><i>Water</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate, safe drinking water points/foundations shall be available in each school. <p><i>Monitoring and Management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure proper use and maintenance of facilities and ongoing hygiene promotion, which is pupil centered. • Effective monitoring shall be inbuilt in each school, zone and district. • Resource mobilization mechanisms and budget line for construction, O&M of WASH facilities to be strengthened. • District education office and key partners will be equipped to support good management, M&E.

- Kenya's *National School Health Policy* and its accompanying *National School Health Guideline*, co-authored by the MoEST and the Ministry of Health in 2009, include recommendations for the construction and O&M of WASH facilities in schools. The *Policy* recommends that schools and local governments are empowered to ensure safe WASH facilities. It also recommends resource mobilization mechanisms, a budget line for WASH O&M, and training for local government education offices to provide monitoring and management support to schools (see figure 1) (MoE, MoH, 2009).
- The draft *National School Health Strategy Implementation Plan 2011-2015* includes activities that complement the *School Health Policy's* O&M recommendations, such as capacity building in O&M of WASH facilities for school support staff, SMC and district (sub-county) government officials. Other than this, key activities in the plan include construction and rehabilitation of water systems and latrines, installation of solid waste management systems, hygiene promotion, sector control and food safety.

The MoEST *NESP 2013-2018* recommends a review and dissemination of the National School Health Policy and has indicative estimates for developing budgets for WASH.

Over the five year period, the MoEST expects 147 million KSh (1.6 million US\$) for WASH (MoEST, 2015).

Besides these documents, the MoEST school infrastructure unit in its *Primary School Design* refers to the *National School Health Policy*, and has specific latrine design instructions for achieving minimum guidelines for WASH in schools. The guidelines recommend five liters of water per pupil per day, one cubicle for 25 girls, one cubicle for 35 boys and one urinal wall for 50 boys and a handwashing facility for each set of cubicles (MoE, 2010).

3.3 Financial Allocations for O&M of WASH Facilities in Primary Schools

In Kenya, although the education system is not yet fully devolved, primary schools are already a property of county governments and so the government has some financial responsibility towards schools. However, a framework of investing in WASH in schools is still being established, as outlined in the *NESP 2013-2018*. A next step is the review and dissemination of the *National SHN Policy*; and development agencies are also advocating for counties to implement the policy and use county revenue sources to support WASH in schools.

A steady source of funding for WASH O&M in government primary schools is the annual FPE grant that comes from the MoF to the MoEST. The allocations to schools are standard across regions, except for nomadic areas and schools that have children with special needs, which receive additional funds on top of the FPE grant. Funds are mostly disbursed from the MoEST directly to schools. The role of county directors of education and their sub-county education officers is to provide data on school population and to monitor utilization of funds in schools.

The FPE allocation is divided into two accounts – the School Instructional Materials Account (SIMBA) for teaching-learning materials, and the General Purpose Account (GPA) for all other expenses. In 2014, the GPA had budget lines of support staff wages, repairs and maintenance of facilities, and electricity and water totaling to 249KSh (2.73 US\$) per student per year that could be used for WASH related expenses.

At the time of this study, the MoEST was revising its school FPE budgets for academic year 2015, increasing the annual per student allocation from 1,020 KSh to 1,420 KSh (MoEST, 2014). As a result, annual GPA allocations would increase 77 percent from 370 KSh/student to 655 KSh/student and this is expected to provide schools with more opportunities to budget and fund their WASH activities (see Table 2 below). This change would also include a 68KSh/student increase in support staff wages

and a six-fold increase in water and electricity utility allocations. Repairs and maintenance allocation are reduced by 27 KSh/student, but environment and sanitation is a new budget line with an annual allocation of 50 KSh/student (0.55 US\$/student), or about 53200 KSh (583 US\$) per median sized case study school with 1064 students. Contingencies for sanitary towels and other supplies is another new budget allocation at 15 KSh/student (0.16 US\$/student) or about 15,960 KSh (175 US\$) per year per median sized school. It may replace the MoEST free provision of sanitary towels and supplies.

Overall, with the new GPA allocations, budget lines of support staff wages, repairs and maintenance, water and electricity, environment, sanitation and sanitary towels, a total of up to 404 KSh (4.43 US\$) per student can be used for WASH. Despite increases, corresponding improvements for WASH remain to be seen. Spending on WASH would depend on principals who prepare the annual budget for schools and the BOM that approves the budgets. Future increases in FPE grants are expected, up to 3,060 KSh per student (MoEST, 2015). This should see an increase in funds for WASH as well.

Table 2: FPE Allocation in the General Purpose Account for Primary Schools

No	Vote Head	Allocation per student, 2008-2014, KSh (US\$)	Allocation per student in 2015, KSh (US\$)
1	Support staff wages	112 (1.23)	180 (1.97)
2	Renovation of classrooms, building of toilets, repairs, maintenance, improvement (RMI) of physical facilities	127 (1.39)	100 (1.09)
3	Activity	43 (0.47)	74 (0.81)
4	Local Transport and Travelling (LT&T)	21 (0.23)	42 (0.46)
5	Electricity, Water, and Conservancy (EWC)	10 (0.11)	60 (0.66)
6	Telephone/Box Rental/Postage	22 (0.24)	10 (0.11)
7	Environment & Sanitation	-	50 (0.55)
8	Capacity Building & meetings (BOM)	6 (0.07)	90 (0.99)
9	Contingencies e.g. Sanitary Towels (Girls 10 +)	-	15 (0.16)
10	Science & Applied Technology	-	20 (0.22)
11	ICT infrastructure materials	-	14 (0.15)
12	Quality Assurance	29 (0.32)	-
	TOTAL	370 (4.06)	655 (7.17)

4. Situation in Schools

4.1 Condition of WASH facilities in schools

WASH facilities in the five NGO supported schools visited were functional and mostly clean versus the non-supported schools which had partially functional and somewhat clean facilities. These differences may be attributed to NGO support with renovations to the water supply and toilets in the previous two years as well as to measures taken to activate the SMC and student body to plan and implement WASH maintenance activities.

In the five NGO-supported schools WASH facilities were mostly functional and clean. Water points and handwashing stations had piped water supply which were functional in all five schools, with problems of leakage reported in one school. Student toilets were flushing toilets which were functional and clean in all five schools on the day of visit. Schools buried and burned their waste in compost pits, and there was no sign of open defecation or litter on the school grounds in any of the schools. A posted schedule for cleaning toilets and handwashing stations was found in all five schools. The main challenge was that only one school had soap at the handwashing station

The WASH facilities in the five government schools not supported by an NGO were partially functional and somewhat clean. But for one school with truck-delivered water, schools had piped water supply. Water points were functional in all five schools, with problems of leakage reported in four schools. Only one school had a functional handwashing station, but no soap was observed. Student toilets (most flush or pour flush) were only partially functional in all five schools on the day of visit, and clean in two schools. There were no signs of open defecation, or litter on the school grounds in any of the schools. A posted schedule for cleaning toilets and handwashing stations was found in one school

4.2 School Resources and Systems for O&M of WASH facilities

All schools acknowledged their responsibility for proper use and routine maintenance of WASH facilities. However, only some schools, mainly those NGO supported, reported including WASH in their annual plans and budgets. Schools found their GPA budgets so restricted that they were



Two school visited demonstrate dysfunctional handwashing facilities. Photo Credit: Save the Children.

unable to prioritize WASH; some reported that they were unable to pay water bills, maintain WASH facilities, or conduct hygiene promotion activities. Support staff wage allocations were used for hiring accountants, secretaries, and custodians (security staff) leaving insufficient funds to hire janitors. Therefore, in most schools, custodians end up fulfilling the role of a janitor. Funds for renovation are used for fixing classrooms, with little left for toilet repairs. BOM and school health clubs were in all schools, though mainly in NGO supported ones were these bodies engaged in WASH.

- Six schools (four NGO supported) reported having annual planning processes; four of which stated that WASH was in their plans. This included renovation of water systems, construction of new toilets, purchase of handwashing materials and payment of water bills.



WASH facilities at two different schools demonstrate the great variance in WASH facilities at schools in the same city. During the study visit both of these toilet facilities found to be partially functional. Photo Credit: Save the Children.

- All five NGO supported schools and one non-supported school reported that their school budgets included line items for WASH facilities. Budgets and reports were prepared either annually or per term and submitted to the school BOM and occasionally to the MoEST for approval.
- All schools were found to have a BOM; in the five NGO supported and two non-supported schools the BOM played a role in maintaining WASH facilities. They were mainly involved in clean-up events and occasionally provided labor for work such as building toilets. Occasionally a BOM would raise community funds for purchase of soap and cleaning supplies, however contributions were small.
- All 10 schools reported having school health clubs and in the five NGO supported and three non-supported schools clubs reported playing a role in the O&M of WASH facilities. The clubs, which meet weekly, generally discuss issues concerning health, nutrition and hygiene, participate in dramas and inter school events, and supervise the cleaning of the school compound and WASH facilities.
- Nine schools reported responsibilities for water system operation and maintenance. This included paying monthly water bills, which schools found difficult to do, and occasional maintenance (e.g. replacing taps, fixing leaks). Key informants reported that schools often receive water only twice per week. Maintenance from the NCWSC were not availed due to long wait times. In two schools water quality was tested in the past year, in one case by the Nairobi City County.
- For handwashing facilities, schools mainly reported responsibilities of checking and undertaking small replacements of taps while the Nairobi City County was reported to provide soap and detergents. Only one school reported purchasing soap.
- In all schools, due to limited funding, the custodian (security staff) was responsible for also cleaning toilet facilities. In some cases girls and boys would also clean their own toilets. Occasional repairs of toilets, such as replacement of broken cisterns and unblocking sewage systems were done using either MoEST funds or NGO support.
- Local hardware shops were within two kilometers of schools. Nine schools reported their head teacher or deputy was responsible for purchasing supplies and that the monthly travel time for purchase of supplies was 30 minutes to two hours. Visits to the shops confirmed they were stocked with handwashing, cleaning, repair supplies.
- Schools reported that since waste collection services are expensive (estimated KSh 1200 per bin per month), schools often bury or burn their waste on school grounds. The responsibility for this task falls to either the custodian, teachers or students. Nine schools confirmed receiving sanitary towels from the MoEST.

These towels are thrown in disposal bins and burned with other trash.

- All schools reported conducting hygiene education activities in the past year. However, none of them budgeted resources for these activities.

4.3 School WASH O&M Costs

School plans, budgets, expenses and records were not shared by school authorities, therefore a comparison between school budgets, funds received and expenses was not possible. Actual costs quoted by school authorities were treated as estimated costs per year. Median costs per student per year and per school for those reporting costs were determined though these are indicative and cannot be used for planning purposes.

Almost all schools provided annual costs for the custodian and toilet cleaning materials, which may be because these were common expense items. The median annual cost for a custodian is 164 KSh (1.8US\$) per student per year, much greater than the existing or 2014 GPA budget allocations for support staff. The median cost for toilet materials is 89 KSh (0.89US\$) per student per year which makes up a large percentage of the school

maintenance allocation of 127 KSh (1.39 US\$) per student per year.

Costs for water system maintenance, waste disposal, and health club activities were mainly cited by NGO supported schools, which may be because schools received additional funding for these activities from the NGO. The median cost of water system maintenance of 65 KSh(0.72 US\$) per student was more than six times greater than prevailing allocations for electricity and water, and still a few cents greater than new allocations. Assuming a school undertook the list of activities in Table 3, the median total cost of WASH O&M in schools may be as much as 506 KSh (5.56 US\$) per student per year. This is greater than previous GPA allocations and is a large proportion of the new allocation, thus making it unfeasible to be covered by the GPA alone.

A lifecycle cost study conducted by the SWASH+ project in schools in three counties in Kenya estimates that 270 KSh per student is needed for recurrent and maintenance WASH costs for a school of 400 students in rural Kenya (SWASH+, 2015).

Table 3. Median costs of WASH items reported during interviews with school authorities¹

WASH in School item	No of Schools (median size, s)	Median per student cost KSh(US\$)/year	Cost per median school KSh(US\$)/year
Custodian (cleaning staff)	9 (s=1,129)	164 (1.80)	185,166 (2,029)
Toilet cleaning materials~ (disinfectants, broom, brushes, mops, buckets, gloves, suction pump)	9 (s=1,129)	89 (0.97)	100,000 (1,096)
Waste disposal for one year (weekly disposal of 10 L bins)	6* (s=1,150)	57 (0.63)	65,698 (720)
Water system maintenance (bill payment, small repair, replacement of valves, taps)	6*(s=1,129)	65(0.72)	73,737 (808)
Materials for handwashing stations (liquid soap, bucket, disinfectants, squeegee)~	5* (s=1,129)	68 (0.75)	77,153 (846)
Health club activities (weekly meetings and occasional events)	4** (s=1065)	52 (0.57)	55,507 (608)
Training for teachers and SMC (one training event)	3** (s=1,000)	11(0.12)	11,390 (125)

Note: Save the Children spent 18,000 USD across 25 schools for training of SMC, health clubs and hygiene promotional materials in 2013 (Save the Children and UNICEF), 2014)

*- all but one school was NGO supported

**- all schools were NGO supported

~- some items may already be covered under toilet cleaning materials.



Brenda, age 10, attends school in Nakuru, at St. John's Primary School. Photo Credit: Save the Children.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

In Kenya, the *National School Health Policy*, the *National Education Sector Plan 2013-2018*, the FPE grant system and the national and county institutions are strong resources to support the O&M of school WASH facilities. Many development partners support school WASH, and the *National School Health Policy of 2009* recommends better resource management for O&M of WASH and a WASH budget line for schools.

Despite these good practices, gaps in the current resource setting mean the government is unable to meet all of the WASH O&M needs of schools. Based on reported data, the estimated median total cost for a custodian, supplies for latrines and handwashing, maintenance of water supply, waste disposal, SMC training and health club activities of 506 KSh (5.56 US\$) per student per year is a large proportion of the new GPA allocation. All visited schools were unable to hire janitors, and some were unable to pay water bills. They rely on local solutions, such as the school custodian taking up cleaning responsibilities and waste disposal. Yet, this solution may not always be consistent or effective. Although local governments and the MOEST provide soap and sanitary pad supplies to schools, one

school reported purchasing its own soap, and most schools did not have soap at their handwashing stations.

Recommendations made by key informants to improve the O&M of WASH facilities in Kenyan schools were as follows:

- Review and operationalize national policies and plans for school WASH in counties and sub-counties, including the details on which agencies are responsible for specific WASH activities and which funding streams are to be accessed by schools for each activity; Develop accompanying guides for counties to train schools in planning and budgeting, and for countries to monitor schools.
- Have local government (county) invest in schools and sub-counties to implement hygiene promotion activities, activate SMCs and student bodies to monitor and maintain WASH facilities and undertake small repairs.
- Ensure schools costs for WASH O&M are met between the new GPA and local government funds. Refer to this study and the SWASH+ study to determine costs. In Nairobi, given the high student volume in schools, more funds may be needed for WASH O&M.
- Conduct capacity building of school principals and SMCs on the O&M of WASH facilities and on planning and budgeting for WASH activities to help ensure WASH allocations are used for their intended purpose. Schools must receive guides to help them plan and budget WASH activities.
- Encourage child governing councils and student health clubs to take an active role in promoting hygiene and proper use and maintenance of school WASH facilities.

References

- CARE, Emory University, the Great Lakes University of Kisumu, the Government of Kenya and Water.org, Sustaining and Scaling School Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Plus Community Impact, Financial Management of School WASH Programs: Understanding the recurring costs for maintaining a school WASH program, SWASH+, Nyaza Province, Kenya, 2012
- Freeman, C. Matthew, et al., The usage of urinals in Kenyan schools, *Waterlines*, vol. 31, no. 3, July 2012
- The Government of Kenya and UNICEF, Education in Kenya: A Situation Analysis, Republic of Kenya, Nairobi, UNICEF, NY, November 2008
- Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, State Department of Education, Circular on revised FPE Capitation for FY 2014/2015, MoEST, Nairobi, 25 September, 2014
- Ministry of Health, Republic of Kenya & UNICEF, Protocol for Implementing CLTS (Community Led Total Sanitation) in Kenya, MoH, Nairobi, UNICEF, NY, January 2014
- Ministry of Public Health and Sanitation and Ministry of Education, Republic of Kenya, Kenya National School Health Strategy Implementation Plan, 2011 - 2015, Nairobi, 2011
- MoE, Republic of Kenya, Primary School Design: School Infrastructure Management Unit, Nairobi, 2010
- MoH, Republic of Kenya, Kenya Health Policy 2014 - 2030: Towards attaining the highest standard of health, Nairobi, August 2014
- MoH, Republic of Kenya, Transforming Health: Accelerating Attainment of Universal Health Coverage, The Kenya Health Sector Strategic And Investment Plan - KHSSP, July 2014 - June 2018, Nairobi, 2014
- Ministry of Public Health and Sanitation and Ministry of Education, Republic of Kenya, National School Health Policy, Nairobi, 2009
- MoPHS and MoE, Republic of Kenya, National School Health Guidelines, 2009
- Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, Republic of Kenya, National Education Sector Plan: Basic Education Programme Rationale and Approach, 2013 – 2018, vol.1, Nairobi, 2015
- MoEST, Republic of Kenya, National Education Sector Plan: Operational Plan, 2013 – 2018, vol. 2, Nairobi, 2015
- MoE, Republic of Kenya, Strategic Plan, 2008 -2012: Kenya Vision 2030, Towards a Globally Competitive and prosperous Kenya, Nairobi Nairobi City Water and Sewerage Company (NCWSC)
<http://www.nairobiwater.co.ke/> 2015
- Save the Children and UNICEF, WinS O&M Study: Desk Review Instructions, UNICEF, NY, 2014
- SWASH+, The Life Cycle Costs of School Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Programmes in Kenyan Primary Schools. Outreach Paper No. 1, 2015
- UNICEF, Canadian International Development Agency, Care Kenya and Department for International Development, Enabling Policy Environment for WASH in Schools, <http://www.washinschoolsmapping.com/projects/Kenya.html>, Wash in Schools, 2014
- UNICEF and World Health Organization, Progress on Sanitation and drinking water – 2015 update and MDG assessment, UNICEF – NY, WHO – Geneva, 2015
- UNICEF, Advancing WASH in Schools Monitoring, UNICEF, NY, 2015
- UNESCO, EFA Global Monitoring Report 2000 -2015: Achievements and Challenges, UNESCO, Paris, 2015
- UNESCO, UNESCO Institute for Statistics – data centre, <http://data.uis.unesco.org>, UNESCO, NY, 2015
- UNESCO International Bureau of Education, World Data on Education, 7th Edition - 2010/11, Kenya, http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/WDE/2010/pdf-versions/Kenya.pdf, IBE UNESCO, Geneva, 2011
- World Bank Group, The World Bank, http://data.worldbank.org/country/Kenya#cp_wdi , 2014