

## 添付資料 6 質問票調査結果概要

### (1) ジンバブエ

#### 1. General Information

- 90% of the respondents were female and 10% were male.
- The average age of the respondents was 34.8 years old with a range of 15 to 80 years old.
- 58% of the respondents were the wives of household heads, 23% were themselves household heads and the rest were family members including in-laws.
- 49% of the respondents were engaged in farming and 32% were housewives, though most of them also were engaged in subsistence farming to some degrees.
- 80% of the households were male headed while 20% were female headed.
- The average age of the household heads was 46.2 years old with a range of 22 to 84 years old.
- The average household size was 9.2.
- For marital status of the household heads, 48% were monogamous, 31.5% were polygamous, 14.5% were widowed and the rest (7%) were either divorced or separated.

#### 2. Impact on Living Environment

- The main sources of drinking water in the study area were boreholes, shallow wells, rivers and dams in the study area (Table 2-1). In the target area 73.8% of the households were currently using boreholes while 5 years ago only 10.6% were using boreholes. In the non-target area the change was from 2.5% to 17.5%.

**Table 2-1 Source of Drinking Water in the Study Area**

Sources	Target Area				Non-target Area			
	Now		5 Years Ago		Now		5 Years Ago	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Borehole	118	73.8	17	10.6	7	17.5	1	2.5
Shallow Well	41	25.6	123	76.9	28	70.0	29	72.5
River/Dam	1	0.6	20	12.5	5	12.5	10	25.0
Total	160	100	160	100	40	100	40	100

- The distance to the water source differs greatly depending on the location of the household and the water source. The distance ranged from 50 m to 12 km. The average distance to the water source in the target area reduced from 1.42 km to 1.15 km in 5 years. In the non-target area the reduction was from 1.84 km to 1.54 km.
- Water collection was primarily a job for women and girls as shown in the table 2-2.

**Table 2-2 Who Collects Water in the Study Area (multiple answers possible)**

Who Collects Water	Number of Households	%
Adult Men	5	2.5
Adult Women	173	86.5
Boys	12	6.0
Girls	88	44.0
Total No. of Households	200	-

- In the target area 45 respondents (28%) noted that women and children in their households were currently spending less time fetching water than 5 years ago. In the non-target area 7 respondents (18%) noted the reduction of time for water collection.
- The time freed from fetching water was spent on doing other household chores (78.8%), working in the field or in the garden (25.0%), doing craft works (11.5%) and studying (5.8%), which was mainly for school age children.
- Among 125 respondents who used boreholes 113 respondents (90.4%) found the quality of water good while the rest thought unpalatable (mainly salty). Among 75 respondents who draw water from unprotected sources only 12 respondents (16%) were satisfied with the quality.
- In the study area few households had toilet facilities at home though the number of households with toilets has increased in the past 5 years as shown in the Table 2-3.

**Table 2-3 Type of Latrines in the Study Area**

Type of Toilet	Target Area				Non-target Area			
	Now		5 Years Ago		Now		5 Years Ago	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
VIP Latrine	36	22.5	15	9.4	4	10.0	5	12.5
Other Pit Latrine	1	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
None	123	76.9	145	90.6	36	90.0	35	87.5
Total	160	100	160	100	40	100	40	100

### 3. Impact on People's Behaviour on Health and Hygiene

- The majority (97.5%) of the households did not boil water before drinking.
- Hand washing was practiced before eating (100%), after going to the toilet (80.5%), before cooking (79.5%) and after working outside (78.0%) as shown in Table 3-1. Little difference was found in the target and non-target area.

**Table 3-1 Hand Washing Practice (multiple answers possible)**

Timing of Hand Washing	Study Area			
	Now		5 Years Ago	
	No.	%	No.	%
Before Cooking	159	79.5	84	42.0
Before Eating	200	100	199	99.5
After Using Toilet	161	80.5	108	54.0
After Working Outside	156	78.0	116	58.0
Total No. of Households	200	-	200	-

- Many do not use soap when washing hands. Some (25%) noted the use of soap or soap substitutes (ash or herbs). Five years ago the use of soap was less common (15.5%).
- The majority (78%) wash hands in a dish or basin (a traditional way) while one-fifth (21.5%) pour water from a cup and the rest (18.5%) wash outside the dish or basin, which have been promoted as more hygienic methods. The change, however, is not significant compared to 5 years ago as shown in the Table 3-2. The hand washing methods were similar at big gathering such as funerals and wedding: the majority wash hands in a shared dish or basin.

**Table 3-2 Hand Washing Method (multiple answers possible)**

Method of Hand Washing	Study Area			
	Now		5 Years Ago	
	No.	%	No.	%
In a Basin/Dish	156	78.0	171	85.5
Outside the Basin/Dish	43	21.5	12	6.0
Pour Water from a Cup	37	18.5	45	22.5
Total No. of Households	200	-	200	-

- For carrying water many use containers without lid such as buckets, though the use of containers with lid has increased compared to 5 years ago as shown in Table 3-3.

**Table 3-3 Method of Carrying Water (multiple answers possible)**

Methods of Carrying Water	Study Area			
	Now		5 Years Ago	
	No.	%	No.	%
Container with Lid	87	43.5	21	10.5
Container without Lid	139	69.5	184	92.0
Total No. of Households	200	-	200	-

- For storing water many (85.5%) keep water in containers with lids inside the house, which was not so common 5 years ago as shown in Table 3-4.

**Table 3-4 Method of Storing Water (multiple answers possible)**

Method of Storing Water		Study Area			
		Now		5 Years Ago	
		No.	%	No.	%
Inside the House	Container with Lid	171	85.5	114	57.0
	Container without Lid	26	13.0	77	38.5
Outside the House	Container with lid	3	1.5	9	4.5
	Container without Lid	0	0	0	0
Total No. of Households		200	-	200	-

#### 4. Impact on People's Health and Hygiene

- For the occurrence of water-borne diseases more respondents in the target area felt that

the incidence of diarrhoea and skin diseases had decreased (58.8% and 76.9%, respectively) than those in the non-target area (47.5% and 60.0%, respectively). For eye diseases very little difference was found in the target and non-target areas. The details are shown in Table 4-1.

**Table 4-1 Occurrence of Water-born Diseases (compared to 5 years ago)**

Disease	Target Area (160 respondents)						Non-target Area (40 respondents)					
	Increase		Decrease		No Change		Increase		Decrease		No Change	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Diarrhoea	48	30.0	94	58.8	18	11.3	13	32.5	19	47.5	8	20.0
Eye Disease	53	33.1	90	56.3	17	10.6	14	35.0	23	57.5	3	7.5
Skin Disease	20	12.5	123	76.9	17	10.6	9	22.5	24	60.0	7	17.5

- The same data was analysed according to the respondent's source of drinking water. As shown in Table 4-2 among those who use boreholes as their water sources the greater decrease was noted in diarrhoea, eye diseases and skin diseases (72.8%, 65.6% and 84.0%, respectively) compared to those who use unprotected water sources (29.3%, 41.3% and 56.9%).

**Table 4-2 Occurrence of Water-born Diseases (compared to 5 years ago)**

Disease	Borehole Users (125 respondents)		Non-borehole Users (75 respondents)	
	Decrease		Decrease	
	No.	%	No.	%
Diarrhoea	91	72.8	22	29.3
Eye Disease	82	65.6	31	41.3
Skin Disease	105	84.0	42	56.0

- Regarding the children's nutritional conditions about the same ratios of respondents expressed improvement and deterioration (38.5% and 37.5%, respectively) compared to 5 years ago while the rest (24%) observed no change.

## 5. Impact on People's Participation

- Many (75.0%) noted that people are more active in participating in community activities compared to 5 years ago. Though no significant difference was found in the target area and non-target area, the response varied from village to village. In one village all the respondents (100%) indicated that people were more active than previously while in another village only a little over half of the respondents (55.0%) indicated so.
- Common community activities were: collecting locally available resources such as river sand, stones, water, or moulding bricks for community projects of building school blocks and clinics; food for work; road construction and repair; and maintenance of

water points (digging shallow wells, clearing the area, fencing the water source, etc.).

## 6. Impact on People's Wealth and Income

- Main sources of income for the households were selling livestock (74%), selling farm products (56.5%) and working as farm labour (34.0%) as shown in Table 6-1.

**Table 6-1 Main Sources of Income (multiple answers possible)**

Source of Income	No.	%
Selling Livestock	148	74.0
Selling Farming Products	113	56.5
Work as Farm Labour	68	34.0
Wages/Salary from a Job outside the Village	50	25.0
Selling Crafts (baskets, mats, etc.)	47	23.5
Remittances	30	15.0
Wages/Salary from a Job in the Village	21	10.5

- Compared to 5 years ago, 85 respondents (42.5%) indicated that their households' area of cultivated land has increased while a little less than half of the respondents (46.5%) indicated no change and the rest (11%) decrease. The average area of cultivated land has increased slightly from 4.95 Acres to 5.55 Acres. Little difference was found between the target area and non-target area. Land was mainly (89%) owned by the household heads and in rare cases owned by other family members (8.5%) and by outsiders (2%).
- Regarding livestock and poultry, some households did not possess any. The number of households which had at least one cattle, goat and chicken/guinea fowl was 131 (65.5%), 155 (77.5%) and 156 (78%), respectively. The ownership of cattle was dominated by household heads (90.8%) while that of goats and poultry were shared with other family members as shown in Table 6-2.

**Table 6-2 Number of Households which Keep Livestock and Poultry and their Ownership**

Animals	No. of HHs	Owned by					
		Household Head		Other Family Member		Outsider	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Cattle	131	119	90.8	10	7.6	2	1.5
Goats	155	130	83.9	25	16.1	0	0
Chicken/Guinea Fowls	156	91	58.3	65	41.7	0	0

- In comparison with 5 years before, the average number of cattle owned by the respondents' households has changed little while that of goats and chicken have decreased. The ratios of respondents who indicated the decrease in number of cattle, goats and chicken/guinea fowls were 32.5%, 49.5% and 60.5%, respectively. The details are shown in Table 6-3.

**Table 6-3 Change in Number of Livestock and Poultry Possessions**

Animals	Average Number		Increase		Decrease		No Change	
	Now	5 Years Ago	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Cattle	5.13	5.05	76	38.0	65	32.5	59	29.5
Goats	11.93	14.28	67	33.5	99	49.5	34	17.0
Chicken/Guinea Fowls	8.27	15.41	56	28.0	121	60.5	13	6.5

- In general female headed households are considered to be resource poor. From the analysis based on the sex of household head, it was found that female headed households owned less cultivated land and smaller number of cattle and poultry as shown in Table 6-4.

**Table 6-4 Average Cultivated Land and Numbers of Cattle and Poultry by Sex of Household Heads**

Item	Male Headed Household (160 households)	Female Headed Household (40 households)
Average Area of Cultivated Land	5.86 acre	4.25 acre
Average No. of Livestock and Poultry		
Cattle	5.8	2.4
Goats	13.0	7.55
Chicken/Guinea Fowl	9.5	3.25

- Food security at the household level worsened considerably compared to 5 years ago<sup>1</sup>. All the respondents, except 3, expressed that the current situation was worse. More than half (60.5%) of the households indicated that 5 years ago they had enough staple food stock to last until the next harvest while currently only one respondent indicated so. Most of the respondents said that they had no food stock at all (71.5%) or very little, not enough to last for this month (25%).
- The number of households without any member earning wages or salaries has not changed much compared to 5 years ago (the number increased from 111 households to 113 households).

## 7. Operation and Maintenance of Water Supply Facility

- Out of 125 respondents who use boreholes 114 respondents (91.2%) indicated that the water point committee took care of the facility. Many of the respondents noted that the committees were active (89.2%) and they were informed of the committee's decisions (88.5%).
- According to the respondents water point committees took care of the facilities by: cleaning the surrounding area (50.8%); regular maintenance such as greasing and tightening bolts (34.6%); ensuring the proper use of the facility by users (20.8%);

<sup>1</sup> It is clear that the current situation is due to severe drought condition affecting the region. Emergency food supply was being distributed to people in need at the time of field survey.

repairing the fence when broken (19.2%); repair or arranging the repair when facilities were broke down (6.9%); and promoting hygiene practices (6.9%).

- In the event of borehole break-down, respondents indicated that the facility was (or would be) repaired by a pump minder (36%), who was trained and previously hired by DDF or by a pump caretaker (35.2%), while the most of the rest (24.5%) noted that nobody repaired (or would repair) it.
- The majority of the respondents noted that anyone can use the water supply facility (98%) and it is used equitably (98.5%).

**(2) ザンビア****1. COMMUNITY INFORMATION****1.1 George Proper**

79% of the respondents were females while 21% were males. Out of these 60.4% of the Household heads were married to one spouse, while 20.9% were widows. In terms of occupation, 20.9% were women who were housewives-i.e at home looking after children. A significant number of the residents at 32.5% are engaged in Vending. Those who indicated that they are unemployed are 14%.

**1.2 George Compound Area 5**

Out of the total number of respondents, 79% were females while 20% were males. Vending is the most popular occupation with 18.6% of the respondents involved in it. The rate of unemployment is also relatively high with a record 20.9% out of formal employment and without any other major occupation for their livelihood. The number of housewives is also relatively high at 20.9%. From the total number of respondents, 16.3% were heading households and out of these 7% of the households are headed by widows. This Area has also recorded a very high rate of polygamy which has 20.9% being married to more than one spouse.

**1.3 George Compound Area 7**

In this area 74.4% of the respondents were females while 26.4% were males. Out of these respondents 36% were household heads. The Area has also a very high rate of unemployment recorded at 28.8% while those engaged in Vending stood at 19.2%. In this Area, 26.4% are housewives, 9.6% are business people. The rest of the people are engaged in other minor informal activities such as running a market stall etc. As regards the marital status of household heads, 74.4% are married to one spouse while 16.8% are widows.

**1.4 Bauleni Compound**

In Bauleni, 77.5% of respondents were females while 20% were males. In this area, the rate of unemployment is at 17.5% while 40% are women who are housewives. Vending is also a major occupation with 10% of the respondents having it as their major occupation. As regards the sex of household heads, 12.5% were females while 85% were males. The widows were 7.5% while those married to one spouse only made up of 80% of the respondents.



## 1.5 Kalikiliki

In Kalikiliki 75% of the respondents are females while 25% are males. Out of these 25% are unemployed while the same percentage is involved in vending activities. The number of women who are raising children at home without being involved in any meaningful occupation stands at 25%. Among the household heads, 20% are females while 80% are males. The number of widows heading households stands at 12.5%, while those who are married (monogamous) make up 80% of the household heads.

**Table 1: Community Information**

Area	Males %	Females %	Widows %	Unemployed %
George Proper	21.0	79.0	20.9	14.0
George Area 5	20.0	79.0	7.0	20.9
George Area 7	26.4	74.4	16.8	28.8
Bauleni	20.0	77.5	7.5	17.5
Kalikiliki	25.0	75.0	12.5	25.0

## 2. IMPACT ON LIVING ENVIRONMENT

### 2.1 Source of Drinking Water

The main source of drinking water for all the sample areas is the Communal Tap. In George Proper, 97.5% use the communal tap now compared to five years ago when only 65% used it. In Area 5, 93% use the communal tap now compared to five years ago when only 55.8% used it. As for Area 7, five years ago only 50% sourced their water from the taps while 26.2% got it from illegally connected taps. However, the last five years have seen remarkable progress where over 90% of the population draws drinking water from the taps. The illegal connections are a thing of the past. In Bauleni Community, five years ago, 65% of the respondents drew their water from communal taps while 12.5% drew their water from illegal connections and yet another 20% drew from other sources. These other sources were actually surrounding farms and government institutions to which the residents trekked to go and get water. At the moment 95% of the residents of Bauleni get their water from the communal taps while 5% still rely on illegal connections. Kalikiliki Compound on the other hand is beset with problems of illegal connections. These have risen from 52.5% five years ago to 72.5% at present. In the case of Shallow wells, all the sample areas have recorded a major decline in the number of people using them. In Bauleni, there are no shallow wells at all whereas in George Proper the percentage of people using shallow wells has gone down from 20.9 five years ago to 2.3 in 2002. In Area 5 the number of those using shallow wells has also gone down from 13.9% five years ago to 6% currently. In Area 7 on the other hand, 9.5% of the respondents used shallow wells five years ago but not any more.

In all the study areas one can see that the communal tap has become the major source of drinking water. The biggest improvement has been recorded in Areas 5 and 7 and Bauleni where at least 40% of the respondents have started using tap water in the last five years.

It is however, quite disappointing to note that shallow wells are still being used especially in George Proper and Area 5.

**Table 2-1 Source of Drinking Water**

Area	George Proper		Area 5		Area 7		Bauleni		Kalikiliki	
	Now %	5 years ago %	Now %	5 Year ago %	Now %	5 years ago %	Now %	5 years ago %	Now %	5 years ago %
Communal Tap	97.5	65.0	93.0	55.8	90.0	50.0	95.0	65.0	72.5	52.5
Shallow Well	2.3	20.9	6.0	13.9	0	9.5	0	0	0	0
Illegal connection	0	7	0	13.9	0	26.2	5.0	12.5	72.5	52.5
Hand pump	0	7	0	4.6	0	7.1	0	2.5	0	5.0
Others	0	0	1.3	11.6	0	7.1	0	20.0	26.0	27.5

## 2.2 Distance to Source (from home)

The respondents in George Proper indicated that although five years ago 27.9% of them used to cover more than a kilometer to fetch drinking water, this was no longer the situation now. In fact in all the study areas, the respondents now cover a kilometer or less from their homes to the water source. In Area 7 five years ago 16.7% used to cover a distance of a kilometer or more while in Area 5 30.2% would cover a distance of at least a Kilometer or more. In the case of Bauleni 42.5% covered a Kilometer or more five years ago while at the moment only 2.5% are left to cover that distance. As for Kalikiliki the situation has not improved at all with 47.5% who had to cover a distance of more than 20Metres to fetch water five years ago while currently 52.5% still have to cover the same distance. However, the number of those who have to cover a KM or more has reduced considerably probably due to the increasing number of illegal connections in the area.

## 2.3 Difficulties in Obtaining Water

67.4% of the respondents in George Proper have indicated that they have currently no difficulties in obtaining water compared to 51.2% who had no difficulties five years ago. However, 32.5% have stated that they still face difficulties in obtaining water. In Area 5 65.1% had difficulties in obtaining water five years ago compared to only 25.6% who have difficulties now. The same situation prevails in Area 7 where 54.7% had difficulties five years ago and only 38.1% have difficulties now. As for Bauleni 75% do not have any difficulties in drawing water leaving only 25% who are currently facing difficulties. In the case of Kalikiliki, the situation has only slightly changed in the last five years with those facing difficulties now at 22.5%. The main reason given by those facing difficulties now is that they are not able to raise user fees of K3,000 per Month. At least 18.6% of respondents in George Proper, 9.3% in Area 5 and 7.1% in Area 7 indicated this as the main reason. Others quoted problems such as awkward opening time for the taps, restriction on containers and overcrowding. The main problem sited for difficulties in obtaining water five years ago was distance to source. This is seen in the responses where

George Proper recorded 11.6%, Area 5, 32.5%, Area 7, 19% and Bauleni 12%. In Kalikiliki not much has changed as 32.55% stated distance as the main problem they used to encounter five years ago and 20% still face the same problem now.

## 2.4 Quality of Water

The quality of water was perceived to have improved significantly by the residents of George Proper with 93% responding that the water was currently of good quality compared to 5 years ago where only 67.4% indicated that the water was of good quality then. Similar perceptions have been recorded in the other areas. Area 5, 93.5%, Area 7, 90.4%, Bauleni 90% and Kalikiliki 100%. The reason given for the quality of water being good is that they know that it is treated by the Project through chlorination.

**Table 2-4 Quality of Water**

Area	George Proper		Area 5		Area 7		Bauleni		Kalikiliki	
	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 Years ago	Now	5 Years ago	Now	5 Years ago	Now	5 Years ago
Good	93.0	67.4	95.3	67.4	88.1	76.2	90.0	90.0	100.0	40.0
Not good	7.0	32.5	4.6	32.5	11.9	23.8	10.0	10.0	0	0

## 2.5 Fetching Of Water

Five years ago in George Proper 74% adult women were involved in fetching water for their homes while now the number has dropped to 58%. In Area 5 on the other hand the number of women fetching water has not changed much in the last five years with 76.7% fetching water five years ago to 72.1% at the moment. In Area 7 the number of women fetching water five years ago and now has remained constant at 73%. This is the same for Bauleni where the percentage is the same at 70 now and five years ago. Kalikiliki on the other hand has recorded a slight drop from 85% of adult women fetching water five years ago and only 70% doing so at the moment.

In all these areas however, the number of adult men engaged in fetching water has remained relatively low at less than 10%. The number of girls fetching water is also higher than that of boys for obvious reasons. However, the number of girls and boys involved in fetching water is much less than that of adult women. This is due to a number of reasons: the Water Committee Rules do not allow children below the age of 12 to fetch water: Most parents especially mothers prefer to send the boys and girls on errands such as vending while they attend to domestic matters: In addition, the numbers of women who are housewives is quite high. This means that they have fetching water as one of the most important daily chores. It is also important to note that the tradition prevailing in all the study areas is that it is a woman's job to fetch water. As such the small percentage of men indicated as fetching water covers mostly those men who fetch water for other purposes other than domestic. These purposes could be for activities such as molding bricks for

building.

### 3. IMPACT ON PEOPLE'S LIVELIHOOD

#### 3.1 Sources of Income

In George Proper 34.9% currently own their businesses compared to 25.6% five years ago. Out of these 11.6% only have their source of income from a private company unlike five years ago when at least 20.9% earned from such companies. Those earning salaries from government have declined from 16.3% five years ago to 14.6% currently. In Area 5 and 7 on the other hand those making a living from private companies at present are 4.6% and 35.7% respectively, while five years ago they were 25% and 14%. In these two areas those who have their own businesses are now at 16.3% and 19% respectively. As for Bauleni a marked increase of those who sourced income from own businesses was recorded from 10% five years before to 30% at present. In this area the number of those earning an income from a private company declined from 45% to 27.5%. As for Kalikiliki, whereas 20% owned shops five years ago the situation has changed now with only 15% being in that position now. The same decline has been experienced with those who earned an income from private companies as there figure has gone down from 45% five years ago to 22.5% at present.

**Table 3-1: Sources of Income**

Area	George Proper		Area 5		Area 7		Bauleni		Kalikiliki	
	Now	5 Years ago	Now	5 Years ago	Now	5 Years ago	Now	5 Years ago	Now	5 Years ago
Own Business	34.9	25.6	34.9	16.3	19.0	30.9	30.0	10.0	15.0	20.0
Piece work	9.3	4.6	4.6	2.3	2.4	4.8	12.5	12.5	20.0	12.5
Vending	2.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.5	0
Government	4.6	16.3	7.0	16.3	9.8	2.4	2.5	5.0	5.0	0
Private Company	11.6	20.9	4.6	25.6	35.7	14.3	27.5	45	22.5	45.0

#### 3.2 Borrowing and Income Generating Activities

The responses in this category show that more and more people in all the study areas are more comfortable to borrow money from their own relatives rather than an institution. In George Proper 16.3 % currently borrow from relatives while in Area 5, 11.6% do the same. As for Area 7 16.7% do borrow from their own relatives as well compared to 2.4% five years ago. In the case of Bauleni, the number of those who have sourced money from household savings has remained at 15% just as it was five years ago. The number of those borrowing from relatives has also remained constant at 2.5%. Similarly the number of people earning a living in the household remained at 72.5% the same as five years ago. Kalikiliki on the overall has not experienced much change as the percentage of those sourcing money from household savings went only slightly down from 20% to 17%.

As regards the number of people earning a living in each household, there were not more

than 3 in all the study areas.

### **3.3 Household Income and Its Control**

In all the study areas, it was found that very few people earn an income of K400, 000 per month or more while a considerable number earn around and below K100, 000. 16.3% of the respondents in George Proper earn at least K400, 000 compared to 4.6% who were in that income bracket five years ago. Similarly for Area 7, an increase in the number of those earning K400, 000 or more has been recorded with the figure moving from 11.9% five years ago to 14.3% at present. Bauleni and Kalikiliki have also recorded an increase in the number of those earning K400, 000 or more with the figures for Bauleni moving from 12.5% to 17.5% and for Kalikiliki from 2.5% to 10% currently during the same period. The situation is quite different for Area 5 where there has been a decline in those earning K400, 000 per month from 20.9% to 18.6% during the same period. As regards those earning K100, 000 or less at the moment, Bauleni had the highest number at 20% in contrast to George Proper which had 18%, area 5, 7% Area 7, 16.7% and Kalikiliki 15%.

In relation to the control of income in the households, it was found that most of the income is controlled by husbands while still some housewives do have some control as well. All the study areas except Kalikiliki recorded more than 20% of husbands controlling household income. In Kalikiliki the situation was slightly different with 10% of husbands controlling income. In Kalikiliki 32.5% housewives control the household income.

### **3.4 Improvement in Resources and Setback**

In George Proper, 16.3% indicated that they have experienced an increase in resources in the last five years. The same went for Area 7 where 16.3% indicated the same and also Bauleni and Kalikiliki who both had 17.5%. Area 5 on the other hand had the lowest at 11.9%. The main reason given for this situation was that they could afford to buy more household goods. However, in comparison over 50% of the respondents in all the study areas indicated that they had suffered a setback of one kind or another. The main reason given for the setbacks was that there had been a general increase in the cost of living and that a ;lot of them were not in employment.

## **4. OPERATION AND MAINTANANCE**

### **4.1 Payment for Water**

Over 75% of respondents in the study Areas (except) Kalikiliki asserted that they do pay for their water. The same number indicated that they pay K3,000 per month in Areas 1, 5 and 7. For Bauleni however, only 60% indicated paying the K3,000. for those that do not pay 7% in George Proper, 5, and 7 said they do not have money to do so. In Bauleni and Kalikiliki 5% fail to pay for their water as well. In George Proper and Bauleni those that fail to pay manage to get water from another source.

**Table 4-1: Payment for Water**

Area	George Proper	Area 5	Area 7	Bauleni	Kalikiliki
Yes	83.7	93.0	83.3	75.0	56.0
No	7.0	7.0	16.7	25.0	45.0

#### 4.2 Care of Water Supply Facility

In all the areas except Kalikiliki, the respondents said that their water supply facility is taken care of by the Water Committee. This care is in the form of cleaning the surroundings, locking up when it is not drawing time etc. In case of a breakdown 20% of the respondents in George Proper indicated that JICA would repair the facility while 41% in Area 5 and 38% in Area 7 indicated that Lusaka water and Sewerage company would undertake the repairs. Over 20% of the respondents in Areas 1,5 and 7 sited the Water Committee to undertake the repair work. In Bauleni, 30% feel that the Water Committee should undertake the repairs.

#### 4.3 Equitable Use of Water

Concerning the equitable use of water 76.2% of respondents in Area 7 and 62.8% in Area 5 with 87% in Bauleni feel that there is equitable use of water. George Proper on the other hand has a lower response at 58.1% indicating equitable use of water. Two major reasons have been given as to why there is no equitable use of water:

- a. Inability to pay
- b. Restriction in opening hours for taps

**Table 4-2 Equitable Use of water**

Area	George Proper	Area 5	Area 7	Bauleni	Kalikiliki
Few Taps	0	0	0	2.5	0
Restrictive/Container	0	4.6	0	2.5	0
Inability to pay	27.9	23.2	11.9	7.5	22.5
Restricted hours	11.6	2.3	2.4	0	0
Tap Leader Rules	0	2.3	2.4	0	0
Insufficient supply	0	2.3	0	0	12.5

## 5. IMPACT ON PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

### 5.1 Awareness of Community Activities

A considerable number of people are not aware of the community activities that are taking place in their vicinity. In George Proper 23.2%, Area 5 46.5%, and Area 7, 66% are not aware. As for Bauleni and Kalikiliki 47.5% are not aware as well. Area 7 is therefore the most affected in terms of the ignorance of its residents as far as community activities are concerned. In the same regard Family Care was sited as the most known community activity by the 3 areas in George while drainage and roads were indicated by

respondents of Area 5 and 7 and not those of George Proper. On the other hand the residents of Bauleni and Kalikiliki identified Drama and Song as quite common for activities related to HIV/AIDS

**Table 5-1: Awareness of Community Activities**

Area	George Proper	Area 5	Area 7	Bauleni	Kalikiliki
Aids Awareness	2.3	0	0	5	2.5
Church	2.3	0	0	0	0
Drama/song	2.3	0	0	2.5	2.5
Family Care	13.9	11.6	7.1	0	0
Water	9.3	7	0	0	2.5
Not Aware	23.3	46.5	66	47.5	47.5

## 5.2 Status of Participation

As regards the status of participation in community activities, George Proper has more activity with 34.9% of respondents saying there is more activity in the area. Area 5 and 7 on the other hand seem to be idle on activities. Most of the poor participation has been attributed to less meetings held and even when these meetings are called very few people attend. In Bauleni and Kalikiliki there is more activity with 22.5% of respondents affirming that. In relation to participation by gender, George Proper together with Bauleni and Kalikiliki have recorded that both men and women participate. In Areas 5 and 7 on the other hand, only 34% and 26% have responded that both the women and men participate.

## 5.3 Effectiveness of CBOs

In George Proper 53.55% of respondents were aware of the activity of the particular CBO while in Area 5 only 32.5% were aware and Area 7 only 30% were aware. The respondents in Bauleni and Kalikiliki were also quite knowledgeable with 42.5% and 47.5% respectively. The residents of George Proper therefore have shown to have more knowledge of what CBOs were in their area than the other respondents from the remaining Areas. Among the most known CBOs were CARE International and JICA who were the most known in George Proper. In Area 5 also 11.6% knew about CARE while in Area 7 very few knew about it. Respondents in Area 7 on the other hand knew more of the Neighborhood Watch Committee than any other CBO. In Bauleni, the Anti-AIDS Group is well known there with 10% indicating in the affirmative. As far as the effectiveness of these CBOs is concerned, over 28% of the respondents in all the study areas stated that the CBOs were relatively effective especially in the area of improving people's lives. Only less than 10% indicated that the CBOs were not effective.

**Table 5-3: Effectiveness of CBOs**

Area	George Proper	Area 5	Area 7	Bauleni	Kalikiliki
Improve lives	7.0	7.0	4.8	5.0	2.5
Positive Results/health	11.6	7.0	2.4	0	2.5
Positive Results/water	7.0	2.3	0	0	0
No positive results	9.3	9.3	2.4	2.5	0

## 6. IMPACT ON PEOPLE'S HEALTH AND NUTRITION

### 6.1 Decrease in Diseases

Cholera and Diarrhea were cited as the most common diseases in the study areas. In George Proper, 74.4%, Area 5, 83% and Area 7, 66% of respondents indicated that both diseases had decreased. The same situation was seen in Bauleni where over 60% indicated that both Cholera and Diarrhea had gone down. In Kalikiliki the situation was different with only 55% citing a decrease in both diseases. The same situation was seen in the responses concerning eye and skin diseases. These diseases have also gone down but not as much as Cholera. Kalikiliki had the lowest response at less than 50% indicating that there had been some very minimal decrease in these two diseases. As regards the reasons for this decrease, George Proper recorded a remarkable 13.9% as being the result of health and hygiene advice. Areas 5 and 7 as well as Bauleni did not indicate any advice on health and hygiene although they did attribute the decrease in the incidence of diseases to provision of clean water. The impact of health and hygiene awareness therefore seems to have been more in George Proper.

**Table 6-1: Decrease in Diseases**

Area	George Proper	Area 5	Area 7	Bauleni	Kalikiliki
Diarrhea	74.4	83.5	66.6	67.5	22.0
Cholera	74.4	86.0	69.0	70.0	18.0
Eye Disease	62.8	76.6	61.9	55.0	19.0
Skin Disease	55.8	74.4	61.9	60.0	19.0

### 6.2 Nutritional Status and Meals per Day

As regards the status of children's nutrition, George Proper recorded the highest percentage of those indicating that it had deteriorated (72%) while Area 5 had the highest number of those stating that it had improved at 37.2%. However, the general perception is that children's nutritional conditions have declined considerably mostly due to the fact that the parents can hardly afford a balanced diet for them due to poor incomes at household level. As far as the number of meals per day are concerned, in Areas 1, 5 and 7 those who could afford 3 meals per day were over 80% five years ago and now were at less than 40%. George Proper has also recorded the highest number of people who eat only one meal per day at 23.2%. On the overall, the number of people who can afford 3 meals per day has gone down. The main reason for this is the low incomes earned by most residents due to the falling standards of the economy.



## **7. IMPACT ON PEOPLE'S HEALTH AND HYGIENE BEHAVIOUR**

### **7.1 Source of Water for Drinking and Washing**

George Proper recorded 100% response in relation to using the same source for water for washing and drinking unlike five years ago when only 76.7% were doing so. In this area five years ago 18.6% used the shallow wells for both drinking and washing purposes. In Area 5 on the other hand 95.3% and 96% in Area 7 use the same source for drinking and washing. In Bauleni the situation has not changed much with 100% responses for now and five years ago. In this area there are no shallow wells. Out of all these areas, George Proper is where a lot of progress has been recorded. Those who got water for drinking and washing from different sources (a practice which was more prevalent five years ago than now) indicated that they did so because water was difficult to find then. The trend is showing that more and more people are using the same source for drinking and washing now than in the past.

### **7.2 Vessels for Fetching Water**

53.5% of the respondents in George Proper currently use a container with a lid to fetch water. In Area 5 the number is much higher with 86% using the container with a lid. Area 7 has 81% of these. The situation is not very different for Bauleni where 65% use a container with a lid. In Kalikiliki only very few people use the container with a lid as only 40% indicated doing so. The high numbers of people using containers with lid in Areas 1, 5, 7 and Bauleni is attributed to the Water Committee rules that stipulate a container with a lid as the acceptable vessel for carrying water. The responses also show that the bucket has been replaced by the container as the most common vessel for transporting water. When asked as to why they use the preferred vessel, 23.2% of George Proper respondents indicated that it is easier to carry, while 16.3% of Area 5 and 9.6% in Area 7 and 22.5% in Bauleni also said the same.

In terms of giving reasons as to why they used the particular vessel, 16.3% of respondents in George Proper, 30% in Area 5 and 48% in Area 7 stated that they use it because it is the one allowed by the Water Committee. As far as storage of water was concerned, 95.3% from George Proper, 97.7% in area 5, 88% in Area 7 and 97% and 100% for Bauleni and Kalikiliki respectively store their water in containers with lids. There is no doubt that the method of keeping water in containers with lids has been greatly influenced by the rules of the Water Committees which stipulate compulsory use of containers with lids.

### **7.3 Treatment of Water**

The responses in all the study areas show that more and more people have ceased the practice of treating water in the last five years. In George Proper for example, 60.4% do not treat their water at present compared to 72.1% who were doing so five years ago. In

Area 5, 65% treat their water leaving the situation the same as it was five years ago. Area 7 on the other hand has 60% of the respondents not treating their water at present, while 79.2% did not treat their water five years ago. The situation is more less the same in Bauleni where percentage of those who do not treat their water has remained the same as five years ago at 67.5%. In Kalikiliki the number of those not treating their water has gone down to 70% from 95% five years ago. For the small number of people who treat their water, the most common method used is chlorination. Those who indicated use of chlorine were 32.5% in George Proper, 25.6% in Area 5, 31.2% in Area 7 and 20% and 25% in Bauleni and Kalikiliki respectively. Boiling was also indicated as a common method that was used a lot five years ago. Now most people seem to have turned to chlorine. They feel that it is easier to use and it is affordable.

**Table 7-3 (a) : Treatment of Water**

Area	George Proper		Area 5		Area 7		Bauleni		Kalikiliki	
	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago
Yes	39.5	73.1	34.9	34.9	40.8	1.6	32.5	32.5	32.5	17.5
No	60.4	27.9	65.1	65.1	60.0	99.2	67.5	67.5	70.0	95.0

**Table 7-3 (b); Method of Treating Water**

Area	George Proper		Area 5		Area 7		Bauleni		Kalikiliki	
	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago
Add chlorine	32.5	7.0	25.6	4.6	31.2	7.2	20.0	17.5	25.0	7.5
Boil	7.0	20.9	9.3	30.2	7.2	14.4	12.5	17.5	7.5	82.5
N/A	60.4	72.1	65.1	0	62.4	79.2	67.5	65.0	67.5	10.0

#### 7.4 Sanitation

As regards sanitation over 70% of the respondents in all the study areas indicated that they use personal household latrines. However, a significant number of 20.9% in George Proper, 7% in Area 5, 9.6% in Area 7, and 12.5% in Bauleni and Kalikiliki have no access to household latrines. There has not been much change in this area compared with five years ago. Regarding the types of latrines used, different households use different types of latrines for various reasons. In George Proper the most commonly used latrine is the traditional one with 46.5% of respondents using them at present. In this area, the number of those using the latrine with slab has remained constant at 32.5%. Areas 5 and 7 on the other hand have more people (over 60%) using the improved latrine with slab compared to those in George Proper. Those using improved latrines with slab in Bauleni are 55% while in Kalikiliki they are at 42%.

A few people in some of these areas are also privileged with Flush toilets. In Area 5, only

4.6% use Flush Toilets at present compared to five years ago when the number of those who used these toilets were 18.6%. The same situation is found in Area 7 where only 2.4% are using Flush Toilets now compared to 9.6% five years ago. Interestingly none of the respondents in George Proper indicated using a Flush toilet at present while 2.3% used these toilets five years ago. In Bauleni and Kalikiliki there are no flush toilets available.

The most used toilet is the one people find affordable, easy to build, use and maintain. In all these areas, affordability topped the list with 30% in George Proper. 23.2% in Area 5, 14% in Area 7 and 15% and 27% in Bauleni and Kalikiliki indicating that they used the respective type of latrine because they could afford it. This situation has not changed much compared with five years ago. Those who currently use shared toilets in George Proper are 18.6% compared to 11.6% five years ago. Area 7 and Bauleni and Kalikiliki also have a significant number of between 7% and 10% who used shared toilet facilities.

**Table 7-4: Type of Latrine Used**

Area	George Proper		Area 5		Area 7		Bauleni		Kalikiliki	
	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago
Improved/slab	32.5	32.5	67.4	67.4	67.2	64.8	55.0	50.0	42.5	45.0
N/A	20.9	13.9	4.6	2.3	7.2	4.8	12.5	5.0	12.5	0
Traditional	46.5	51.2	20.9	18.6	19.2	21.6	27.5	45.0	45.0	55.0
Flush Toilet	0	51.2	4.6	18.6	2.4	9.6	0	0	0	0
Traditional flush	0	0	2.3	2.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
VIP	0	0	0	0	2.4	0	5.0	0	0	0

## 7.5 Hand Washing Practices

### 7.5.1 Time for Washing Hands

In George Proper 18.6% of the respondents wash their hands after using the toilet and before eating compared to 16.3% who did so five years ago. Less people (7%) wash their hands after using the toilet and before eating in Area 5 currently compared to 25.6% five years ago. Area 7 has also experienced a decline in those who wash their hands after using the toilet and before eating from 26.4% five years ago to 16.8% at present. Similarly Kalikiliki has also recorded a down turn of 35% five years ago to 32.5% at present. In contrast the number of people who wash their hands in Bauleni after toilet and before eating has gone up from 35% five years ago to 37.5% at present.

In general very few people wash their hands after undertaking some household chores. The most preferred time to wash hands apart from after visiting the toilet and before eating is before cooking and when hands are seen to be dirty.

### 7.5.2 Hand Washing Methods

All the study areas record over 55% of its respondents washing hands in a basin as the most common method. This situation is not very different from the practice of five years ago when the same number also used to wash hands in a similar way. The second most practiced method is that of pouring water using a cup. The statistics show that there has been an increase in the number of people using this method compared to five years ago. In George Proper, the numbers rose to 16.3% from 11.6% while in Area 5, a significant improvement was recorded at 13.9% compared to 2.3% five years ago. In Area 7, the respondents using this method are 14.4% compared to 9.6% five years ago. Similarly, Bauleni has also experienced an increase in those who use the method from 7.5% five years ago to 10% at present. As for using soap when washing hands, all the study areas recorded an overwhelming increase indicating that the use of soap is a very common practice.

The main reason cited for using the particular method of hand washing is to prevent disease. This was the response from 53.3% of people in George Proper, 48.8% in Area 5, 43.2% in Area 7, 53% in Bauleni and 30% in Kalikiliki. The second most important reason given in George Proper was that of conserving water, while Area 5 was also to conserve water and because the method was easy. 14.4% in Area 7 did not have any reason for employing the particular hand washing method. As regards washing hands at big gatherings, there hasn't been much change compared with the situation five years ago. Over 50% of the respondents still wash their hands in a basin even at funerals or weddings.

**Table 7-5-2: Hand Washing Methods**

Area	George Proper		Area 5		Area 7		Bauleni		Kalikiliki	
	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago
Bath tub	2.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pouring water/cup	16.3	11.6	13.9	2.3	14.4	9.6	10.0	7.5	5.0	5.0
Outside basin	13.9	9.3	27.9	30.2	31.2	28.8	25.0	20.0	12.5	10.0
Out/basin/pouring water	4.6	2.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wash in basin	62.7	74.4	58.1	65.1	55.2	57.6	62.5	67.5	82.5	85.0
No s. method	0	2.3	0	0	0	0	2.5	2.5	0	0
From tap	0	0	0	2.3	0	4.8	0	2.5	0	0

### 7.6 Garbage Disposal

In George Proper 41.8% of the respondents take their garbage to the collection site compared to only 23.2% who did so five years ago. The situation is however, different in Areas 5 and 7 where 69.8% and 62.4% respectively bury in the yard. More people (74.4% and 64.8%) actually did that five years ago in these areas. Bauleni on the other hand has

not recorded any significant change as the numbers of those who bury outside the yard is relatively the same as that of five years ago at slightly over 50%. Kalikiliki recorded the lowest number of people engaged in garbage disposal practices. The main reason given for the practiced garbage disposal method was that it was an easier method and it also prevented disease.

**Table 7-6: Garbage Disposal Methods**

Area	George Proper		Area 5		Area 7		Bauleni		Kalikiliki	
	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago	Now	5 years ago
Burn/ house	9.3	11.6	0	0	12.0	9.6	10.0	7.5	7.5	10
Bury/ ground/house	39.5	62.8	69.8	74.4	62.4	64.8	52.5	57.5	17.5	22.5
Collection site	41.8	23.2	11.6	9.3	9.6	14.8	17.5	12.5	32.5	30.0
Garbage pit	4.6	2.3	11.6	7.0	9.6	9.6	7.5	12.5	0	0
Garbage truck	4.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### 7.7 Advice of Community Health Worker

The number of respondents who had received advice from CHWs was lowest in Area 7 at 24%, while Area 5 recorded 41.8%. George Proper on the other hand had 58% having received advice from CHW and Bauleni, 42.5% with Kalikiliki at 32.5%. In Areas 5, 7 and Bauleni there was an increase in the number of those who had received advice compared to five years ago. George Proper on the other had recorded a decline of 62.8% five years ago to 58.1% at present. Most respondents in George Proper (16.3%) indicated that the advice was related to family care while the highest number of respondents in Area 5 (11.6%) sited health and hygiene. The overall response in these areas show that five years ago there was very little activity of this nature.

## 添付資料 7 PRA ガイドライン

## (1) ジンバブエ

21-22 November 2002 : Mucheni Village (Sinansengwe Ward)

25-26 November 2002 : Gande Village (Sinakoma Ward)

Time	PRA Tools and Issues	Participants	Output
<b>Day 1</b> 8:00-9:00	<b>Introduction Meeting</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Village Head: Opening remarks and introduction of village leaders and JICA Evaluation Team</li> <li>Evaluation Team: Explain the objectives and methods of this evaluation</li> </ul>	Village leaders and wide range of villagers	
9:00-12:30	<b>Focus group discussion with SSI</b> <u>Community Profile (III-2)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Village history, important events and occurrences with regard to water and sanitation</li> <li>Demographical changes (including health aspect)</li> <li>Social norms and customs</li> <li>Social structure</li> </ul> <u>Community's access to information and towns (III-4)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the community interact with neighbouring communities? For what purpose?</li> <li>How do people travel to Binga City and Bulawayo? For what purpose? How long does it take? How frequent do they travel?</li> <li>How do people obtain information?</li> <li>What proportion of people listen to the radio and read newspaper?</li> <li>What kinds of extension or promotion activities are organized in the community (agriculture extension work, community health promotion, etc.)?</li> </ul> <u>Community's relationship with the government (III-5)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the community interact with the RDC?</li> <li>What kind of support does the community receive from the government (health care, welfare, etc.)?</li> </ul> <u>Interventions from other donors and NGOs (III-6)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the community received any other supports from other donors and NGOs? If so, what kind?</li> </ul>	A group of 5-6 people including village leaders and elders	Historical diagram Venn diagram  Mobility Map   Venn Diagram
12:30-13:30	<b>Lunch</b>		
13:30-15:00	<b>Key informant interview with SSI</b> <u>Community participation in the project/program (III-1)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was there a consultation meeting between the JICA/SCF and the community during the project (water supply project) formulation? If so, what was discussed and decided?</li> <li>What was/is the community involvement during the implementation?</li> <li>How has the community's awareness evolved?</li> </ul>	A group of 5-6 village leaders including village head	

Time	PRA Tools and Issues	Participants	Output
15:30-17:00	<p><b>Focus Group Discussion with SSI and Self-Evaluation</b>  <u>O&amp;M and Management of Water supply facility (I-3)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the roles and responsibilities of the water point committee in the village?</li> <li>• How was the committee formed?</li> <li>• How does it operate?</li> <li>• How are decisions made in the committee?</li> <li>• What kind of skills and knowledge are the members equipped with from training?</li> <li>• When was the last break-down?</li> <li>• How long did it take to be fixed?</li> <li>• How do community members participate in the management of the borehole (selecting the committee, contributing to the maintenance, etc.)?</li> <li>• Problems experienced in the operation and management of the borehole.</li> <li>• How is the wasted water dealt with? Does the committee (or people near the borehole) make use of wasted water (water leaking or wasted at the borehole)? If so, how?</li> <li>• What kind of support is available from the authorities (RDC, ZINWA, DDF, etc.) and other support service agencies like NGOs with regard management of water and health and hygiene promotion?</li> <li>• How is the communication between the authorities and the community effected?</li> <li>• Does the committee have tools and where are they kept?</li> <li>• How does the committee know of break-down?</li> </ul>	Members of Water Point Committee	
<b>Day 2</b> 8:00-9:00	<p><b>Observation and Interviews</b> Physical observation of the water supply facility</p>		Sketch, or photo, and description
9:00-10:30	<p><b>Community Mapping and Well-being Ranking</b>  <u>Community Profile (III-2, 3)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural resources</li> <li>• Human resources</li> <li>• Physical/ social infrastructure</li> <li>• Communal activities</li> <li>• Women and vulnerable people such as those on HBC (home based care)</li> </ul>	4 Separate Groups: group of 5-6 old men; group of 5-6 young men; group of 5-6 old women; and group of 5-6 young women (Women's groups should include heads of households)	Social/ Resource Map  Well-being Ranking
10:30-12:00	<p><b>Focus Group Discussions</b>  <u>Impact on living environment (II-1)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has access to safe water improved?</li> <li>• What are the benefits to the community from the installation of borehole?</li> <li>• Who benefited the most by it?</li> <li>• How is time previously spent fetching water now spent?</li> <li>• What is the progress of the construction of latrines?</li> </ul>	Four separate groups: group of 5-6 old men; group of 5-6 young men; group of 5-6 old women; and group of 5-6 young	

Time	PRA Tools and Issues	Participants	Output
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What benefits have been realised from it?</li> <li>• Who is benefiting most by it?</li> </ul> <p><i><u>Impact on people's health and hygiene practices (II-2)</u></i> (using Pocket Chart)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have you received training related to water and sanitation?</li> <li>• In what ways have your and your HH members' health and hygiene practices been improved (hand washing, using latrines, way of carrying and storing water, etc.)?</li> <li>• How did the behaviour change happen?</li> <li>• What benefit have they brought?</li> <li>• Who benefited most by it?</li> </ul>	women (women's groups should include heads of households)	
12:00-13:00	<b>Lunch</b>		
13:00-15:00	<p><b>Focus Group Discussions with SSI</b> <i><u>Impact on people's participation in community activities including maintenance of water facilities (II-5)</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What kind of communal events and community activities are organized?</li> <li>• How are they organized? Who attend them?</li> <li>• How do women contribute in decision making process regarding these events/activities?</li> <li>• Are people more active now than 5 years ago in participation in those activities?</li> <li>• If so, why?</li> <li>• How community leaders are trained (traditional training, leadership training course run by the government or NGOs, etc.)?</li> </ul>	4 Separate Groups: group of 5-6 old men; group of 5-6 young men; group of 5-6 old women; and group of 5-6 young women (Women's groups should include heads of households)	
15:30-16:00	<p><b>Wrap-up Meeting</b> JICA Team: Summary of findings Community: Comments Village Head: Closing remarks</p>	Village leaders and wide range of villagers	



## (2) ザンビア

Time	PRA Tools and Issues	Participants	Output
Day 1 8:00-8:30	<b>Introduction Meeting</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RDC and Water Committee: Opening remarks and introduction of community leaders and JICA team members (including local consultants)</li> <li>JICA Team: Explain the objectives and methods of this evaluation study</li> </ul>	RDC, Water Committee & community members who attend PRA exercises	
8:30-10:30	<b>Community Mapping</b> <i>Community Profile (III- 3)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural resources</li> <li>Human resources (household, headship)</li> <li>Physical/ social infrastructure</li> </ul>	To select 2 zones/each survey area  20 participants in total/ each survey area =10 participants/ zone (5 men & 5 women including at least 2 female household heads) x 2 zones	Social/ resource map of zones
10:30-12:30	<b>Focus Group Discussions with SSI and Pocket Chart Exercise</b> <i>Impact on living environment (II-1)</i> <u>Guide Questions for FGD</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Which water source do you and your HH use for each usage (i.e. drinking, cooking, washing, bathing, gardening, etc.)? Is there any change in available water source compared with 5 years ago?</li> <li>How many bucket/container do/did you fetch water in a day for different usage?</li> <li>Did the access to safe water and sanitation improved if compared with 5 years ago?</li> <li>What benefits have the community gained from the improved water supply?</li> <li>Who benefited most by it?</li> <li>How do they spend the time which was previously used fetching water?</li> <li>Is there other social services improved in past 5 years?</li> <li>How is such improvement linked with your living condition? (positive/ negative impacts)</li> <li>Do you send children to primary/ basic school? If not, what is the reason?</li> <li>Is there access to the literacy class for the adults?</li> </ul>		Matrix indicating water source and usage  Matrix ranking
	<i>Impact on people's hygiene practices and health conditions (II-2, 3)</i> <b>Guide Questions for FGD</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How do they carry, keep and use water?</li> <li>In what ways have the people's hygiene practices been changed in terms of excreta disposal and food hygiene?</li> <li>How do they control the domestic and environmental hygiene especially garbage disposal?</li> <li>What benefits have the community gained from behavioural change in hygiene?</li> <li>Who benefited most by it?</li> <li>How is the improvement of nutrition condition of household members?</li> <li>What is the major disease for you and your HH members throughout a year? Is there any change compared with 5 years ago?</li> </ul>		Matrix indicating method of handling water  Matrix indicating method of hygiene practice  Disease calendar
12:30-13:30	<b>Break</b>		
13:30-15:00	<i>Impact on people's participation in community activities (II-5)</i>		

Time	PRA Tools and Issues	Participants	Output
	<u>Guide Questions for FGD</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What kind of community events/activities are organized including maintenance of water point?</li> <li>• How are they organized? Who attend them?</li> <li>• How do women contribute in decision making process regarding these events/activities?</li> <li>• Are people more active now than 5 years ago in participation in those activities? Why do you think so?</li> <li>• Which government organisation, NGO, and CBO are working in the area?</li> <li>• What kind of benefits do those organisations bring to the community?</li> </ul>		
15:00-17:00	Well-Being Ranking and Focus Group Discussions with SSI <i>Impact on improvement of livelihood (II-6)</i> <u>Guide Questions for FGD</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is your perception of well-being?</li> <li>• How are household assets, income and expenditure, and practice of saving at household level?</li> <li>• Has your household accessed to micro-finance? What was its usage?</li> <li>• Do you think your household has had increase in resources or improvement in livelihood compared with 5 years ago?</li> <li>• In what aspect?</li> <li>• What do you think is the major reason of improvement/ setback?</li> <li>• Is there any relation between the impacts from improvement of social services and improvement/ setback of your living condition?</li> </ul>		Well-being ranking
Day 2 8:00-10:30	<b>Focus Group Discussion with SSI and Self-Evaluation</b> <i>O&amp;M and Management of Water supply facility (I-3)</i> <u>Guide Questions for FGD</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are your roles and responsibilities as tap leader/ tap attendant?</li> <li>• What kind of skills and knowledge are you equipped from the training?</li> <li>• How do community members participate in the management of the water supply facility?</li> <li>• How is the communication between tap leaders/ tap attendants, RDC/ Water Committee, and LWSC?</li> <li>• What kind of problems did you encounter to operate the public tap?</li> <li>• How did you solve such problems?</li> <li>• Is there any issue to be tackled in order to improve sustainability of water supply?</li> </ul>	Tap Leaders/ Tap Attendants in survey zones	
10:30-12:00	<b>Wrap-up Meeting</b> JICA Team: Summary of findings Community leaders	RDC	