

Annex 1: Overview of participatory research activities undertaken in the study villages

Participatory research methods

A series of participatory research activities (see Rietbergen-McCracken & Narayan-Parker 1998)¹ were conducted in three different agricultural communities of Enongo, Enkalashe, and Olwaadhiya to understand the roles, perceived influence and capacities of villagers to participate in practical water resources governance at community level.

Participatory Resource Mapping

First, the researchers used a ‘Participatory Resource Mapping’² exercise (Mascarenhas and Kumar 1991) to produce a resource map of the present water situation and reflect on the multiple uses and users of different water sources. The issue of social differentiation (i.e. impacts of imbalances in power and inequality within and across social groups) was then explored using a Resource Use Matrix to evaluate the different ways different social groups can access and control water sources.

*Governance Walk*³

Building on the ‘Gender Walk’ by Oettle et al. (2014), a ‘Governance Walk’ exercise was used to explore how different social groups participate in water governance. We asked participants to highlight the extent to which members of the community are involved in identifying priorities for water use and allocation, whether or not their concerns are being heard and considered, and the strategies and mechanisms established to make the government pay attention to their concerns. The responses were displayed on flipcharts and each respondent was asked to explain the rationale for their responses.

*Sad and Happy Face*¹

Building on the Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation approach (Rietbergen-McCracken and Narayan-Parker 1998) a ‘Sad and Happy Face’ activity was used to assess the performance of the current water management systems and identify challenges and opportunities for improved water governance (particularly related to participation and flexibility).¹ We asked participants to identify the extent to which they are happy or sad (i.e. level of satisfaction) with the performance and impact of current water management and governance systems in the village e.g. service delivery, cost sharing, maintenance etc. The information was used to identify the challenges facing current water governance systems and identify opportunities to improve their performance.

*Story with a Gap*⁴

In addition, a ‘Story with a Gap’ activity (Narayan and Srinivasan 1994) was used to depict scenarios for ‘before’ and ‘after (improved future)’ to explore what changes were desired by community. Step to improving the situation were identified at the same time as considering the

¹ E.g. engagement of vulnerable groups, institutional environment, perspective of other actors and operational efficiency

barriers and enablers to achieving the future scenario and what resources they would need. With this exercise the community were able to translate the negative situation they face into a positive state. This was accompanied by a field visit to boreholes in cattle posts and interviews with water point committee members to get an understanding of water management issues from the perspectives of pastoralist communities.

¹Rietbergen-McCracken J, Narayan-Parker D eds (1998). Participation and Social Assessment: Tools and Techniques 1. World Bank Publications

²Mascarenhas J, Kumar P.P (1991) Participatory mapping and modelling users' notes. RRA notes 12:9-20

³Koelle,B., Oettle, N and Parring, S. 2014. Experiential Learning for Adaptation, Facilitation Cards. Indigo development and change, Cape Town.

⁴Narayan, D. and Srinivasan, L., 1994. Participatory development tool kit: training materials for agencies & communities. Banco Mundial. The World Bank.