

Consultative stakeholder involvement approach on implementation of water projects in Kisumu East sub-county, Kenya

Edwin Omondi Arwa¹, Prof. Charles M. Rambo², PhD, Dr. Isaac Abuya, PhD³

¹MA Project Planning and Management, University of Nairobi, Kenya

^{2,3}Senior Lecturer PhD, University of Nairobi, School of Continuing and Distance Education, Kenya

Abstract: Water projects face implementation challenges of cost and time overruns due to lack of stakeholders' involvement and this has led sustainability constraints. The purpose of the study was to assess the influence of consultative stakeholder involvement approach on implementation of water projects in Kisumu East sub-county. The study adopted descriptive survey research design and data collected through self-administered structured questionnaire. The research instrument was piloted for content validity and reliability tests. A sample size of 118 respondents was selected using stratified random sampling from a target population of 167 involved in implementation of water projects in Kisumu East sub-county. High Cronbach's coefficient Alpha of 0.8 was obtained. The data was analysed using descriptive statistic of mean, standard deviation, frequencies percentages and inferential statistics of correlation and regression at $\alpha=0.05$ level of significance. The study found out statistically significant relationships between Participative Stakeholder Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects. The null hypothesis H_{01} : Participative stakeholder involvement approach does not significantly influence implementation of water projects in Kisumu East sub-county was rejected since $p=0.000<0.05$. It is recommended that a holistic bottom up approach in implementation of projects should be embraced so that all key stakeholders in projects become part and parcel of the projects and to bring ownership of projects by stakeholders. Further research should be carried out on project planning and design to establish whether stakeholders are involved at these initial stages before implementation of water projects.

Keywords: Consultative stakeholders' Involvement approach, Implementation of water projects

I. INTRODUCTION

Access to clean drinking water remains a big problem globally with 783 million people unable to access clean drinking water, especially in rural areas due to mismanagement of available water resources and poor or weak government policies (Giupponi, Jakemann, Karssenber and Hare, 2006). Water governance challenges are attributed to conflicts and competing water needs (Akhmouch and Clavreul, 2016). Water is a scarce resource and needs an integrated management approach in making decisions that will capture stakeholder needs (Akhmouch&Clavreul, 2016). According to UNEP (2019), Sustainable Development Goal 6 (SDG 6) focuses on availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all. This agenda builds on the

relevant Millennium Development Goals. In Thailand, involvement of stakeholders in the water industry is not well developed and as such there is a shift from an initial government dominated and ineffective management process to a more stakeholder involvement process in water resources development projects (Uraiwong and Watanabe 2017). Involvement of stakeholders in water projects implementation is aimed at making the development demand driven and sustainable.

Kenya is classified as a water scarce country since it receives an annual renewable fresh water supply of only 647 cubic meters per capita (Birongo and Quyen, 2005). Government devolved the water function to improve service delivery and implementation of water projects, though this has proved to be a mirage. Almost 80% of diseases in "developing" countries are associated with water, causing early deaths. Previous water resource projects have failed due to poor involvement and identification of stakeholder needs and inadequate assessment of social impact of the project (Uraiwong and Watanabe 2017). To address this stakeholder involvement has become key in achieving water projects outcomes (Uraiwong and Watanabe 2017). In Kenya, a research by Nyabera (2015) established that a vast majority of beneficiaries are never involved in needs assessment and this negatively affected successful implementation of project and ultimately jeopardised water projects sustainability.

Lack of clean drinking water globally threatens the lives of humans, it is approximated that 1.4 million people die each year from contaminated drinking water; and 3.6 million people die each year from waterborne diseases (UNDP, 2006). If water project is to be successfully implemented, then all key stakeholders that represent the interests of the beneficiaries must be involved in the implementation process. This study seeks to examine the influence of consultative stakeholder's involvement approach on implementation of sustainable water projects. This study is expected to contribute to the body of knowledge of project management so as to improve sustainability of water projects by capturing real beneficiary needs. This study may also provide insights in the role that different stakeholders play and how their roles improves chances of projects success and minimizes risks of project failure. It highlights the need for bottom-up approach in

project planning, design and implementation. This study may also contribute to formulation of policies related to implementation of water projects by both public and private sector. Involvement of stakeholders in implementing water projects may bring a sense of legitimacy, power and urgency of stakeholders and ownership of projects. The county governments and different government entities dealing with water infrastructure development can use the results of this study to improve on effectiveness and efficiency of water projects implementation by aligning stakeholder needs and interests to organisational goals. Further research can be done on how to implement the different stakeholder involvement approaches by organizations.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Consultative Stakeholder Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects

Consultative stakeholder involvement approach as used in this study meant discussion, dialogue, negotiation, deliberation and conference. Sturdy, Smith-Merry and Freeman (2012) in their study highlighted functions that led to consultation, identifying objections to proposed initiatives, generating ideas and negotiating compromise positions that that would accommodate different relevant interests of different stakeholders. Sturdy, Smith-Merry and Freeman (2012) also noted in their study on Stakeholder Consultation as Social Mobilization that consultation offers a means of persuading stakeholders to accept policy decisions besides soliciting their input, they also stressed on public and stakeholder role for democratic assent to decisions, minimizing potential opposition or as a way of building public trust. Sturdy, Smith-Merry and Freeman (2012) notes that other research carried out have sought to understand the working of consultation as a tool for persuasion. They note that consultation inculcates shared orientation around implementation of policies and programmes and that “collective action frame” for mobilization of all stakeholders around work to be implemented. Consultation helps in securing acceptance and bringing a kind of collective action necessary for effective implementation. Sturdy, Smith-Merry and Freeman (2012) noted that consultation has not been examined in to details so that it serves as a means of social mobilization.

Marxsen (2015) states that for legitimacy equation to be solved, participatory democracy is key to identifying democratic legitimacy with inclusiveness and for citizens and stakeholders. Consultation mechanisms in which citizens and stakeholders are reached out to and asked for their contribution. In the study, Marxsen (2015) examines open consultation as a form of participatory governance and tries to establish whether citizens are effectively given voice as a result of consultation and the contribution to substitute for the underdeveloped institutions. Findings by Marxsen (2015) shows that consultation is dominant in organizations with business backgrounds or an industry while it's low in not-for-profit organisations and groups. Marxsen (2015) defines consultation as a process where the input from external

interested parties trigger the shaping of policies before decision making. He identifies two forms of consultation namely open and closed consultation. In open consultation, specific stakeholders with potential views or concerns in order to include their views in the decision-making process while in closed consultation, all beneficiaries and organizations are invited to participate i.e citizens, civil society organizations, business associations and public authorities and private companies. Open consultation increases legitimacy of decisions, use of external stakeholder expertise through consultation. Open consultation aids in coherent and transparent actions. Marxsen (2015) notes that civil society organizations mobilise people especially those suffering from exclusion and discrimination to give their voices and concerns so that services meet the needs of beneficiaries. Churches and religious communities have contributions to make. Consultation is only effective when conducted early in the process of planning to create an impact. For legitimacy of a consultation process, transparency was crucial. The results by Marxsen (2015) shows that consultation in itself is always insufficient as far as transparency of the procedures are concerned.

Bunea (2017) states that consultation is a policy instrument that is widely used and it constitutes a direct communication link between those who affect or are affected by an initiative and decision makers and this brings feedback whether an initiative is feasible or not on its implementation. In his research on stakeholder consultation on European System of Governance, Bunea (2017) state that one of the most ambitious consultative regimes are operated by the European Union however he states that there was controversy that arose from its inception as a result of the EU consultation regime concerning its potential to boost success in decision making. Its relevance and impact on outcomes and the capacity to produce a legitimate, open, transparent, inclusive and evidence-based consultation process were often questioned. Stakeholder consultation was criticized for being conducted in a rush and ultimately fail to achieve inclusive goals and biasness in interest representation. The question remains whether consultation by the EU contributed to representation of all stakeholder interests. In his study, the European stakeholders evaluated the interactions and dialogue with officials of EU. This demonstrates how stakeholders evaluate how their interests are represented. The findings show weak alignment of stakeholder interest. Stakeholder evaluation of consultation can be determined and shaped by costs and benefits for their position in consultation process. Bunea (2017) states that stakeholder involvement process in EU evolved overtime in 1960s from unstructured dialogues to established and more formal practice during formulation and agenda setting. Stakeholders should be recognized as relevant dialogue partners and trustworthy with capacity to meet immediate, complex and high-quality informational needs in multifaceted environment. Insiders are actors who are regarded as legitimate by government and usually consulted from time to time Bunea (2017).

Wickenden, Mulligan, Fefoame and Katende (2012) conducted a study on Stakeholder consultations on community-based rehabilitation guidelines in Ghana and Uganda with an objective of consulting with key stakeholders to get opinions and suggestions on development programs. The researchers found out that stakeholders in different facets can play key roles in shaping public policies through participatory consultations and stresses the need to include even the marginalised groups in consultations i.e. Persons living with (Disabilities PWDs) and women.

III. METHODOLOGY

This study employed descriptive survey research design and data collected using structured questionnaire from a sample size of 118 out of a target population of 167 of PMCs, Contractors, Water Department staff and ward Administrators. A pilot testing was done on 10% of the sample size and a reliability coefficient of 0.77 and validity coefficient of 0.8 obtained. Analysis involved descriptive statistic of percentages, frequencies, mean and standard deviation while inferential statistics involved correlation and regression analysis.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The response rate was 89.83% of the total respondents. The study sought to establish how participative stakeholders' involvement approach influence implementation of water projects in Kisumu East-sub county, Kenya.

4.1 Consultative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects

The study investigates the influence of consultative stakeholder involvement approach on implementation of water projects in Kisumu East sub-county.

4.1.1 Descriptive analysis of Consultative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects

To achieve this, the respondents were asked to give their opinions on the level of agreement or disagreement with statements using Likert scale of 1-5 where 1- Strongly disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Neutral, 4-Agree and 5-Strongly agree. The results are presented in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1: Consultative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects

Statements	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	Mean	SD
Discussion with stakeholders enhances tracking perceptions and attitude	35(33%)	56(53%)	12(11%)	1(1%)	2(2%)	4.14	0.80
Dialogue improves stakeholder's willingness to take part in projects implementation	31(29%)	55(52%)	18(17%)	2(2%)	0(0%)	4.08	0.73
Negotiation with stakeholders leads to better decision making	27(25%)	47(44%)	24(23%)	7(7%)	1(1%)	3.87	0.90
Deliberations improves tracking needs and expectations of stakeholders	20(19%)	50(47%)	24(23%)	12(11%)	0(0%)	3.74	0.90
Stakeholders share information and raise their concerns in conferences	32(30%)	59(56%)	9(8%)	6(6%)	0(0%)	4.10	0.78
Composite mean and composite standard deviation						3.99	0.82

The study sought to establish the extent to which respondents agreed that discussion enhances beneficiary satisfaction in water projects implementation. Out of 106 respondents 35(33%) strongly agreed, 56(53%) agreed, 12(11%) were neutral, 1(1%) disagreed, and 2(2%) strongly disagreed with a mean and standard deviation of 4.41 and 0.80 respectively. The findings suggest that majority of respondents 86% agreed that discussion had an influence on implementation of water projects.

The study sought to assess the extent to which respondents agreed that dialogue enhances timeliness in water projects implementation. Out of 106 respondents 31(29%) strongly agreed, 55(52%) agreed, 18(17%) were neutral, 2(2%) disagreed, and 0(0%) strongly disagreed with a mean and standard deviation of 4.08 and 0.73 respectively. The findings

suggest that majority of respondents 81% agreed that dialogue had an influence on implementation of water projects.

The study sought to investigate the extent to which respondents agreed that negotiation enhances timeliness in water projects implementation. Out of 106 respondents 27(25%) strongly agreed, 47(44%) agreed, 24(23%) were neutral, 7(7%) disagreed, and 1(1%) strongly disagreed with a mean and standard deviation of 3.87 and 0.90 respectively. The findings suggest that majority of respondents 69% agreed that negotiation had an influence on implementation of water projects.

The study sought to investigate the extent to which respondents agreed that deliberations enhances timeliness in water projects implementation. Out of 106 respondents 20(19%) strongly agreed, 50(47%) agreed, 24(23%) were neutral, 12(11%) disagreed, and 0(0%) strongly disagreed

with a mean and standard deviation of 3.74 and 0.90 respectively. The findings suggest that majority of respondents 66% agreed that deliberations had an influence on implementation of water projects.

The study sought to establish the extent to which respondents agreed that conferences enhances timeliness in water projects implementation. Out of 106 respondents 32(30%) strongly agreed, 59(56%) agreed, 9(8%) were neutral, 6(6%) disagreed, and 0(0%) strongly disagreed with a mean and standard deviation of 4.10 and 0.78 respectively. The findings suggest that majority of respondents 86% agreed that conferences had an influence on implementation of water projects.

The composite mean was 3.99 and composite standard deviation was 0.82, this showed that Discussion, Dialogue and Conference influenced Implementation of Water Projects since there means were higher than the composite mean while Deliberation and Negotiation did not influenced Implementation of Water Projects since there means were smaller in values than the composite mean.

4.1.2 Inferential Analysis of Consultative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects

Inferential analysis of Consultative Involvement Approach and implementation of water projects was conducted in terms of correlation, ANOVA, regression and coefficients. The results were as outlined below.

4.1.2.1 Correlation of Consultative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects

Pearson correlation coefficient was used to establish the existence or non-existence of significance relationship as well as degree of association between Consultative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects.

Table 4.2: Correlation of Consultative Involvement Approach (CIA) and Implementation of Water Projects (IWP)

		Consultative Involvement Approach	Implementation of Water Projects
Consultative Involvement Approach	Pearson Correlation	1	.396**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	n	106	106
Implementation of Water Projects	Pearson Correlation	.396**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	n	106	106
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			

Table 4.2 presents the correlation statistics of Consultative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects.

The correlation table shows that Consultative Involvement Approach was significantly related (p value<0.05) against Implementation of Water Projects. The p value (p<0.05) implies that there is a significant relationship between Consultative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects leading to rejection of the null hypothesis H₀₄. Consultative stakeholder involvement approach does not significantly influence implementation of water projects in Kisumu East sub-county. The results are consistent with the findings of studies that have found significant relationships between Consultative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects (Marxsen, 2015).

4.1.2.2 Regression Analysis between Consultative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects in Kisumu East Sub-County

In this study, simple linear regression was adopted to establish how Consultative Involvement Approach Influences Implementation of Water Projects from opinions of the respondents. The reason for using the model was to establish how each predictor significantly or insignificantly predicted Implementation of Water Projects, secondly to find out how Consultative Involvement Approach best predicted Implementation of Water Projects and finally to confirm whether the model was a best fit for predicting Implementation of Water Projects. The regression model summary results are presented in table 4.3 below.

Table 4.3: Regression Analysis between Consultative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects in Kisumu East Sub-County

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.396 ^a	.157	.149	.64193
a. Predictors: (constant), Discussion, Dialogue, Negotiation, Deliberation, Conference				

The table 4.3 presents a model summary of relationship between Consultative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects. To find out the amount of variation in Implementation of Water Projects which explains its relationship with Consultative Involvement Approach. R-Square (coefficient of determination) is commonly used statistic to evaluate model fit. It explains the amount of variation in Implementation of Water Projects and relationship with Consultative Involvement Approach. The above model summary table indicates that there is a positive multiple correlation (R=0.396) between Implementation of Water Projects and Consultative Involvement Approach and those predicted by the regression model. In addition, the coefficient of determination R² =15.7% indicates that the amount of variance in Implementation of Water Projects is explained by Consultative Involvement Approach. The results of the model are consistent with findings of studies that have found significant relationship between Consultative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects (Sturdy, Smith-Merry and Freeman (2012), Marxsen (2015), Bunea

(2017) and Wickenden, Mulligan, Fefoame and Katende (2012)).

4.1.2.3 ANOVA^a Results of the Regression between Consultative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects in Kisumu East Sub-County

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a collection of statistical models and their associated procedures used to analyse the differences among means in a sample. It is a statistical tool used to develop and confirm and explanation of an observed data.

Table 4.4: ANOVA^a Results of the Regression between Consultative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects in Kisumu East Sub-County

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
1	Regression	7.983	1	7.983	19.373	.000 ^b
	Residual	42.856	104	.412		
	Total	50.840	105			
a. Predictors: Discussion, Dialogue, Negotiation, Deliberation, Conference						
b. Dependent Variable: Implementation of Water Projects in Kisumu-East Sub-county						

ANOVA results on Table 4.4 on regression of Consultative Stakeholder Involvement Approach on Implementation of Water Projects. The study sought to find out whether the regression model was best fit for predicting Implementation of Water Projects through use of F-statistics from the ANOVA output. As per results in table 4.4 F=19.373 is significant at p-value<0.05 implying the regression model result is significantly better prediction of Implementation of Water Projects. From the perspective of overall research participants, Empowering Involvement Approach had positive influence on Implementation of Water Projects. The results are consistent with the findings of studies that have found significant relationships between Empowering Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects (Sturdy, Smith-Merry and Freeman (2012), Marxsen (2015), Bunea (2017) and Wickenden, Mulligan, Fefoame and Katende (2012)).

4.1.2.4 Regression Coefficients of the relationship between Predictive Variables and Implementation of Water Projects

The study attempted to establish the extent to which Consultative Stakeholder Involvement Approach Influence Implementation of Water Projects in Kisumu East Sub-county. Simple linear regression model was used to test whether Consultative Involvement Approach affected Implementation of Water Projects.

Table 4.5: Regression Coefficients of the relationship between Predictive Variables and Implementation of Water Projects

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	1.609	.455		3.536	.001
	Empowering Involvement Approach	.453	.114	.362	3.965	.000
a. Implementation of Water Projects						

Where

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_4$$

of Implementation of Water Projects, and

X₄= the average score for research participants' Consultative Involvement Approach

The reason for using the model was to establish how each predictor significantly or insignificantly predicted Implementation of Water Projects, to find out which of the approaches best predicted Implementation of Water Projects.

4.1.2.5 Testing for Hypothesis

The null hypothesis was H₀₄: Consultative stakeholder involvement approach does not significantly influence implementation of water projects in Kisumu East sub-county. The null hypothesis was tested at α=0.05 level of significance. From the correlation results shown in table 4.2, the null hypothesis was rejected since p-value (0.000) <0.05 and it was concluded that at least one of the explanatory variables is significantly related to the Implementation of Water Projects. The results are consistent with the findings of studies that have found significant relationship between Consultative Involvement Approach and Implementation of Water Projects(Bunea, 2017).

V. CONCLUSION

The study finding indicate that there is a positive correlation coefficient (R=0.396) between Implementation of Water Projects andParticipative Involvement Approach and those predicted by the regression model. In addition, the coefficient of determination (R²=15.7%) suggests that the amount of variation in Implementation of Water Projects is explained by Consultative Involvement Approach based on the perspective of all the 106 research participants. From the correlation results, the null hypothesis H₀₄: Consultative stakeholder involvement approach does not significantly influence implementation of water projects in Kisumu East sub-county was rejected since p value = 0.000<0.05 and so it was concluded that at least one of the explanatory variables is significantly related to the Implementation of Water projects.The study revealed that discussion, dialogue, negotiation, deliberation and conferencehad great effect on implementation of water projects. Overall, discussion and conferences had the greatest effect while deliberation had the least effect. The study recommends that Community should be encouraged to take part in implementation of water projects to bring a sense of ownership to projects by the community members since after implementation is complete the project is

given to communities to operate and maintain. This requires an understanding of the water project from the onset so as to be assured of sustainability of the project.

REFERENCES

- [1] Akhmouch A. andClavreul D. (2016). Stakeholder Engagement for Inclusive Water Governance: “Practicing WhatWe Preach” with the OECD Water Governance Initiative. 8(204).
- [2] Birongo, J.M. and Quyen, N.L. (2005). An Analysis of Water Governance in Kibera, Kenya. Retrieved 25th April 2019 from: <http://rudar.ruc.dk/bitstream/1800/863/1/Project%20Report%20-%20Group%202249.pdf>
- [3] Bunea, A. (2017). Designing stakeholder consultations: Reinforcing or alleviating bias in the European Union system of governance? *European Journal of Political Research*, 56(1), 46–69. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12165>
- [4] Chidammodzi, C. L., &Muhandiki, V. S. (2015). Determination of the status of stakeholder participation in the management of the Lake Malawi basin through application of Integrated Lake Basin Management. *Lakes & Reservoirs: Research & Management*, 20(3), 166–181.
- [5] Cook, J. &. (2016). Environment for Development: The Costs of Coping with Poor Water Supply in Rural Kenya. Retrieved from Environment for Development. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-costs-of-coping-with-poor-water-supply-in-rural-Cook-Kimuyu/68f51edccfa1bb9936ea0c6dd2bf2217329a9d4d>
- [6] Desai, V. M. (2018). Collaborative Stakeholder Engagement: An Integration between Theories of Organizational Legitimacy and Learning. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(1), 220–244.
- [7] Giupponi, C.,Jakemann, A.J,Karssenberg, D., and Hare, M.P. (2006). Sustainable management of Water resources: An integrated approach, Massachusetts: Edward ElgarPublishing limited
- [8] Graff, M., & Francis, R. (2017). Does Stakeholder Participation Influence Epa’s Chemical Risk Values? *Public Administration Quarterly*, 41(3), 496–531.
- [9] Hansen. (2007). *Stakeholders participation In Project implementation and Delivery*. New age International Publishers. London, UK
- [10] Horney, J., Spurlock, D., Grabich, S., &Berke, P. (2016). Capacity for Stakeholder Participation in Recovery Planning. *Planning Practice & Research*, 31(1), 65–79.
- [11] Mahianyu, J. & Njeru, A. (2016). Factors Influencing Project Implementation in the Department of Public Health in Kiambu County. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*.(68), 1291-1301.
- [12] Marxsen, C. (2015). Open Stakeholder Consultations at the European Level-Voice of the Citizens? *European Law Journal*, 21(2), 257–280.
- [13] Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R. & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of Who and What Really Counts. *Academy of Management Review*. 22, No 4, pp 853 – 886.
- [14] Owuor, M. O., &Moronge, M. (2017). Influence of Stakeholder Participation on Completion of Water Supply and Sanitation Projects in Informal Settlements in Nairobi City County, Kenya. *The Strategic Journal of Business and climate change*,3(4), 42 – 59.
- [15] Slaymaker, T. &Newborne P. (2004). Implementation of Water Supply & Sanitation Programmes under PRSPs. Synthesis of research findings from sub-Saharan Africa <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/2404.pdf> retrieved on 10th April 2019
- [16] Sloan, P. (2009). Redefining Stakeholder Engagement: From Control to Collaboration. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, (36), 25–40. <https://doi.org/10.9774/GLEAF.4700.2009.wi.00005>
- [17] Smith, S. (2012). Toward Inclusive Co-Management: Factors Influencing Stakeholder Participation. *Coastal Management*, 40(3), 327–337.
- [18] Sturdy, S., Smith-Merry, J., & Freeman, R. (2012). Stakeholder Consultation as Social Mobilization: Framing Scottish Mental Health Policy. *Social Policy & Administration*, 46(7), 823–844.
- [19] UNEP (2019). Sustainable Development Goals and water. <https://www.unenvironment.org/explore-topics/water/what-we-do/supporting-sustainable-development-goals-and-water> retrieved on 5th May 2019
- [20] Wickenden, M., Mulligan, D., Fefoame, G. O., & Katende, P. (2012). Stakeholder consultations on community-based rehabilitation guidelines in Ghana and Uganda. *African Journal of Disability*, 1(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ajod.v1i1.1>