

PHC Business Case

Illustrative Kenya Community WASH and Livelihoods Project

This is an illustrative PHC Port project for exploring how PHC Service could support a community-owned WASH and livelihoods intervention in Kenya. The proposed delivery model combines physical WASH outputs with the governance and behaviour-change work required to sustain them. PHC would provide a shared structure for recording the project's intentions, concerns, actions, locations, people, events and deliverables, while its comment mechanism would enable community members, committee representatives, implementers, local administrators and funders to contribute observations and respond to emerging issues. Particular attention would be given to committee legitimacy, community understanding, participation, incentives, inclusion, fee collection, financial transparency, maintenance responsibilities, safeguarding, grievance handling and the relationship between customary practices and formal local administration. The project would begin as a neutral demonstration and 7-Day Review candidate. Its scope, location, beneficiaries, implementing organisation, funding arrangements and delivery claims would remain provisional until authorised stakeholders provide or approve suitable source materials.

1. PROJECT CONTEXT

P515 is an illustrative PHC Port project developed from a high-level discussion with a professional supporting implementation of a WASH and livelihoods project in Kenya. The discussion identifies community ownership as a decisive sustainability issue: community committees have reportedly been established to manage water systems and lead sanitation and hygiene behaviour change, but lasting performance depends on whether people understand, trust and own those governance arrangements from the beginning. The live implementing organisation, locations, communities, assets, budget, funders, beneficiary population and results are not identified or authorised for use. This Business Case therefore does not seek approval for infrastructure expenditure or claim benefits from a named live project. It makes the narrower case for authorised discovery and governance assurance: first a PHC 7-Day Review, then—only if justified—a six-month PHC Service proposition grounded in actual project materials and stakeholder participation.

2. CURRENT POSITION AND GAP TO TARGET

The current position contains a credible WASH sustainability challenge and a willing high-level discussion partner, but not yet an authorised project engagement. The Project Info, Framing Questions, Strategic Plan and Manifesto provide a coherent provisional model covering water, sanitation, hygiene, livelihoods, committee legitimacy, inclusion, maintenance, finance, safeguarding and feedback. The critical gap is evidence. There is no approved baseline for service functionality, water safety, access, hygiene or sanitation practice, committee representation, financial arrangements, maintenance capacity, community trust, complaints, livelihood viability or partner authority. There is also no evidence that the project owner or communities have accepted PHC involvement. The target position is an authorised, evidence-based governance arrangement in which responsibilities and decisions are understood, community feedback produces visible action, infrastructure and practices are sustained, and prospective funders can distinguish verified performance from aspiration.

3. OPERATING OPPORTUNITY

The opportunity is to make community ownership an observable operating capability rather than a broad development claim. PHC can connect the project's Schedule, Concerns, Actions, Locations, People, Events and Deliverables with continuing comments from community members, committees, implementers, technical specialists, local administration and funders. This creates a way to see, for example, whether a reported breakdown is linked to a responsible asset and location, whether action was assigned, how finance or parts affected the response and whether the affected users regard the matter as resolved. The same structure can show whether committee decisions are representative, whether hygiene activity changes practice and whether livelihood benefits reach their intended participants. If successful, the model could strengthen the real project's funding readiness and provide a reusable governance pattern for other community-managed WASH interventions without pretending that one template fits every community.

4. PROBLEM BEING SOLVED

WASH projects can produce completed assets and activities while leaving the conditions for continuing benefit weak or invisible. A borehole, pump, sanitation facility, training session or committee is an output; it does not by itself prove safe and reliable service, adopted behaviour, fair access or legitimate local control. Governance failures may include unclear responsibility, committee capture, exclusion of women or marginalised groups, opaque charges and expenditure, slow repairs, unsafe water, retaliation against complainants, poor alignment with local administration and livelihood benefits captured by a few people. Conventional periodic reporting may notice these problems late or reconstruct a favourable account after the event. The proposed intervention addresses the absence of a continuously maintained evidence base through which stakeholders can expose concerns early, connect them with decisions and responsible parties, and test whether community governance is actually sustaining WASH and livelihood outcomes.

5. PROPOSED INVESTMENT LOGIC

The proposed investment follows controlled stages. Stage 1 is the present illustrative work, undertaken without attributing confidential facts or demanding commitment from the live project. Stage 2 is organisational permission for a high-level stakeholder discussion and access to approved public or internal materials. Stage 3 is a bounded PHC 7-Day Review, undertaken at Order Efficiency's commercial risk before an order is placed, to establish scope, baseline evidence, priority concerns, stakeholder authority and a credible six-month service design. The Review's work and cost would form part of the overall PHC Service proposition if accepted; if the proposal is declined, the prospective client has no service commitment and retains the useful Review package subject to agreed terms. Stage 4 is a decision on a six-month PHC Service with defined roles, deliverables, costs and measures. Further WASH or livelihood investment should then be released progressively against verified need, capability and evidence rather than assumed impact.

6. EXPECTED BENEFITS

The immediate benefit is better decision quality: authorised stakeholders receive a structured account of what is known, unknown, contested and most important before committing to a longer service or presenting the project to funders. Operational benefits could include clearer committee mandates; broader and safer participation; faster identification and resolution of faults; stronger maintenance and asset records; transparent treatment of charges and expenditure; improved coordination with technical and local-government actors; and a visible route from community feedback to action. Assurance benefits could include traceable evidence by person, date and location; separation of outputs from outcomes; earlier detection of governance or safeguarding weakness; and more credible progressive reporting to funders. Longer-term human benefits may include safer and more reliable water, dignified sanitation, sustained hygiene practices, reduced

7. COST AND RESOURCE NEEDS

No defensible total budget can yet be stated because the live project's scale, locations, population, infrastructure condition, existing contracts, local costs and delivery model are unknown. Initial resource needs for the Review would include an authorised organisational contact; selected project descriptions, governance, monitoring, budget and reporting material; time with implementers, committee representatives and other approved stakeholders; and agreement on confidentiality, safeguarding, consent and data access. Order Efficiency would provide the PHC review and analysis resource and prepare the Review report and six-month proposal. Any continuation budget should separately identify PHC Service costs, implementing-team time, community participation and accessibility, connectivity or equipment, water testing, maintenance, safeguarding, translation or facilitation, monitoring and livelihood support. Capital and operational WASH costs must not be hidden inside governance language, and community participation must not be treated as a free resource without examining burden and fairness.

8. WHY GOVERNANCE SUPPORT IS NEEDED

Governance support is required because community ownership crosses organisational and technical boundaries. Committees may operate infrastructure, but water safety, public health, safeguarding, finance, local administration, community representation, maintenance supply chains and funder assurance involve different people with different authority and incentives. Without an integrating structure, responsibility can become ambiguous precisely where problems cross those boundaries. PHC provides linked records and comment-led feedback so that concerns remain connected to relevant actions, people, locations and deliverables and can be sustained through repeated response rather than lost in meetings or messaging threads. Independent facilitation also creates space to test optimistic claims and surface uncomfortable evidence. PHC cannot confer legitimacy on a committee, manufacture trust or replace legal, technical and community decision-making; its value is to make those matters examinable and to maintain the evidence needed for responsible decisions.

9. RECOMMENDATION

Proceed with a carefully framed invitation to Charles for a high-level discussion using the illustrative documents, explicitly asking him to correct the WASH model without disclosing material he is not authorised to share. Do not publicly identify the live project, its organisation, communities or apparent results and do not describe Charles as its sponsor or decision-maker. If he finds the model relevant, ask him to seek internal permission for a short exploratory meeting with an authorised project representative and selected stakeholders. The next approval sought should be permission to define a PHC 7-Day Review—not approval for a six-month service or WASH investment. The Review should have written scope, information boundaries, stakeholder access, confidentiality and safeguarding arrangements, expected outputs and a clear commercial pathway into the six-month proposal. A continuation recommendation should be made only if the Review demonstrates both a material governance need and sufficient organisational willingness to act on continuing community feedback.