



**ORGANIZATION AND PERFORMANCE OF WATER RESOURCE
USERS' ASSOCIATIONS IN THE SOUTHERN RANGELANDS OF
KENYA¹**

**[ORGANIZACIÓN Y DESEMPEÑO DE LAS ASOCIACIONES PARA EL
USO DE LOS RECURSOS HÍDRICOS EN LOS AGOSTADEROS DEL SUR
DE KENIA]**

S.O. Jawuoro¹, O.K. Koech¹, G.N. Karuku¹ and J.S. Mbau

*¹Department of Land Resource Management and Agricultural Technology
(LARMAT), University of Nairobi, P.O Box 29053-00625, Nairobi, Kenya.*

Email: stanleyjawuoro@gmail.com

**Corresponding author*

SUMMARY

Water insecurity is a threat to pastoral livelihoods and sustainability. The Water Act of Kenya, 2002, created the Water Resource Users' Associations (WRUAs) to enhance water resource conservation access at the local level. Nevertheless, environmental degradation has increased in recent times, further exacerbating water crisis and threatening livelihoods. This study sought to assess the status of community based water resource conservation in the Southern rangelands of Kiserian, Kajiado County, Kenya. Kiserian WRUA members were purposively sampled for this survey. Data was mainly collected through administration of a semi-structured questionnaire. Focus group discussions and key informant interviews were also conducted to validate the data obtained from the questionnaire. Chi-square and descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data using SPSS version 20. Results indicated that access to information on water conservation and training were significantly associated, with membership to the WRUA ($\chi^2=0.56$, $p\leq 0.05$) and ($\chi^2=0.71$, $p\leq 0.05$), respectively. Majority (79.5%) of the Kiserian WRUA members had participated in tree planting within the catchment. Half (50%) of the WRUA members were mainly motivated to join the association because of perceived benefits like improved access to water at lower prices and participation in catchment protection. The main challenges facing the WRUA were inadequate funding from the government and other stakeholders (93.2%) and lack of support from county leadership (34.1%). It was concluded that WRUAs, especially in the rangelands of Kajiado, Kenya, played a key role in catchment conservation and water access for resilient livelihoods among pastoralists. This study therefore recommends awareness to increase WRUA membership and allocation of sufficient funding from the government and other related stakeholders to WRUA conservation activities, if catchment conservation for improved water access in the area is to be realized.

Key words: Kiserian; Rangelands; water management; rural community.

RESUMEN

La inseguridad hídrica es una amenaza para los medios de vida pastoral y la sostenibilidad. La Ley de Agua de Kenia, 2002, creó las Asociaciones de Usuarios de Recursos Hídricos (WRUA) para mejorar el acceso a la conservación de los recursos hídricos a nivel local. Sin embargo, la degradación ambiental se ha incrementado en los últimos tiempos, agravando aún más la crisis del agua y amenazando los medios de subsistencia. Este estudio buscó evaluar el estado de la conservación de recursos hídricos basados en la comunidad en los agostaderos del sur de Kiserian, condado de Kajiado, Kenia. Los miembros de WRUA de Kiserian se seleccionaron intencionalmente para esta encuesta. Los datos se recolectaron principalmente mediante la administración de un cuestionario semiestructurado. También se llevaron a cabo discusiones de grupos focales y entrevistas con informantes clave para validar los datos obtenidos del cuestionario. Chi cuadrado y estadísticas descriptivas se utilizaron para analizar los datos utilizando SPSS versión 20. Los resultados indicaron que el acceso a la información sobre la conservación del agua y la capacitación se asociaron significativamente, con membresía a la WRUA ($\chi^2 = 0,56$, $p\leq 0.05$) y ($\chi^2 = 0.71$, $p\leq 0.05$), respectivamente. La mayoría (79.5%) de los miembros de WRUA de Kiserian habían participado en la plantación de árboles dentro de la cuenca. La mitad (50%) de los miembros de WRUA estaban motivados principalmente para unirse a la asociación debido a los beneficios percibidos, como un mejor acceso al agua a

¹ Submitted January 31, 2017 – Accepted September 10, 2017. This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

precios más bajos y la participación en la protección de la cuenca. Los principales desafíos que enfrentaba la WRUA eran el financiamiento inadecuado del gobierno y otras partes interesadas (93.2%) y la falta de apoyo de los líderes del condado (34.1%). Se concluyó que las WRUA, especialmente en los agostaderos de Kajiado, Kenia, desempeñaron un papel clave en la conservación de la cuenca y el acceso al agua para medios de vida resilientes entre los pastores. Por lo tanto, este estudio recomienda concientizar para aumentar la membresía de WRUA y la asignación de fondos suficientes del gobierno y otras partes interesadas relacionadas a las actividades de conservación de WRUA, si la conservación de la cuenca para mejorar el acceso al agua en el área se va a realizar.

Palabras clave: Kiserian; agostadero; manejo de cuencas; comunidades rurales.

INTRODUCTION

Water insecurity has been linked to poverty and disease in most parts of the world, as impeded access and affordability of water hampers human well-being and development (Shivoga et al., 2007; Luwesi et al., 2012; Luwesi and Barder, 2013). In order to address the water crisis, there have been concerted efforts by several stakeholders especially in rangelands of Africa, where both statutory and customary set-ups play major roles in water management (van Koppen et al., 2014). These efforts have been triggered by the realization that natural resource dependent economies such as pastoralism are vulnerable to climate change and variability, and as such, possess low adaptive capacity (Opiyo et al., 2014; Reid et al., 2014).

Kenya instituted key reforms in the water sector, culminating in the enactment of the Water Act (2002), and subsequent establishment of various Water Resource Users Associations (WRUAs) by the Water Resource Management Authority (Yerian et al., 2014; Baldwin et al., 2015). Some of the responsibilities on water management were decentralized to lower government institutions; non-governmental organizations were mandated to provide water and manage water resources, provision of water resources was alienated from Water Resource Management Authority and policy making disintegrated from daily operations of institutions dealing in water (K'akumu et al., 2016; McCord et al., 2017). The Act vested the power to manage water resources on the Water Resource Management Authority (WRMA), with the Ministry of Water and Irrigation playing the policy and oversight role. The WRUAs were formed and exempt from supplying water, yet mandated to conserve water resources at the local level (Mathenge et al., 2014).

Community based water resource management through the WRUAs has gained popularity in most parts of Kenya (Mathenge et al., 2014; K'akumu et al., 2016). WRUAs have been identified as key instruments in improving water access and availability especially in the rangelands where land degradation and low rainfall have limited the capacity of ecosystems to provide adequate water resources (

Murtinho et al., 2013). This can be achieved by formulation of conservation strategies unique to particular regions' climatic conditions and livelihood options. Currently, there is a spill of population from urban centers into the rangelands of Kenya and as such, water demand in these areas has been further stretched beyond the supply (Nkedianye et al., 2011). Insights on community water resource conservation and management are vital if the government and other stakeholders are to realize improved water access and reduced land degradation in the rangelands. Previous studies have shown that the rangelands of Kenya experience acute water shortages that adversely impact on livelihoods of the people (Kioko and Okello, 2010; Opiyo et al., 2011; Ogutu et al., 2014; Okello et al., 2014; Kiringe et al., 2016). However, there is insufficient information on community based water resource conservation in these areas. Water interventions have therefore been haphazard and without evidence on how local communities can improve availability of water from natural sources such as rivers and springs. This study therefore sought to establish the status of community based water resource management in the southern rangelands of Kenya to obtain information to provide guidelines for future interventions or policy makers.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study area

The study was done in Kiserian, Kajiado County (Longitudes 36° 5" and 37° 5" East and Latitudes 10 ° " and 30 ° "). The altitude ranges from 1580 to 2460 metres above sea level. Kiserian is found in agro-ecological zone IV and is therefore a semi-arid region. Rainfall is bimodal in its distribution. The first rains, locally referred to as long rains are received from March to May while the short rains (second rains) fall between October and December (Ogutu et al., 2013). The seasonal rainfall received within the County is between 300-1250mm (Kareri, 2013). The minimum and maximum mean diurnal temperatures are 10 °C and 24 °C respectively (Krhoda, 2002). The r/ET_0 is < 0.65 (Middleton and Thomas, 1997). The main soil type in Kiserian is vertisols which are sticky when wet and form large

cracks when dry (de Leeuw et al., 1991; Ombogo, 2013). *Acacia mellifera*, *Acacia tortilis*, *Acacia nubica*, *Acacia ancistroclada*, *Acacia nilotica*, *Commiphora riparia*, *Commiphora africana* and *Balanites aegyptiaca* are the most common plant species (Bekure, 1991).

The area has a population of about 202,651 people with a population growth rate of 4.5% and a life expectancy of 45 years (RoK, 2010). The main land use and livelihood source is livestock rearing, although livelihoods have been diversified in order to capitalize on emerging social and economic opportunities and minimize environmental risks (Ogutu et al., 2014). Formal employment, trade, cultivation and group ranching are replacing subsistence pastoralism in the area, especially among the traditionally nomadic Maasai community (Kioko and Okello, 2010).

Research design

A survey was used for this study. Descriptions were given for the various subjects including motivation, benefits and challenges of WRUA membership discussed under this research.

Population sampling

Primary data obtained by interviewing Kiserian water users was used for this study. Purposive sampling was used to select Kiserian WRUA members for interviews. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), 10-50% of the population can be taken as a representative sample. Out of the 60 members of the Kiserian WRUA, 44 were selected using the formula;

$$n = \frac{z^2pqN}{e^2(N - 1) + z^2pq} \dots \dots (1)$$

Where n=sample size, N=entire population, z=level of significance (0.05), e=expected error (0.03), p=probability that an individual has desirable characteristics and q=probability that an individual does not have the desired characteristics

Random sampling was used to select 38 non-WRUA members for interviews using the recommendations of Nyariki (2009);

$$n = \frac{z^2pq}{d^2} \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

Where n=sample size, z=level of significance (0.05), d²=expected error (0.03), p=probability that an individual has desirable characteristics and q=probability that an individual does not have the desired characteristics.




Figure 1: Map of Kajiado County, Kenya showing Kiserian (in red)

Questionnaire administration

A pre-test was done on 10 participating water users to validate the questionnaire before presentation to the selected interviewees. The questionnaire collected information on socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the water users, water sources, motivation and benefits of WRUA membership, capacity building on water resource conservation, WRUA conservation projects and challenges facing the WRUA. Respondents were interviewed to fill the questionnaire under the guidance of trained enumerators for enhanced quality.

Focus group discussion and Key informant interviews

Five focus group discussions were also conducted to verify and reinforce the information obtained from the questionnaire and to gather information on proposals to guide policy review. Two local water distributing company officials, one WRMA extension officer, a local chief and the chairperson of the Kiserian WRUA were used as Key Informants for the study.

Data analysis

Data analysis was done using SPSS version 20. Qualitative data was presented as tables and discussed. Quantitative data was organized and descriptions given in frequencies, means and percentages. Chi-square tests were done to determine the association between categorical variables. Threshold for significance was set at $p \leq 0.05$.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Social and demographic characteristics of Kiserian water users

A majority of WRUA members (70.4%) and non-members (65.8%) interviewed were male, whereas 29.6% and 34.2% of WRUA members and non-members interviewed, respectively, were females. The mean age of the respondents was 41.85 years. These findings could be attributed to the fact that men are the main decision makers in most households in the Kenyan rangelands (Wasonga, 2009) and could therefore decide on their membership status without any consultation with other household members. The findings concur with Lugusa (2015) who observed that pastoral community based organizations in the Baringo, Kenya were male dominated based on the fact that most households were male-headed. Agevi et al., (2014) also found out that men in Malava, Kenya were more likely to join community groups than

women because of the benefits they expect. As reported by Coulibaly-Lingani et al., (2011), household chores and reproductive roles could/would deter women from joining community conservation groups.

Most of the respondents (37.8%) had attained primary education while 20.1% had no formal education at all. Secondary and tertiary education had been attained by 24.4% and 18.3% of the respondents, respectively, a status greater than the county's documented education levels where only 7.8% of the population had attained secondary education (GoK, 2013).

Pastoralism was found to be the main land use and was the predominant source of livelihood (30.4%). Cultivation of crops was the main livelihood source for 19.5% of the respondents while 23.2%, 10.9% and 15.8% of the respondents earned their livelihood mainly from business, formal employment and casual labour, respectively. Kajiado County Integrated Development Plan 2013-2017 (GoK, 2013) stated that a majority of the population within the County are livestock keepers, which concurs with our findings. Homewood (2009), Okello et al., (2014) and Omondi et al., (2014) also reported that livestock rearing was the main means to livelihood in Kajiado County, Kenya. Species reared included cattle, sheep, goats and donkeys although most respondents revealed from the focus group discussions that cattle had declined within their herds, concurring with the findings of Kagunyu and Wanjohi (2014) and Lugusa (2015) that preference for shoats had increased among Kenyan pastoralists.

Businesses, formal employment, crop cultivation and casual labour emerged as alternative livelihood sources. The diversification in livelihoods could have been triggered by changing climate, a shift in lifestyle and food preferences and a need to gain from emergent socio-economic opportunities. These results are consistent with those of Okello et al., (2005) that outbreak of zoonotic diseases, shrinking land and diminishing livestock numbers had led to livelihood diversification in Kajiado County. The observations of this study further corroborate with those of Lamprey and Reid (2004), Norton-Griffiths (2007) and Homewood (2009) that lifestyle and food preference change were key drivers of livelihood diversification among the Maasai community of Kenya.

Categories of water users in Kiserian

Table 1 shows water use in Kiserian, Kajiado County. Water was mainly used for livestock rearing (42.7%) and domestic purposes (40.1%). Other main water

uses included crop cultivation (9.8%), business (3.7%) and forestry (3.7%). Increased urbanization of Kiserian could justify the high proportion of domestic water users where populations working in Nairobi and its environs living in the study area have increased in the area in recent years (Mukunga, 2012). Reed et al., (2015) reported that livestock keeping was the main water use in the rangelands of Kenya. In addition, Opiyo et al., (2011) and Omondi et al., (2014) also showed that livestock production was the predominant water use in Mwingi and Amboseli, Kenya, respectively.

Type of water sources in Kajiado

Surface and underground water sources were used by residents in the study area (Figure 2). The most prevalent water resources used was borehole (54.8%). Other water sources included piped water (13.4%), wells (3.7%), rivers (9.8%), surface dams (4.9%) and springs (13.4%).




Figure 2: Types of water sources in Kiserian, Kenya.

The widespread use of borehole water in Kajiado County emanates from the fact that the County suffers from water scarcity which necessitated water

intervention measures (Kioko and Okello, 2010; Okello et al., 2014). These measures include drilling of boreholes and supply of tank water by the Ministry of water and the County government, respectively (GoK, 2013). A dam was also built in 2011 to boost water supply in the region (Mukunga, 2012). Wahome et al., (2014) and Kiringe et al., (2016) also observed that boreholes were the major source of water in Kajiado and Samburu respectively. Underground water was also reported to be more accessed compared to surface water in Yemen (van Steenberg et al., 2011) due to prolonged use and reliable supply during droughts.

Motivation and benefits of joining WRUA membership

The motivating factors and benefits of WRUA membership are presented in Table 2. A majority (68.2%) of the members were motivated by desire to protect the catchment while water shortage experience and desire to access training were motivating factors for 43.2% and 38.6% of the members, respectively. Peer pressure and passion for community service motivated 9.1% and 25% of the members to join the WRUA, respectively.

Experience of drought and perceived benefits have been observed to be the main factor motivating rangeland community members to join climate change adaptation and conservation groups (Wasonga, 2009; Lugusa, 2015). Acute water shortages especially during droughts might have created awareness among members on the need to conserve the catchment and consequently influenced them to join the WRUA. Similar observations were reported by Kyeyamwa et al., (2008) where farmers formed groups to boost their chances of accessing credit and fertilizers. While conducting a study on factors motivating household participation in fodder groups in Baringo, Lugusa (2015) observed that drought experience was the main motivating factor in joining the fodder groups.

Table 1: Categories of water users in Kiserian

Variable	Frequency (N=70)	Per Cent (%)
Crop cultivation	8	9.8
Livestock keeping	23	42.7
Domestic users	33	40.1
Business	3	3.7
Forestry	3	3.7

Table 2: Motivation and benefits of WRUA membership

	Variable	Frequency	
		(N)	%
Motivation for joining WRUA	Water shortage experience	19	43.2
	Catchment protection	30	68.2
	Pressure from neighbours	4	9.1
	To access training	17	38.6
	Passion for community service	11	25
Benefits of WRUA membership	Improved water access	18	40.9
	Access to water management information	17	38.6
	Enhanced community awareness	12	27.2
	Participation in catchment protection	22	50
	Access to market for trees	1	2.3
	New farming methods	7	15.9

Half (50%) of the members had benefited by participation in catchment protection while 40.9% of the members had benefited through access to water resources. Other benefits of membership included access to water conservation information and training (38.6%), enhanced community awareness (27.2%), access to market for tree seedlings (2.3%) and acquisition of new farming methods (15.9%).

Most governments in Africa use community based organizations in up-scaling technologies that enhance rural economies as opposed to targeting individuals (Franzel et al., 2001; Noordin et al., 2001). Local community groups therefore provide structures for the government and other development agencies to carry out technology transfer and capacity building.

Key Informant Interviews revealed that WRMA, Ministry of Livestock, non-governmental organizations, Kenya Tea Development Authority and Water Trust Fund were the main sources of training and information on water resource conservation.

Access to information on water conservation and training were significantly associated, with membership to the WRUA ($\chi^2=0.56$, $p\leq 0.05$) and ($\chi^2=0.71$, $p\leq 0.05$), respectively, (Table 3). As a result, the WRUA members had a higher mean daily household water supply (0.17m^3) compared to non-members (0.15m^3) and obtained the same amount of water (20L gallon) at a lower mean price of Kshs. 11.25 and Kshs. 12.60, respectively (Table 4).

Table 3: Capacity building on water resource conservation

	WRUA Members		Non-WRUA Members		Chi square value (χ^2)	p-value
	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent		
Access to training	35	79.54	5	13.16	0.71	<0.001
Access to information	41	93.18	12	31.58	0.56	<0.001

Table 4: Daily water demand, supply and cost (per 20L gallon) in Kiserian

Variable	WRUA members		Non-WRUA members	
	Mean	Std. deviation	Mean	Std. deviation
Daily household water demand(m^3)	0.17	0.1	0.23	0.1
Daily household water supply(m^3)	0.15	0.1	0.2	0.1
Price per 20L gallon of water(Kshs)	11.3	4.6	12.6	5.4

Munyua and Stilwell (2013) reported that vulnerable communities had formed groups in order to benefit from extension services and capacity building programs offered by the government in Central Kenya. While conducting a study on milk farmers in Meru, Davies et al., (2004) observed that rural groups had better access to training as opposed to individual farmers.

Conservation projects carried out by Kiserian WRUA

Table 5 shows the conservation projects undertaken by the Kiserian WRUA members. Majority (79.5%) of the members had participated in river de-silting, 75% in tree planting and 45.4% in river pegging. Lowest participation was observed in riparian area fencing and community sensitization (15.9%).

WRUA activities were mainly conservation oriented, and thus in tandem with WRUA mandate outlined by (Rampa, 2011). Tree planting is a widely known conservation measure, and has been used to rehabilitate degraded areas (Mogaka, 2006). Luwesi and Barder (2013) Mathenge et al., (2014) witnessed tree planting in rehabilitation of Muooni sub-catchment in Machakos and Ngaciuma sub-catchment in central Kenya, respectively. Low literacy levels have hampered community sensitization programs by community based organizations (Alufah et al., 2012) and could justify the low participation in community sensitization activities by the Kiserian WRUA.

Table 5: Participation in conservation projects carried out by Kiserian WRUA

Variable	Frequency	
	(N)	%
Tree planting	33	75.0
De-silting	35	79.5
River pegging	20	45.4
Riparian area Fencing	7	15.9
Community sensitization	7	15.9

Challenges facing the Kiserian WRUA

The challenges faced by the Kiserian WRUA are shown in Figure 3. The main challenge facing the WRUA (93.2%) was lack of funding. Other challenges included community hostility towards conservation initiatives (29.5%), low literacy among members (40.9%), incompetent leadership (13.6%) and duplication of roles with water service providers (50%). Inadequate funds available to WRUA could be because of the limited funding sources. WRMA was the main financier of the Kiserian WRUA. Community hostility towards conservation initiatives might have been due to inadequate understanding from the general public on the need to conserve the catchment. Incompetent leadership could have been caused by the low literacy levels among the members. Most members stated during the focus group discussions that they lacked training in leadership and management.




Figure 3: Challenges facing the Kiserian WRUA

The findings of this study concur with past studies. Agevi et al., (2014) observed that inadequate funding was the main challenge facing community based organizations in Malava, Kenya. Murтинho et al., (2013) also reported that external financial support significantly enhanced the capacity of local communities to adapt to water scarcity in Columbia. Similarly, Mathenge et al., (2014) observed that overlap of roles between Water Service Providers (WSPs) and WRUAs hindered conservation efforts in Ngaciuma sub-catchment, Kenya, respectively.

CONCLUSION

Use of boreholes had gained popularity as a water intervention measure aimed at curbing water scarcity in Kajiado County. WRUA members had better access to capacity building and therefore accessed water at lower costs. The communities in the study area had diversified their livelihood options to better adapt to changing climate and socio-economic landscape. Funding and duplication of roles were the main challenges facing the WRUAs in the southern rangelands of Kajiado. Perceived benefits were the main motivation for rangeland communities to join WRUAs. This study therefore recommends that community sensitization on roles and benefits of WRUAs be done to enable a larger proportion of the general public to join the WRUA. Besides, there is need for stakeholders to empower the local communities in adopting sustainable livelihood diversification strategies by supporting WRUA activities through funding and technical guidance. Water resource governance and access policies should also be reviewed to avoid overlapping and conflicting functions of water service providers (WSPs) and WRUAs.

Acknowledgements

This study was funded by the International Canopy for Conservation (I-CAN) in collaboration with the African Conservation Centre (ACC) and the African Dryland Institute of Sustainability (ADIS), University of Nairobi. Sincere appreciations are hereby extended to Kiserian WRUA officials and the Kajiado County Government for their support.

REFERENCES

Alufah, S., Shisanya, C., and Obando J. 2012. Analysis of factors influencing adoption of soil and water conservation technologies in Ngaciuma sub-catchment, Kenya. *African Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 4(5), 172-185

Baldwin, E., Washington- Ottombre, C., Dell'Angelo, J., Cole, D., and Evans, T. 2015. Polycentric

governance and irrigation reform in Kenya. *Governance*, 29(2), 207-225

- Bekure, S. (Ed.). 1991. Maasai herding: an analysis of the livestock production system of Maasai pastoralists in eastern Kajiado District, Kenya (Vol. 4). ILRI (aka ILCA and ILRAD)
- Coulibaly-Lingani, P., Savadogo, P., Tigabu, M., and Oden, P. C. 2011. Factors influencing people's participation in the forest management program in Burkina Faso, West Africa. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 13(4), 292-302.
- Davies, K., Franzel, S., Hildebrand, P., Irani, T., and Place, N. 2004. Extending technologies among small-scale farmers in Meru, Kenya: ingredients for success in farmer groups. *The Journal of agricultural education and extension*, 10(2), 53-62.
- de Leeuw, P. N., Grandin, B. E., and Bekure, S. 1991. Introduction to the Kenyan rangelands and Kajiado district. Maasai herding: An analysis of the livestock production system of Maasai pastoralists in eastern Kajiado District, Kenya, ILCA Systems Study. <https://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/4202>
- Franzel, S., Coe, R., Cooper, P., Place, F., and Scherr, S. J. 2001. Assessing the adoption potential of agroforestry practices in sub-Saharan Africa. *Agricultural systems*, 69(1), 37-62.
- GOK-2013: Kajiado County Integrated Development Plan 2013-2017
- Gomes, N. 2006. Access to water, pastoral resource management and pastoralists' livelihoods: Lessons learned from water development in selected areas of Eastern Africa (Kenya, Ethiopia, Somalia). FAO LSP WP, 26.
- Homewood, K. 2009. Policy and practice in Kenya rangelands: Impacts on livelihoods and wildlife. In *Staying Maasai?* Springer New York. (pp. 335-367).
- Kagunyu, A. W., and Wanjohi, J. 2014. Camel rearing replacing cattle production among the Borana community in Isiolo County of Northern Kenya, as climate variability bites. *Pastoralism*, 4(1), 13
- K'akumu, O. A., Olima, W. H., and Opiyo, R. O. 2016. Local Experiences in Irrigation Management Transfer (Imt): The Case of the West Kano Scheme in Kenya. *Irrigation and Drainage*, 65(5), 682-690

- Kareri, R. 2013. Some aspects of the geography of Kenya. In Proceedings of the 2010 Indiana University-Perdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) Fulbright Hays Group Projects Symposium, Eldoret, Kenya (Vol. 9)
- Kioko, J., and Okello, M. M. 2010. Land use cover and environmental changes in a semi-arid rangeland, Southern Kenya. *Journal of Geography and Regional Planning*, 3(11), 322-326.
- Kiringe, J. W., Mwaura, F., and Warinwa, F. 2016. Characterization of Water Source Types and Uses in Kirisia Forest Watershed, Samburu County, Kenya. *Environment and Natural Resources Research*, 6(3), 77-90.
- Krhoda, G. 2002. Nairobi river basin phase II: The monitoring and sampling strategy for Ngong/Motoine River, pp.55.
- Kyeyamwa, H., Verbeke, W., Speelman, S., Opuda-Asibo, J., and Huylenbroeck, G. V. 2008. Structure and dynamics of livestock marketing in rural Uganda: constraints and prospects for research and development. *Journal of International Food and Agribusiness Marketing*, 20(4), 59-89.
- Lamprey, R. H., and Reid, R. S. 2004. Expansion of human settlement in Kenya's Maasai Mara: what future for pastoralism and wildlife? *Journal of Biogeography*, 31(6), 997-1032.
- Lugusa, K. O., Wasonga, O. V., Elhadi, Y. A., and Crane, T. A. (2016). Value chain analysis of grass seeds in the drylands of Baringo County, Kenya: A producers' perspective. *Pastoralism*, 6(1), 6. DOI 10.1186/s13570-016-0053-1
- Luwesi, C. N., and Bader, E. 2013. Essentials of Implementation of Improved Green Water Management in Muooni Catchment, Machakos District of Kenya. *Journal of Agri-Food and Applied Sciences*, 1(2), 63-70.
- Luwesi, C. N., Obando, J. A., and Shisanya, C. 2012. Hydro-economic inventory for sustainable livelihood in Kenyan ASALs: The case of Muooni Dam. *CICD Series*, 9, pp. 105-125.
- Mathenge, J. M., Luwesi, C. N., Shisanya, C. A., Mahiri, I., Akombo, R. A., and Mutiso, M. N. 2014. Water security where governmental policies conflict with local practices: the roles of community water management systems in Ngaciuma-Kinyartha, Kenya. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, 3(5), 793-804.
- McCord, P., Dell'Angelo, J., Baldwin, E., and Evans, T. 2017. Polycentric Transformation in Kenyan Water Governance: A Dynamic Analysis of Institutional and Social-Ecological Change. *Policy Studies Journal* 45:633-658.
- Middleton, N., and Thomas, D. 1997. World atlas of desertification (No. Ed. 2). Arnold, Hodder Headline, PLC
- Mukunga, F. M. 2012. Influence of community participation on the performance of Kiserian Dam water project, Kajiado County, Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi, Kenya).
- Munyua, H. M., and Stilwell, C. 2013. Three ways of knowing: Agricultural knowledge systems of small-scale farmers in Africa with reference to Kenya. *Library and Information Science Research*, 35(4), 326-337.
- Murtinho, F., Eakin, H., López-Carr, D., and Hayes, T. M. 2013. Does external funding help adaptation? Evidence from community-based water management in the Colombian Andes. *Environmental management*, 52(5), 1103-1114
- Murtinho, F., Tague, C., de Bievre, B., Eakin, H., and Lopez-Carr, D. 2013. Water scarcity in the Andes: a comparison of local perceptions and observed climate, land use and socioeconomic changes. *Human Ecology*, 41:667-681. doi: 10.1007/s10745-013-9590-z
- Nkedianye, D., de Leeuw, J., Ogutu, J. O., Said, M. Y., Saidimu, T. L., Kifugo, S. C., and Reid, R. S. 2011. Mobility and livestock mortality in communally used pastoral areas: the impact of the 2005-2006 drought on livestock mortality in Maasailand. *Pastoralism: Research, Policy and Practice*, 1(1), 1.
- Noordin, Q., Niang, A., Jama, B., and Nyasimi, M. 2001. Scaling up adoption and impact of agroforestry technologies: experiences from western Kenya. *Development in practice*, 11(4), 509-523.
- Norton-Griffiths, M., and Said, M. Y. 2010. The future for wildlife on Kenya's rangelands: an economic perspective. In: *Wild Rangelands: Conserving Wildlife While Maintaining Livestock in Semi-Arid Ecosystems*, J.T. du Toit, R. Kock and J.C. Deutsch eds.). John Wiley and Sons, Ltd, Chichester, U.K. pp: 367-392.

- Nyariki, D. M. 2009. Household data collection for socio-economic research in agriculture: approaches and challenges in developing countries. *Journal of Social Science*, 19(2), 91-99.
- Nyariki, D. M. 2009. Household data collection for socio-economic research in agriculture: Approaches and challenges in developing countries. *Journal Social Sciences*, 19(2), 91-99.
- Ogutu, J. O., Piepho, H. P., Said, M. Y., and Kifugo, S. C. 2014. Herbivore dynamics and range contraction in Kajiado County Kenya: climate and land use changes, population pressures, governance, policy and human-wildlife conflicts. *The Open Ecology Journal*, 7(1): 9-31.
- Okello, M. M. 2005. Land use changes and human-wildlife conflicts in the Amboseli Area, Kenya. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 10(1), 19-28.
- Okello, M. M., and Kioko, J. M. 2010. Contraction of Wildlife Dispersal Area in Olgulului-Olorashi Group Ranch Around Amboseli National Park, Kenya. *Open Conservation Biology Journal*, 4, 34-45.
- Okello, M. M., Kiringe, J. W., and Salaton, T. 2014. Water Quantity and Quality Dimensions in Public and Environmental Health Among the Maasai of Amboseli Area, Kenya. *Environment and Natural Resources Research*, 4(3), 227 .
- Olive, M. M., and Abel, M. G. 2003. Research methods: Quantitative and Qualitative approaches
- Ombogo, M. O. 2013. The impact of climate variability on pastoralism: forage dynamics and trends in cattle population in Kajiado County, Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Omondi, S. P., Kidali, J. A., Ogali, I., Mugambi, J. M., and Letoire, J. 2014. The status of livestock technologies and services in the Southern Maasai rangelands of Kenya. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 9(15), 1166-1171.
- Opiyo, F. E., Ekaya, W. N., Nyariki, D. M., and Mureithi, S. M. 2011. Seedbed preparation influence on morphometric characteristics of perennial grasses of a semi-arid rangeland in Kenya. *African Journal of Plant Science*, 5(8), 460-468.
- Opiyo, F. E., Wasonga, O. V., and Nyangito, M. M. 2014. Measuring household vulnerability to climate-induced stresses in pastoral rangelands of Kenya: Implications for resilience programming. *Pastoralism*, 4(1), 1
- Rampa, F. 2011. Analysing governance in the water sector in Kenya. Discussion Paper 124, Maastricht: European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM)
- Reed, M. S., Stringer, L. C., Dougill, A. J., Perkins, J. S., Athlough, J. R., Mulale, K., and Favretto, N. 2015. Reorienting land degradation towards sustainable land management: Linking sustainable livelihoods with ecosystem services in rangeland systems. *Journal of environmental management*, 151, 472-485.
- Reid, R. S., Fernández-Giménez, M. E., and Galvin, K. A. 2014. Dynamics and resilience of rangelands and pastoral peoples around the globe. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 39, 217-242.
- RoK. 2010. National Policy for the Sustainable Development of Arid and Semi-Arid Lands of Kenya, draft, Government Printers, Nairobi. Climate change and variability in Northern Kenya
- Shivoga, W. A., Muchiri, M., Kibichi, S., Odanga, J., Miller, S. N., Baldyga, T. J., and Gichaba, M. C. 2007. Influences of land use/cover on water quality in the upper and middle reaches of River Njoro, Kenya. *Lakes and Reservoirs: Research and Management*, 12(2), 97-105.
- Simiyu, N. L., and Dulo, S. O. 2015. Spatiotemporal Analysis of Borehole Locations in Nairobi County 1930-2013. *International Journal of Application or Innovation in Engineering and Management*, 4(3), 230-238.
- Van Koppen, B., Van der Zaag, P., Manzungu, E., and Tapela, B. 2014. Roman water law in rural Africa: the unfinished business of colonial dispossession. *Water International*, 39(1), 49-62.
- Van Steenberg, F., Haile, A. M., Alemehayu, T., Alamirew, T., and Geleta, Y. 2011. Status and potential of spate irrigation in Ethiopia. *Water resources management*, 25(7), 1899-1913.
- Wahome, C. N., Okemo, P. O., and Nyamache, A. K. 2014. Microbial quality and antibiotic resistant bacterial pathogens isolated from groundwater used by residents of Ongata

- Rongai, Kajiado North County, Kenya. International Journal of Biological and Chemical Sciences, 8(1), 134-143.
- Yerian, S., Hennink, M., Greene, L. E., Kiptugen, D., Buri, J., and Freeman, M. C. 2014. The Role of Women in Water Management and Conflict Resolution in Marsabit, Kenya. Environmental management, 54(6), 1320-1330.