



Questions on the 2026 Water Call

This document provides an overview of all questions that were submitted to the embassy in reference to the Call for Concept Papers for Water programming in Kenya. Some questions contained personal information and were addressed individually.

No rights can be obtained from this information.

Questions grouped in one cell were all submitted by one organization.

Since a lot of questions were asked multiple times, feel free to check the FAQ-document for easier reading as well.

Questions	Responses
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. On the eligibility, are CBOs eligible consortium members?2. On the geographic scope, does the proposed intervention need to cover the whole basin or the whole county?	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Yes.2. No.
<ol style="list-style-type: none">3. Does the lead applicant need to be registered in Kenya, or can a Netherlands-based lead applicant also apply and add the local office as a partner/apply in collaboration with the local office, taking into account that the local office will have a leadership role nonetheless?	<ol style="list-style-type: none">3. Yes, there's no need for a registration in Kenya, we will only be assessing the track record in Kenya.
<ol style="list-style-type: none">4. Are Dutch organizations, without a legal presence in Kenya, eligible to act as consortium lead?	<ol style="list-style-type: none">4. Yes
<ol style="list-style-type: none">5. Would the Embassy consider a digital water intelligence and decision-support platform, eligible as a core intervention if it is directly linked to water allocation, drought response, catchment restoration, WRUA strengthening, utility performance, and investment preparation decisions?6. The call notes that digital systems should respond to diagnosed structural constraints. Would a concept that begins with a basin diagnostic and then deploys digital water accounting, monitoring and decision-support tools be considered consistent with the diagnostic-first requirement?7. Would the Embassy welcome a concept paper that uses ASAL Basin Resilience as the primary entry point, while also including selected secondary-town or growth-corridor water service use cases within the same basin system?8. Is it acceptable for a programme to include a national or basin-wide water accounting	<ol style="list-style-type: none">5. Yes.6. Yes.7. Yes.8. Yes



<p>layer, provided that implementation activities are focused in selected counties, basins, WRUAs or utilities?</p> <p>9. Are there priority basins, ASAL counties, growth corridors, or secondary towns that the Embassy would particularly encourage applicants to consider, beyond the county bonus scoring already described in the call?</p> <p>10. Would a phased geographic approach be acceptable, where the programme starts with a small number of priority basins or counties and then expands based on diagnostic findings, institutional readiness and stakeholder demand?</p> <p>11. Are costs related to satellite data processing, cloud computing, dashboard hosting, platform maintenance, geospatial data integration, and recurring monthly analytics eligible budget items?</p> <p>12. Are software localisation, platform configuration, algorithm refinement, user interface development and integration with government or utility systems eligible under the grant?</p> <p>13. Is the use of proprietary analytics or pre-existing commercial technology acceptable if the outputs, dashboards, reports or decision products are made available to mandated Kenyan institutions under agreed access terms?</p> <p>14. What are the Embassy's expectations on data ownership, licensing and open access for grant-funded digital water information products?</p> <p>15. Would the Embassy expect digital outputs to be hosted by a Kenyan public institution, by the consortium, or through a hybrid arrangement agreed during implementation?</p> <p>16. Should applicants propose interoperability with existing national systems, such as WRA, WASREB, county water systems, utility systems, WRUA monitoring tools, NAWASIP, NISIP or Kenya Water Compact-related systems?</p> <p>17. For a water accounting and basin decision-support concept, which mandated institutions would the Embassy consider most relevant for co-creation at concept stage: WRA, WASREB, counties, water</p>	<p>9. No.</p> <p>10. Yes.</p> <p>11. Yes</p> <p>12. Yes</p> <p>13. Partly. Anything that is financed with public money should be open to the public. We will not accept proprietary agreements on software licensing arrangements.</p> <p>14. See question 13.</p> <p>15. No specific expectations.</p> <p>16. Yes.</p>
--	---



<p>utilities, WRUAs, NWHSA, the State Department for Water and Sanitation, or others?</p> <p>18. Would letters of support or documented consultation from one or two mandated institutions be sufficient at concept stage, with broader county, WRUA and utility co-creation completed during the full proposal stage?</p> <p>19. Where a programme covers a basin that crosses several counties, is endorsement expected from each county, or would endorsement from a national basin-level authority and selected county actors be sufficient at concept stage?</p> <p>20. Can the inception phase include a formal diagnostic and co-design process to finalise target counties, WRUAs, utilities and investment priorities, provided that the concept paper already identifies the proposed selection criteria?</p> <p>21. Are consortia led by a Kenyan private company eligible, provided they meet the lead applicant turnover, water-sector track record and non-commercial rate requirements?</p> <p>22. Are non-Kenyan and non-Dutch private companies eligible as consortium members if they bring specialised water, hydrological modelling or Earth Observation technology capacity?</p> <p>23. Can a Dutch organisation be included as an associate, technical collaborator or knowledge partner rather than as a formal consortium member, while still demonstrating Dutch added value and Dutch earning capacity?</p> <p>24. What forms of evidence would be considered strongest for demonstrating Dutch added value: Dutch technical partnerships, knowledge exchange, commercial linkages, Dutch water-sector expertise, technology transfer, joint research, or future market development?</p> <p>25. For private-sector consortium members, how should “non-commercial rates” be interpreted in practice for specialised technology, analytics, software and expert services?</p>	<p>17. The Embassy will not advice on that subject at this stage.</p> <p>18. Any documentation of co-creation will be considered, although it is not a requirement.</p> <p>19. There are no specific requirements for that at this stage.</p> <p>20. Yes.</p> <p>21. Yes.</p> <p>22. Yes.</p> <p>23. Yes.</p> <p>24. The Embassy will not advice on that subject at this stage.</p> <p>25. For Profit organizations should demonstrate non-commercial rates by presenting what the internal costs of a certain employee would be, those costs are eligible for subsidy under this call. For Larger Dutch companies, some guidelines are available here: https://www.rvo.nl/onderwerpen/subsidies/pelregels/ez/iks</p>
--	---



<p>26. Are subscription-style or service-based costs for water intelligence products eligible during the grant period if they are linked to public-interest decision support and institutional strengthening?</p> <p>27. Would a sustainability model that blends grant-funded public-good services with future paid services to utilities, counties, water users, agribusinesses or financial institutions be considered acceptable?</p> <p>28. Are sub-grants or small catalytic funds to WRUAs, community groups, youth/women enterprises, utilities or local service providers eligible if they support water monitoring, restoration, sanitation, water-use efficiency or service performance?</p> <p>29. Can the budget include targeted hardware where justified by the diagnostic, such as telemetry, gauges, sensors, field validation equipment or data collection tools, or should the programme avoid hardware investments?</p> <p>30. What indicators would the Embassy consider appropriate for measuring improved water accounting, water allocation, basin resilience, drought preparedness, and decision-making quality?</p> <p>31. Can investment-ready project concepts, feasibility packages, or bankable pipelines generated from the water diagnostic be counted as programme results even if financing is mobilised after the grant period?</p> <p>32. How should applicants show that digital monitoring and water intelligence are changing institutional behaviour, rather than simply producing data products?</p> <p>33. Would the Embassy value explicit results around improved transparency, public access to water information, WRUA compliance monitoring, abstraction monitoring, or water conflict reduction?</p> <p>34. Is there an expectation that concept papers include preliminary baselines and targets, or can these be finalised during the inception and diagnostic phase?</p>	<p>26. This question is too broad to be answered here. In certain contexts this could be acceptable, please present the case for it in the concept paper.</p> <p>27. It would be eligible for submission at this stage. The details of it will be assessed during evaluation.</p> <p>28. Yes.</p> <p>29. Yes, those costs are eligible.</p> <p>30. The embassy has no preferences for this at this stage.</p> <p>31. If the program is defined like that, then possibly yes, this will be assessed during evaluation.</p> <p>32. The Embassy will not be prescriptive about that at this stage.</p> <p>33. The Embassy has no preference in this regard.</p> <p>34. Some indications are welcome, however these can be finalized during the development of the full proposal.</p>
<p>35. If a Dutch organization is not a mandatory consortium member, would documented collaboration with Dutch actors through technology transfer, supplier partnerships,</p>	<p>35. It would be considered evidence, whether it is sufficient will be assessed during evaluation.</p>



<p>demonstration activities, innovation exchange, or distribution arrangements be considered sufficient evidence of Dutch added value?</p> <p>36. If a Dutch company is involved, can it participate as an associate technical partner rather than as a formal grant-funded consortium member?</p> <p>37. Can mandated public institutions such as County Governments, Water Resources Authority (WRA), Water Resource Users Associations (WRUAs), National Drought Management Authority (NDMA), and County Livestock Departments participate as co-creation and steering partners without being direct grant recipients?</p> <p>38. Would a water–livestock–rangeland enterprise model be considered a strong fit within Programme Area 1, particularly under the “livelihood and enterprise catalyst” domain?</p> <p>39. Would the Embassy consider multipurpose water systems that support livestock production, household water access, rangeland restoration, and drought resilience as appropriate investments under the basin resilience framework?</p> <p>40. Would you recommend that such a proposal remain focused on Programme Area 1, or could limited elements of Programme Area 2 (for example solarization, utility performance support, or water-system maintenance models) strengthen the overall programme logic?</p> <p>41. Within Programme Area 1, what balance would you expect between basin-level governance interventions and livelihood or enterprise development interventions?</p> <p>42. Are infrastructure investments such as water pans, boreholes, solar pumping systems, telemetry systems, storage tanks, livestock watering points, and community-managed</p>	<p>36. Both are possible.</p> <p>37. Yes.</p> <p>38. It would be considered a fit. Whether it is strong would be assessed during evaluation.</p> <p>39. Those are indeed eligible investments.</p> <p>40. Concept papers are free to work on either one of the program areas or work on a combination of both.</p> <p>41. there are no specific expectations in this regard.</p> <p>42. Yes</p>
--	---



<p>water kiosks considered eligible intervention components?</p> <p>43. Since Isiolo County attracts the 3-point geographic bonus and Laikipia and Kajiado Counties attract the 2-point bonus, would a programme operating across all three counties receive the maximum available 3-point geographic score?</p> <p>44. Would Kajiado County be considered an acceptable learning and demonstration location where a consortium partner is already operating successfully, even if implementation activities are concentrated in Isiolo and Laikipia?</p> <p>45. Can a proposal include a phased expansion strategy into additional ASAL counties after successful piloting and learning, without committing implementation resources to all target counties during the initial five-year programme period?</p> <p>46. Are structured cross-county learning exchanges between pastoralist communities and institutions in Kajiado, Laikipia, and Isiolo considered eligible programme activities?</p> <p>47. At concept paper stage, what forms of evidence would be considered sufficient to demonstrate co-creation? For example: Letters of support; Meeting minutes; Attendance sheets; County endorsement letters; Co-signed concept development notes.</p> <p>48. For programmes spanning multiple counties, should co-creation processes be undertaken separately with each county government, or would an inter-county consultation and steering process be acceptable?</p> <p>49. For a water–livestock resilience programme, which institutions would you consider most critical to engage during concept development? For example: County Departments of Water; County Departments of Livestock; County Environment Departments; WRA; WRUAs; NDMA; NEMA;</p>	<p>43. Yes.</p> <p>44. Yes, if it makes sense in the project.</p> <p>45. Yes, but it will not attract the bonus points.</p> <p>46. Yes</p> <p>47. Both are acceptable.</p> <p>48. We are not prescriptive in this regard, all possible evidence will be considered.</p>
---	---



<p>Local peace and conflict-management structures.</p> <p>50. Can the concept paper indicate that detailed activity planning and budgeting with county governments will be finalized during the full proposal development phase, provided evidence of meaningful consultation is included at concept note stage?</p>	<p>49. We are not prescriptive in this regards. 50. Yes.</p>
<p>51. Could you clarify if affiliated partners can be in multiple proposals?</p>	<p>51. It is not completely clear what you mean by affiliated partners. As long as they're separate organizations, it's possible. An organization can participate in only one consortium.</p>
<p>52. Our INGO has a Federated structure. We have an office in the Netherlands, and an office in Kenya. Both offices are legally registered with local authorities. Can the embassy please confirm that as both offices represent the same organization, we are considered as one entity within the consortium?</p> <p>53. If a consortium is able to contribute own funds, will this earn more points in the application scoring?</p> <p>54. Can the embassy please clarify whether the Consortium Lead must be Kenyan registered, or can entities that are registered in other countries lead the consortium?</p> <p>55. Can the embassy please clarify how frequently project audits must be completed? Or simply an end audit is expected?</p>	<p>52. Yes. If your INGO is the lead applicant, you have to choose which office will be the main contract partners for the embassy.</p> <p>53. It will not automatically earn more points, but it is welcome contribution. It will depend also if the contributions is in kind, or in cash, and what it constitutes of.</p> <p>54. The consortium lead is not required to be registered in Kenya. They should however have a demonstrated track record of 3 years in Kenya.</p> <p>55. Annual audits are part of standard operating procedures in Embassy contracts.</p>
<p>56. Are private sector organizations that are actively involved in project implementation considered formal consortium members and therefore counted within the minimum/maximum consortium size requirement (2-4 organizations)?</p> <p>57. What criteria distinguish a formal consortium partner from: an associated partner or stakeholder; a technical knowledge partner; or a service provider/contractor engaged for specific activities?</p> <p>58. May private sector entities contribute technical expertise, innovation, technology, or advisory support without being considered formal consortium members for the purpose of the consortium size requirement?</p>	<p>56. The consortium can decide whether they would like them to be included as an official consortium member which comes with rights and duties, or as a sub-contractor in which case the procurement guidelines of the lead applicant apply.</p> <p>57. If the proposal mentions them as a consortium member, they should be included as part of the project management structure, with clarified roles, responsibilities and influence in the decision making. Otherwise they will be outside the contract of the embassy and should adhere to the procurement guidelines of the lead applicant.</p>



	<p>58. Yes, but they would have to adhere to the procurement guidelines of the lead applicant.</p>
<p>59. How may entities that are not formal consortium members—such as Dutch institutions, county governments, or other stakeholders—be engaged in the project? Specifically, can they be included as strategic partners rather than subcontractors, and how should such arrangements be reflected in the concept note? Are there any limitations on naming such entities at this stage if their roles are not yet contractually defined, and is it acceptable to reference them based on letters of intent or non-binding MoUs?</p> <p>60. How should applicants reflect the involvement of for-profit entities that are neither consortium members nor subcontractors but contribute as strategic or technical partners? In this context, are any disclosures regarding commercial or non-commercial rates required at the concept stage?</p> <p>61. May project activities extend beyond Kenya's borders, for example into Somalia?</p> <p>62. Is there a standard template for CVs to be submitted as annexes?</p>	<p>59. They can be mentioned in the Concept Paper as stakeholders or strategic partners, but always according to the procurement guidelines of the Lead Applicant. It's acceptable, but not required, to reference them in letters of intent or MoU's.</p> <p>60. Disclosures about non-commercial rates are only required for formal consortium members. Procurement of goods or services should follow your internal procurement guidelines.</p> <p>61. No.</p> <p>62. No.</p>
<p>63. Please clarify the requirements regarding local registration for consortium leads, if any. The instructions in the main document do not specify such requirement, but the answers in questions 2 and 3 in the attached FAQ, seemingly copied from the FNS call, are contradictory to that.</p>	<p>63. Organisations are not required to be registered in Kenya. We will only assess their track record in Kenya.</p>
<p>64. Does the concept note need to follow a specific Embassy template, or is a free-format document acceptable provided it addresses all required sections as outlined in the call?</p>	<p>64. There is no embassy provided template. Guidance has been provided, in the call, on sections to be used – reference section D in the call.</p>
<p>65. Can an organization participate as sub-contractor in more than one consortium?</p> <p>66. Can an organization participate in a consortium and at the same time participate as a sub-contractor in another consortium? Focusing on different program area of the call.</p>	<p>65. Yes.</p> <p>66. Yes, but the selection of a sub-contractor at this stage is only possible if permissible by the procurement guidelines of the Lead Applicant.</p>
<p>67. In addition to the 4 consortium partners, are implementing partners allowed? If yes, does EKN have a description for implementing</p>	<p>67. Implementing Partners outside of the consortium are allowed as sub-contractors.</p>



<p>partners or would these include Dutch and local business partners, local NGOs and government entities?</p> <p>68. Are organizations that receive core funding directly from the Dutch government eligible as consortium partners or/and implementing partners?</p>	<p>We prefer large implementing partners to be part of the formal consortium, if possible.</p> <p>68. Yes, under conditions that double-dipping is avoided.</p>
<p>69. Kindly supply us with the Concept Paper template.</p>	<p>69. Specific templates for the concept paper will not be provided. Guidance has been provided, in the call, on sections to be used – reference section D in the call.</p>



Kingdom of the Netherlands