

PARTNERS FOR RESILIENCE-KENYA

CONSOLIDATED REPORT (JANUARY – DECEMBER 2011)



Table of Contents

1	BASIC INFORMATION	3
2.	CONTEXT OF INDIVIDUAL ORGANISATION	3
2.1	CHANGES IN THE EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT	3
2.1.1.	<i>Drought</i>	3
2.1.2.	<i>Flooding</i>	4
2.1.3.	<i>Conflict and Insecurity</i>	4
2.1.4.	<i>Emerging Opportunities</i>	5
2.2	ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS	6
2.2.1.	<i>At Individual Organization Level</i>	6
2.2.2.	<i>At Pfor Alliance Level</i>	8
3.	RESULTS	9
3.1	STRENGTHENING COMMUNITY RESILIENCE (DIRECT INTERVENTION)	9
3.2.	STRENGTHENING CIVIL SOCIETY (CAPACITY BUILDING)	12
3.3.	INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT (POLICY DIALOGUE).....	15
3.4.	MONITORING AND EVALUATION	17
3.5.	LINKING AND LEARNING	17
3.6.	DISCREPANCIES.....	18
4.	CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	19
5.	SUMMARIZED ACTIVITIES/EVENTS	20

1 Basic Information

- Reporting period : January to December 2011
- Total budget (in €) for the reporting period: -
- Name of the person who compiled the report: Sirak Abebe
- Date of the report: 15 February 2012

This is a consolidated 2011 report for PfR partners working in Kenya. These Partners are: Netherlands Red Cross (NLRC), Cordaid, Wetlands International (WI) and Red Cross/Red Crescent Climate Centre (RCCC). The report is consolidated by NLRC which is the lead agency for Kenya PfR programme using the format provided by Coordination Team Netherlands (CTNL). It has captured changes in the external and internal environment of PfR partners affecting the implementation of the program, progress made with respect to the three strategic directions and major challenges encountered during this reporting period. As most of the partners are still working on their financial report for 2011, the report doesn't include financial related information (such as financial discrepancies and fund absorption levels).

2. Context of Individual Organisation

2.1 Changes in the External Environment

With the exception of RCCC (which indicated no significant external changes affecting its activities), the other PfR members (NLRC, Cordaid, and WI) reported to have been affected by various changes in the external environment during this reporting period. Severe drought, flood, conflict and insecurity were the major changes that affected the programme implementation negatively. However, some of these contextual changes were able to be taken advantage for the benefit of the programme. The details are presented as follows: -

2.1.1. Drought

Kenya like the other countries in the Greater Horn of Africa was faced with what has come to be known as the worst drought in the last 60 years in 2011. One of the epicentres was the Northern part of Kenya including the lower catchment of the Ewaso Nyiro North River Basin (PfR Kenya focus area). Kenya Red Cross, Cordaid and MID-P were involved in emergency response activities to save lives and livelihoods. This of course meant that the set-up of the PfR programme was not the main priority for these organisations during this crisis time.

Although some staff members were very busy with response measures, it was nevertheless commendable that all partners in Kenya did their very best to participate in PfR planning meetings and workshops such as the Mutual Workshop in Nanyuki in August, despite these additional pressures.

The drought has also led to increased intra- and inter-district migration of animals and people in search of pasture and water. This occasionally resulted in conflict between different ethnic groups over the scarce resources which everybody needs so badly. The influx of livestock from neighbouring districts to river banks led to rapid deterioration of pasture, which further eroded the communities' livelihoods and coping mechanisms.

2.1.2. Flooding

Despite the temporary relief that the much anticipated rains brought to the mostly pastoral communities in the area, it also led to flooding in some places which affected the programme activities. Earlier in the year, communities were driven to graze their animals in the wetland areas and river banks because of the extremely dry conditions. This concentration of people and livestock left them very vulnerable to flash floods, which are known to occur frequently in this region. A flash flood in May 2011 left 600 animals dead. The rains in November and December destroyed homes and infrastructures in Merti; some of the programme sites were cut off from the rest of the district. For example, a team due to carry out a VCA in Bulesa and Dadacha Basa in November only managed to carry out one of the VCAs, and was stranded in Merti for several extra days. The large team in Merti for the training workshop in late November also struggled on the return journey to Isiolo due to sudden heavy rains which blocked the roads.

2.1.3. Conflict and Insecurity

Conflict and tensions between different ethnic groups have led to attacks in the different parts of the country including the programme area. Conflict between Borana and Turkana had been repeatedly reported during this period, in which bystanders have been caught in the cross fire. Roads linking Isiolo to Merti have been cut off intermittently due to the conflict. The communities living in these areas, due to fear of attacks, have not fully attended the VCA assessments as it would have been expected under normal circumstances. Some communities have even moved to IDP camps. Experience shows that these conflicts become more common and more devastating as national elections approach. As the next election is due to be held in 2012, a further escalation in conflict can be expected.

The security situation in the programme area has also been worsening by the threat from the Al-Shaabab terrorist network which has already been involved in kidnapping, killing and injuring of civilians in various parts of the country (mainly North Eastern Kenya). This affected the free movement of staff and volunteers and mobilizing local communities for assessment. The movement of Wetlands International and Netherlands Red Cross staff were even more restricted due to the strict security procedure and advice from IFRC and British Foreign and Commonwealth Office (for WI).

2.1.4. Emerging Opportunities

As the common adage goes, there is opportunity in adversity. Due to the drought, there were calls from all stakeholders (donors, private sector, public, UN system Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) urging the Government to be more proactive in managing drought, since drought is predictable and manageable. As a result the Government approved the establishment of a National Drought Management Authority. The authority will be charged with the responsibility of managing drought. On the climate change policy, the Government was in the process of developing operational/implementation plans for the National Climate Change Response Strategy. These include National Adaptation Plans and Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions. There was also draft climate change legislation in place which was being led by Civil Society Organisations given that it was a private Member of Parliament (MP) bill and not Government bill. The CSOs, through the Kenya Climate Change Working Group, were supporting the MP.

There were also growing numbers of NGOs (Oxfam, Save the Children, CARE, World Vision etc) involved in disaster risk reduction and resilience building which could be networked with for better and sustainable impact. Contacts were made with some of these NGOs during the proposal development stage. However after the approval, it was limited and not in a strategic manner. The main reason being, even the cohesion among the PfR members was not that strong and they were not having similar level of understanding about the three approaches (DRR, CCA and EMR). So, the primary focus for PfR members was to put their house in order, have common understanding about the PfR project (approaches and expected results) so that they can speak the same language while reaching to others.

2.2 Organisational developments

Organizational development measures to enhance the capacity of PfR partners in order to effectively plan, implement, coordinate and monitor the programme activities have taken place at two levels: individual organization level and at the level of PfR Alliance.

2.2.1. At Individual Organization Level

2011 being the first year of the PfR programme, there were various measures taken by individual organization to facilitate the smooth implementation of the programme in Kenya. These measures include but not limited to: - establishing offices in Kenya (WI), setting up systems and structures (all the PfR members), employing/deploying staff (all PfR members), identify relevant implementing partner (Cordaid), discuss and agree with the implementation arrangements with implementing partners such as signing of commitment notes/MoU (NLRC and Cordaid), securing formal registration (WI), getting better understanding of the three approaches (DRR, CCA and EMR), harmonizing the different tools, knowing each other etc. The details per organization are presented as follows:

i. Netherlands Red Cross (NLRC)

Netherlands Red Cross East Africa Regional Office, based in Nairobi, has been responsible for leading the PfR alliance in Kenya and availing funds and technical support to Kenya Red Cross Society which has been implementing the programme at the grass root level. A Senior Regional DRR Programme Officer (supported by the Regional Manager, two Finance Staffs in Nairobi and Technical Advisor and Desk Officers from The Hague) was leading the PfR activities on behalf of NLRC in the region (including Kenya). The Programme officer was exposed to and participated in different mutual learning workshops, experience sharing forums (such as the Bora Bora Conference), reconnaissance visits, Comprehensive Disaster Risk Management Framework CDRMF online course offered by WB, and various meetings as part of capacity building. He also facilitated joint planning and implementation. Considering the work load on the Senior Regional DRR Officer, NLRC has employed a Regional DRR Delegate towards the end of the year who will mainly focus on PfR activities in Kenya.

The traditional implementing partner of NLRC, the Kenya Red Cross Society (KRCS), has also established the required human and institutional arrangements for effective coordination

and implementation of the programme activities. The activities have been managed by a Project Manager (100%) based in Isiolo and supported by the Disaster Management Department at Regional and Head Quarters (specifically, the Acting Head of Disaster Management Department-25%, Regional Disaster Management Officer-50% and Monitoring and Evaluation Officer -25%). There were also a driver (100%) and a branch accountant (25%) involved in the implementation of PfR programme.

ii. Cordaid

Cordaid has assigned a senior Programme Officer, based in Cordaid Field Office in Nairobi-Kenya, to spend 40% of her time on the PfR programme and a finance officer who have also been giving financial support. Cordaid's local implementing partner, Merti Integrated Development Program (MID-P), has also established the required human and institutional arrangements for the programme. Cordaid made contributions to the salary of Chief Executive Officer, Programme Officer, Finance Officer and four Community Mobilizers of MID-P. The Community Mobilizers were new staff which will be funded 100% by PfR. These Mobilizers have been supporting the communities and their identified organizations to understand the various approaches and facilitate the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of PfR programme activities.

iii. Wetlands International (WI)

During the first half the year, the Wetlands International Programme Manager was working remotely from the Regional Office in Senegal, participating in major planning events and contributing to the PfR set up from a distance. The Senior Technical Officer was present in Nairobi, taking part in day to day PfR activities. That time was crucial to Wetlands International in planning the set up of the office that would be responsible for PfR and other MFS funded work in East Africa, which began work from its new Nairobi base in July. The NGO registration was received at the end of the year. An administrative assistant was hired which has increased capacity of the Wetlands International Kenya office to operate. During this period, WI Africa office systems and procedures started to be applied in the Kenya office. Support continues to be provided to this small Nairobi-based team from the finance department in Dakar, Senegal, which is responsible for financial report and advice. The capacity building workshop held in Merti in November was also supported by the Communications and Capacity Building managers from Dakar. However, there is still a need

for an additional member of technical staff to meet programme commitments, which will be addressed in early 2012.

iv. Red Cross/Red Crescent Climate Centre (RCCC)

During the first half of 2011, RCCC was also providing assistance remotely to the Uganda country team. However in July 2011 an East Africa Program Officer was brought on board to provide additional support to the Uganda, Ethiopia and Kenya country teams. This closer base has allowed the RCCC to better meet the needs and expectations of the East Africa country teams and will also help to strengthen the policy dialogue component of the RCCC work. RCCC support to the Kenya country team has included participation in country team meetings and workshops, seasonal forecast updates and coordination of the Bora Bora conference. Additional correspondence and technical assistance was provided over the phone and via-email.

2.2.2. At PfR Alliance Level

In addition to the measures taken by individual organization, there were also measures taken by the PfR Alliance in Kenya to work as a team and coordinate their activities in more efficient and effective ways. The following measures/activities were implemented during the period: -

- The PfR Country Team for Kenya was formed during the March 2011 and has been meeting on monthly basis. Meetings with the implementing partners (KRCS and MID-P) have also been held on quarterly basis. Through this arrangement, the team has been making critical decisions on programme related issues (including joint activities and cost sharing). In August 2011, NLRC engaged a consultant to assist the Kenya Team in coming up with organizational and operational structures of the programme. The report was already submitted and included key finding and recommendations, ToR for the country Team as well as meeting schedule.
- The PfR Alliance members also shared roles and responsibilities with respect to the three thematic areas (monitoring and evaluation, advocacy, linking and learning) by considering the competence, mandate and interest of the organizations. As a result, NLRC, Cordaid and WI took the responsibilities of monitoring and evaluation, advocacy, and linking and learning respectively.

- Joint field visit and planning:- Some potential target communities were visited by part of the PfR Kenya and global team in March 2011 and possible activities identified. Then, following further planning sessions, one of the outcomes of the Mutual Learning session in August was a clearer picture of how each PfR Alliance member would make a contribution to the community resilience component (NLRC/KRCS brought in their experiences on VCA, Cordaid/MID-P shared their CMDRR approach and experiences, Wetlands International and the Red Cross Climate Centre also presented the ecosystem and landscape approaches and climate change adaptation respectively into these processes).
- A good working relationship and cooperation was also forged between the two key implementing partners (KRCS and MID-P) at the local level for experience sharing and mutual support during planning and implementation. They have accomplished the following together: discussed and shared target areas (communities) for PfR program implementation, conducted community mobilization in 5 areas, MID-P staffs involved in 5 VCA assessments organized and facilitated by KRCS, participated in the county budget preparation process together, joined hands in peace-building meetings with funding from other sources (not PfR).

3. Results

As it is indicated above, significant part of the 2011 was used by most PfR members on preparation and responding to the crisis unfolded in Kenya following the severe drought. That means there was not much time left for robust implementation of activities across the three strategic outcomes. However, even with the short available time, some activities were implemented and encouraging results were achieved.

3.1 Strengthening Community resilience (Direct Intervention)

Result 1: *Communities able to identify, plan and implement risk reduction measures based on community risk assessment / VCA*

Disaster risk assessment: - KRCS has used the vulnerability and capacity assessment (VCA) approach while MID-P used the participatory disaster risk assessment approach (PDRA) to define the risk level of various groups in the community. A total of eight climate risk assessments were conducted in eight selected areas out of 13 planned to be conducted in the first two years of the programme. Four of these assessments were facilitated by KRCS in Bulesa, Kinna, Gafarsa and Malkadaka and the other four were facilitated by MID-P in

Dadacha Basa, Biliqo, Iresaboru and Badana. Drought, conflict, flood, human diseases (Diarrhoea, dysentery), livestock diseases, bush fire, wildlife menace, water scarcity and environmental degradation were identified by the communities as major hazards affecting their lives and livelihoods. Based on the assessment result, the communities were able to identify the most at risk (most vulnerable groups) and came up with risk reduction measures which have two parts (community development or action plan and contingency plan).

The risk reduction measures in these eight areas were expected to cover about 25,000 people. Community organisations were also formed (in some places identified from the existing local organizations) in each of the communities with membership of most at risk groups. These organizations were involving in community mobilization, promoting the understanding of resilience building, spearheading the planning (revision) of risk reduction measures, facilitating the implementation of community action plans, serving as a bridge between the community and external actors and enhancing social cohesion.

Cordaid and NLRC were providing direct and indirect support to the implementing partners (MID-P and KRCS) while conducting their VCA/PDRA exercises. WI took an active role in one of these assessments with MID-P and KRCS to provide suggestions on ways that environmental issues could be effectively taken into account. Then, during the capacity building course in November, the VCA was used as an exercise to reach collective agreement on how ecosystems and climate issues should be included in this work, so that local partners can integrate relevant question into future VCA/PDRA assessments and be more aware of what to think about when considering the sustainability of planned action. For RCCC, they implement activities at the community level through coordination with Cordaid and NLRC, so there were not many direct community interventions during this period.

Result 2: Communities are capable to protect and adapt their livelihoods in synergy with the natural environment

During the community sensitization meetings and VCA/PDRA exercises, efforts were made by staff and volunteers of the implementing partners to raise awareness among the communities on how their lives and livelihoods have been threatened by climate change, ecosystem degradation, and the ever increasing hazards in their area. Though the communities have admitted and realized the slow but real changes in their local environment, only few have managed to embrace an improved ways of protecting and adapting their livelihoods. Most of them have been very reluctant to embrace new ideas and

failed to think outside the box. However, the majority are using traditional risk reduction measures (such as herd diversification and splitting, destocking and restocking, migration, irrigated farming etc), some of which are actually found to be less effective nowadays. In PfR efforts were made to identify those traditional risk reduction measures which are still relevant and improve them by bringing new knowledge and skills. The following are some of the examples that shows how PfR programme have been trying to improve, counter, and even change some of the traditional risk reduction measures: -

- Traditionally most of the pastoralist communities (living at the lower parts of Ewaso Nyior River Basin) migrate to river banks and high land areas in search of water and pasture during drought in order to reduce risk. However, as the frequency and intensity of drought increases (aggravated by climate change), pastoralists have to travel longer distances than ever before which often leads to conflict with the host communities. PfR has been countering this by changing community perception to keep few, productive and adaptive livelihood rather than keeping large herds of animals which are less productive and less adaptive to the changing climate. For instance, in drought prone areas keeping camel and goat is less risky than keeping cattle, having more than one livelihood also helps to reduce the risk of drought than relying just with one.
- Destocking is also one of the traditional adaptive capacities by the communities during drought. However most of the communities destock when it is already too late (after the physical situation of the cattle deteriorated and the prices goes down). This is because of two key reasons: - communities attitude towards selling their cattle (for most, destocking is the last option they take if they see the imminent deaths of their animals); the other reason is that the traditional early warning system on which the community base its decision are becoming less effective mainly due to climate change. So they are not sure about the looming danger to take destocking decision in good time. PfR have been trying to improve the traditional destocking by improving the early warning/early action and changing the community perception.
- Some community members engage in unsustainable and potentially damaging coping capacities to reduce their risk of starvation during drought, these includes sales of charcoal and firewood. The EMR approach in the PfR has been focusing on the importance of preserving the eco-system (including forest) for sustainable human existence in this drought and conflict prone area. The activities include changing community perception and advocating for protection, preservation, wise use of the natural resources. Long term solution should be sought for those who are desperate and no means of survival during drought.

- Survive on external assistance: - Some community members are always sure that someone would definitely step-in whenever they are in crisis and they don't worry much in finding their own local solutions to reduce their risk. PfR would like to fight this dependency syndrome and promote self-reliance and restoring self-respect. The problem is not only with the local communities but also with some humanitarian organizations which provide blanket emergency aid without considering the long term consequences of such actions on the attitude and productivity capacities of the local people. PfR promote the idea of selective targeting of beneficiaries of food aid and promote self reliance by addressing the root causes of vulnerability rather than treating the effect of vulnerabilities.

Though there were already some activities identified in the community development/action plan that would help them protect and adapt their livelihoods in the face of growing hazards in their area, the issues and measures didn't come out very well. The next step would be to help the community refine the issues and come up with more practical and relevant livelihood protection and adaptation measures that are directly linked to the hazards that they face. Despite the various community sensitization efforts, it is possible to conclude that there were very limited tangible livelihood protection and adaptation activities during this reporting period. It would be among the key focuses in 2012.

3.2. Strengthening Civil Society (Capacity Building)

Result 1: Partner NGOs/CBOs (e.g. MID-P, KRCS, WI -Kenya and its local community reps, Local Water Users Associations) in Ewaso Nyiro Basin have enhanced capacity on DRR, CCA and EMR approaches

Building capacities and creating awareness on CMDRR, VCA, climate change adaptation, and ecosystem based approaches among PfR Kenya partners and their local CSO (implementing partners) were part of the key activities of 2011. Unless these organizations are well informed with a good level of understanding about these approaches, they can't implement them; and if they can't implement themselves, it is hard to influence others to adopt the approaches. The following capacity building activities were done: -

During the planning workshop in March 2011, WI enhanced the understanding of PfR partners on why ecosystems are important, the potential benefits of building ecosystems approaches into DRR programming, and showing the type of activities this might involve. The `Mutual Learning and Review Workshop` was also organized by WI in August 2011;

where partners gathered to learn more about each other and to introduce their participatory risk assessment tools. The main goal of this workshop was to determine whether the tools needed to be harmonized with each other, whether they were similar enough to have each partner remain with its own tools and how to build ecosystems approaches and climate information into these tools. Cordaid presented the basic minimum of community managed disaster risk reduction approach (CMDRR), WI presented on ecosystem management and ecosystem based adaptation, NLRC and KRCS made a presentation on VCA while RCCC presented on climate change adaptation and the variety of ways to incorporate climate information into risk assessments. Outcomes from the workshop included plans for further capacity building such as the one week training and field exercise in Merti.

The training and field exercise in Merti was conducted in November and focused on `Integrating Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) and Ecosystems Management and Restoration (EMR) into Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)`. This one week training involved 19 participants from PfR Kenya and covered an introduction to climate, climate change, ecosystem services, basic introduction to early warning/early action, how to communicate key climate change and adaptation concepts to the communities, and an introduction to a key resource document on these approaches, 'The characteristics of a disaster resilient community'¹. The training also incorporated a field component where participants took lessons learned throughout the week and contextualized them to Bulesa community. This training involved all PfR Kenya partners and used a combination of interactive training tools, workshop-style consensus building and practical field work to make joint decisions on how best to include these issues in partners` work, first of all in the remaining risk assessments.

KRCS has also trained 30 volunteers (members of the local communities) from all the programme sites in VCA so that they can influence the attitude of the community and community based organizations with respect to disaster risk reduction. They are now well equipped with theoretical and practical knowledge of the VCA process. Using volunteers to promote the PfR programme approach has at least two advantages: - they are better trusted in the community and get easy access for information and they ensure better chance of sustainability of the programme as they likely stay longer in the same community.

Capacity Building in PfR programme was done using a variety of tools: WI used elements from its own Ecosystems Based Climate Change Adaptation training course as well as tools from other relevant tools and frameworks such as Twigg's 'Characteristics of a disaster

¹ by John Twigg

resilient community', CRISTAL and SLED; Cordaid used the CMDRR Training Manual and NLRC and KRCS used the VCA Manual of IFRC. In order to avoid confusion and encourage learning, appropriate materials and themes from these various sources should be structured in a more formal way.

Result 2: Partner NGOs/CBOs ((e.g. MID-P, KRCS, WI -Kenya and) in Ewaso Nyiro Basin advocate the DRR/CCA/EMR approach with their peers/other stakeholders in their networks (e.g. DSG, AWF Isiolo branch, Arid lands, ENNDA, NWSB, IWASCO, its local community reps, Local Water Users Associations)

PfR members and their implementing partners have made some effort to advocate DRR/CCA/EMR approaches to other stakeholders in their network in order to influence their practices at various levels.

During the Participatory Disaster Risk Assessment, MID-P invited other actors (such as the local leaders, local sectoral committees (e.g. water, environmental and education committees) and a few staff from relevant Government departments. This has contributed to enhance their knowledge in DRR, CCA, EMR and CMDRR concepts to some extent. With more engagements with these groups in the coming years, it is expected that they will be champions of the same and reach out to other communities and actors.

KRCS has also presented community action plans from the four areas (where the VCAs have been conducted) to the local government officials so that they can support the initiatives technically and financially. However, this effort didn't yield much during the reporting period because: i. in 2011, the focus of most of the local government officials was on responding to the emergency crisis triggered by the drought; ii. These officials also wanted to score a short term mark by providing tangible support rather than taking the long route of resilience building which can be realized may be after five or ten years from now; iii. They lacked the knowledge and skills in DRR, CCA and EMR and not sure whether that was the right approach to take. There were various approaches being promoted by different organizations; iv. The community action plans were developed in the last quarter of the year. Therefore the time was too short to effectively market them. However, the effort will continue in the coming year and it hoped that it will be possible to convince government to support the implementation of these plans.

In late 2011, a 2 day meeting was led by WI's own capacity building experts, to present the overall PfR Alliance, its program and objectives to members of WI's East Africa trainers network, including representatives from Uganda. For the WI network of trainers, collaboration with PfR means collaboration with a totally new sector (humanitarian and development) and way of working, putting disaster risk and community resilience at the core, and bringing in the ecosystems and landscape approach as a part of this. The trainers network provided valuable advice on how to go about capacity building within PfR activities. A consensus was reached that the network would be available to support PfR, including in the delivery of courses where necessary, as well as in the development of training materials.

It is important to note that as these three approaches are relatively new at the local level, it needs time for the implementing partners (even the PfR alliance members) to deeply understand the concepts and practical applications in order to get the confidence to engage others in their network.

3.3. Institutional Environment (Policy Dialogue)

Result 1: Increased policy dialogue by PFR, CSOs and CBOs

Cordaid being the country lead on policy dialogue, it has developed a draft country advocacy strategy outlining which policy and legislative areas and processes PfR may need to engage with and defining roles of each organisation; and suggested planning for year 2011. This was shared with all partners. The strategy was not finalised given that 2011 was quite a busy year for PfR members due to drought and programme preparatory activities. Therefore it was agreed that partners engage in opportunistic policy work. Some of the achievements during this period, however, were:

Cordaid has participated in at least two key policy related activities at national level. i.e. i. In the climate change workshop organised by the Government to develop Kenya's position for COP 17, (participants were also trained on practical guide on UNFCCC negotiation). ii. In national budgeting process: the Kenya's new constitution provided for a participatory budgeting process. The year 2011/2012 budget was developed in such a manner. After the government made public announcement through the national media, Cordaid informed all the PfR partners. As a result, MID-P and Kenya Red-Cross participated in the budget development meeting in Isiolo County. Kenya's budget is based on sectors and the partners advocated for more budgets for sectors affected most by climate hazard, especially drought.

There was also push for investment in infrastructure like bridges, rural electrification, ICT. As a result, the government undertook need surveys especially for bridges and electricity. The partners will continue to engage with the government to follow-up on whether the government will actually provide funding for the plans; and if funds are received they will monitor implementation of activities.

As part of the effort by WI to assess the impacts of upstream catchment management and water use on communities downstream and influencing policies of key responsible actors on the basis of this information, some early progress was made in 2011 with a first aerial survey of the river basin taking place during the short rainy season, which gave a good overview of the river's course from the source to the Lorian swamp, and where the downstream villages seem to be most vulnerable, particularly during this time of flooding. WI also used the opportunity (which arose from its membership of the Kenya Water Partnership) in December to provide input on sustainability concepts, the landscape approach and the impacts of upstream engineering on downstream users, to the drafting team of the national water act.

During the 'reconnaissance' visit to the programme area in May 2011, the PfR members visited the following key decision making bodies as an initial courtesy effort: line departments - Departments of Water, Agriculture, Environment, etc; Ewaso Nyiro North Development Authority (ENNDA); Water Resources Management Authority (WARMA), and Arid Lands Programme. Following this, it was expected that the programme baseline study would identify strategies, policies and plans affecting the Ewaso Nyiro North, its people and resources. Although the study report gave a good background on some national level policies, it was not detailed and didn't cover all policies. Further analysis work is needed before a decision can be taken on plans to be influenced, although it is likely that WI will engage strongly with ENNDA and WRMA which carry a lot of influence in the Basin, to support these agencies to make their development approaches sustainable. The private sector interests in the Ewaso Nyiro North are not yet well known, and more research needs to be done in 2012 to identify whether there are any major industrial or farming concerns having an impact on the flow of the river, such as through water extraction or erosion and siltation.

RCCC represented PfR partners by attending COP-17 in Durban, South Africa in December 2011. Overall, increasing the support to policy dialogue at the national level will be a goal of the RCCC during the coming year especially through greater support to Cordaid who is a lead agency for Advocacy in Kenya. One of the main outcomes of the Durban negotiations

was the establishment of the guidelines for the drafting of National Adaptation Plans of Action (NAPAs); in light of this, the RCCC will also offer support to the Kenya PfR team around how to engage in policy dialogue as this document is being drafted in Kenya.

3.4. Monitoring and Evaluation

During the planning meeting in Kenya (March 2011), where all partners participated, the country logframe was developed. In the meeting, the PFR programme details were shared. This helped to enhance the understanding of the programme by the PfR members for better implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

One of the key activities under this sub-title is the baseline survey conducted by a consultant. On behalf of and in consultation with the country team, NLRC Nairobi office prepared the ToR for the baseline survey and engaged a consultant to undertake the assignment. Findings of the consultancy will be used, with modification where necessary, for future planning, implementation and review of the programme. WI, NLRC and CORDAID shared the baseline survey cost. The baseline survey documented good background information and a description of the programme area. However, there is still some missing information with regard to the basic indicators of the programme such as number of deaths and losses of livelihoods as a result of the major hazards (drought, flood, conflict etc) experienced in the area of operation. This could be resulted from the approach the consultant preferred to take while collecting and presenting the information; more emphasis to generic qualitative information rather than indicator based quantitative data. PfR Kenya Team have agreed that most of the missing information are not difficult to collect and volunteers/community mobilizes can easily get them from the relevant offices and government officials.

Monthly and quarterly meetings have been held with PfR members to discuss programme progress, challenges encountered and possible solutions, joint planning, joint activities (such as field visits, trainings, etc), cost sharing and other related issues. Key and important program related decisions have been made in these meetings and been followed up for their proper implementation.

3.5. Linking and Learning

The reconnaissance visit made to the upper catchment of the river basin by the PfR Kenya country team was part of learning and linking, advocacy and capacity building for the team,

given that most of them were not familiar with the area. Various stakeholders were visited, and the programme was introduced with a promise for programme launch at a later date.

The global Bora Bora conference was the other activity conducted under this component. Staffs from Cordaid, RCCC, MID-P, NLRC, and WI have participated in the conference. The conference was indeed a learning workshop as it provided a platform for sharing and interacting with partners of the programme. PfR members contributed by presenting country progress on various aspects and gave their views to the as general participants.

The mutual learning and review workshop, which was also mentioned under the civil society strengthening result above, can also be considered as learning and linking activity as it facilitated learning and networking among the different actors.

Wetlands International drafted a concept for Linking & Learning for the PfR in Kenya, which was first presented for comments by partners during the Mutual Learning workshop in August 2011. During the 'Bora Bora' conference in late September, key principles of the Linking & Learning component in PfR were agreed and a Global 'L&L' group constituted, in which Wetlands International will be the focal point for Kenya. Recommendations for country teams regarding Linking & Learning efforts included to focus on a reduced number of key learning agenda questions each year (whilst still providing outline answers to all learning agenda questions), to work with the new Global Knowledge Centres group as regards linking to external academic and research institutions and to work with the Global Communication Group on issues relating to major communications efforts with external partners. Based on the recommendations and development of the PfR in Kenya, the original L&L concept for Kenya is under review to be finalised in 2012 and integrated with monitoring and evaluation activities.

3.6. Discrepancies

The level of discrepancies between the planning and actual achievement, between the budget and expenditures varies from organization to organization. In general, however, there were significant discrepancies in both areas. The causes are as follows: -

- 2011 was the first year of the project. The nature of the project (bringing three new and innovative approaches together, bringing four NGOs –which have different experiences, approaches, focuses and capacities together for the first time to achieve one common goal) was not an easy task. Some of them even didn't have a presence in Kenya when the project started. It took time for each of them to set up

the required institutional set up with implementation capacities. Moreover, they also needed time to know each other and build trust to work as a team.

- As we were effectively asking partners from the DRR sector to integrate new components in their work, there was an understanding early on in 2011 that to fully build in Ecosystem and Climate approaches into the mindset and working methodologies of partners would require a considerable effort of understanding, capacity building and relationship building. This was necessary in the first year to ensure that the innovative nature of PfR, and the basic elements of these components were understood by all. We are satisfied that this was the best approach to take; with partners now gradually taking on board the new thinking and feeling comfortable to ask questions of the climate and environmental partners.
- The same year was also a time when the communities in the PfR operational area plagued by one of the worst crisis in decades. Large number of local communities was between life and death. In such situation it was neither logical nor practical to talk about long term resilience building project while the community was in dire need of immediate food and non-food items. Even the local government officials didn't care about our resilience building program in such a situation. So, most of the PfR partners involved in life saving interventions and PfR project were given less priority. However, when the situation normalized after the second half of the year, then the partners turned their focus towards the PfR project and managed to achieve some key milestones.

4. Challenges and Recommendations

Overall, it has become clear that the downstream area of the Ewaso Nyiro North Basin is a difficult working area, due to access, insecurity and hazards. These bring delays and often extra costs, which need to be taken into account. The PfR partners in Kenya are closely reviewing this situation, and when joint activities have been planned, agreements have been made on security procedures.

It is also important to note that, these three approaches are relatively new to the implementing partners (and even to some of the PfR members) and integrating them and using them at once make it even more difficult. Though there were good efforts made to enhance the understanding of all partners, there are still vague areas that need to be addressed in subsequent capacity building efforts. On top of this, most of the partners had never been involved in such kinds of partnership arrangement before and were quite

skeptical to fully engage, especially at the beginning. This all needs time and patience in order to guide the programme into success.

Against all the odds, the Kenya PfR Team has been slowly but surely emerging as a team who brings different competencies and experiences to achieve one common goal. There have been a growing relationship and cooperation which is really crucial for the success of the programme.

5. Summarized Activities/Events

Key Activities	Duration	Output	Participants
Formation of Kenya PfR Team	March 2011	Kenya PfR Team formed	NLRC, WI, Cordaid,
Planning workshop	March 2011	-Agreed on the importance of harmonizing the tools used by PfR partners -Plans for further capacity building such as the one week training and field exercise in Merti	NLRC, Cordaid, WI, RCCC
Visit of the potential target communities	March 2011	- Familiarized with the operational area - Potential and generic activities identified	PfR Kenya and Global Team
Preparing organizational and operational structure of PfR members	August 2011	PfR organizational and operational structure and ToR for the PfR team was prepared	Consultant, all PfR members contributed
Sharing of responsibilities of the three thematic areas		NLRC – responsible for M&E Cordaid – advocacy WI – learning and linking	NLRC, WI, Cordaid
Reconnaissance field visit to the upper catchment of Ewaso Nyiro River	May 2011	-PfR members familiarized themselves with the area - initial courtesy visit made to relevant government departments (departments of Water, Agriculture, Environment, Ewaso Nyiro, ENNDA, WARMA, and Arid Lands Programme	NLRC, Cordaid, WI, KRCS, and MID-P
Mutual learning and review workshop	August 2011	-Partners learned about each other and their competence areas and contributions to realize the goal of PfR (NLRC/KRCS – VCA, Cordaid – CMDRR, WI-EMR, RCCC – CCA) -facilitated learning and networking among the different actors	NLRC, Cordaid, WI, RCCC
Bora Bora Conference	Late September	-Partners interacted and shared knowledge and experiences about PfR - Key principles of the Linking & Learning component in PfR were agreed and a Global 'L&L' group constituted,	Cordaid, WI, MID-P, NLRC
Training and field exercise in Merti	Nov 2011	- Some of the tools of CCA, EMR and DRR integrated and field tested	NLRC, Cordaid, WI, KRCS, MID-P
Community sensitization, Conducting risk assessment (VCA/PDRA) and preparing risk reduction plans	September-December	Risk assessment conducted and risk reduction plans for eight communities (which cover 25,000 people) prepared by the community	KRCS, MID-P, WI, Cordaid, NLRC
Sharing of community action plan to local government		-Communities plan were shared with the local authorities	KRCS & MID-P

Training of 30 Volunteers		30 volunteer have got the skills and knowledge in facilitating VCA process at community level	KRCS
Presentation by WI to members of WI's East Africa trainers network about PfR	Late 2011 (2 days)	-Awareness about PfR created. -network gave advice on appropriate training options for PfR, including training materials, curricula	WI
Participating in national and local budgeting process		-Cordaid participated in the national budgeting process -KRCS and MID-P participated in county budgeting process	Cordaid, KRCS, MID-P
Preparing PfR advocacy strategies	August-Dec	Cordaid prepared a draft advocacy strategies and shared to PfR members for comment	Cordaid
Preparation of linking & learning concept	August	WI shared a first draft L&L strategy to members for comments & updates	WI
Baseline data collection and finalisation of the report	July-November	Baseline information collected and shared	Consultant with M&E staff of KRCS & MID-P
Monthly and quarterly meetings		-PfR plans discussed and agreed -Joint activities and cost sharing discussed and agreed -progress of the implementation of the project reviewed	NLRC, WI, Cordaid, KRCS, and MID-P