Review of

Partners for Resilience Kenya

Climate-Proof Disaster Risk Reduction

Programme

Policy dialogue and advocacy

Draft report

By:

Inge-Merete Hougaard
Lund University

10 October 2012

Developed for:

If you want to go fast, go alone.

If you want to go far, go together.

African proverb

Table of content

List of tables

List of abbreviations

ACF	Action Contre La Faim (Action Against Hunger)
AG	Attorney General
ALRMP	Arid Lands Resource Management Project
ASAL	Arid and Semi-Arid Land
CBO	Community-based organisation
CSO	Civil society organisation
CCCA	Climate change adaptation
CDKN	Climate and Development Knowledge Network
CIC	Commission for the Implementation of the Constitution
CIOC	Constitutional Implementation Oversight Committee
Cordaid	Catholic Organisation for Relief and Development Aid
CPDRRP	Climate-Proof Disaster Risk Reduction Programme
CSO	Civil society organisation
DRR	Disaster risk reduction
DRSRS	Department of Resource Survey and Remote Sensing
DSG	District Steering Group
EC	European Community
EMCA	Environmental Management and Coordination Act
EMR	Ecosystem management and restoration
ENNDA	Ewaso Nyiro North Development Authority
FENN	Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North
GoK	Government of Kenya
IRDP	Integrated Regional Development Plan
KEMU	Kenya Methodist University
KFS	Kenya Forest Service
KLRC	Kenya Law Reform Commission

KRCS   Kenya Red Cross Society

KWS   Kenya Wildlife Service

MID-P   Merti Integrated Development Programme

MoSSP   Ministry of State for Special Programmes

MP   Member of Parliament

NCLR   National Council for Law Reporting

NEMA   National Environment Management Authority

NGO   Non-governmental organisation

NLRC   Netherlands Red Cross

OECD/DAC Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance
              Committee

OM   Outcome Mapping

PfR   Partners for Resilience

PfR-K   Partners for Resilience - Kenya

RCCC   Red Cross/Red Crescent Climate Centre

ToR   Terms of Reference

VSF   Vétérinaires Sans Frontiéres

WI   Wetlands International

WIA   Wetlands International Africa

WRMA   Water Resources Management Authority

Definition of concepts

Community-based organisation (CBO)**:** In this review the term refers to organisations emerging from and mainly operating at community level.

Implementing partner: In this review the term *implementing partners* is used to cover the two local organisations operating at community level in Kenya, namely KRCS and MID-P.

Institutional framework: In this review the term *institutional framework* is used to describe government institutions and parastatals at all levels that operate to develop or implement a given law or policy.

Legislative framework: In this review the term refers to the laws, regulations, policies, strategies and plans that guide a particular thematic area, such as disaster management.

Non-governmental organisation (NGO): In this review the term NGO is used to classify national or international organisations that are operating independent from government institutions.

PfR: The PfR term is used to signify the partnership at global level.

PfR-K/PfR-K partners: In this review the terms *PfR-K* and *PfR-K partners* are used interchangeably to signify the group consisting of PfR-K team members and implementing partner, i.e. staff from Cordaid, NLRC, WI, RCCC, KRCS and MID-P, who are involved in the CPDRRP.

PfR-K team: The term is used about the PfR country team in Kenya i.e. the staff members from the four organisations Cordaid, NLRC, WI and RCCC who are involved in the CPDRRP.

Executive summary

Programme:	Climate-Proof Disaster Risk Reduction
Programme location:	Ewaso Nyiro North River Basin, Kenya
Implementing agent:	Partners for Resilience – Kenya
Review purpose:	Review the policy advocacy work in CPDRRP and identify areas of influence for PfR-K in legislation and policy-making as well as in law enforcement and policy implementation within the areas of disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and ecosystems management.
Methodology:	Desk research, interviews, etc.
Review start and end dates:	10 September 2012 –10 October 2012
Expected review report release date:	5 November 2012

This review has been conducted with the aim of supporting the policy advocacy activities in the Climate-Proof Disaster Risk Reduction programme (CPDRRP) carried out by Partners for Resilience – Kenya (PfR-K). Through in-depth studies of programme documents and stakeholder interviews the achievements and progress in policy advocacy activities are documented. Though many activities are yet to take place, considerable progress is recorded – especially when it comes to changing attitudes and behaviour. Nevertheless, policy advocacy activities require increased attention if the programme objectives are to be reached by the end of the programme period. To support the policy advocacy work a thorough study of the legislative framework has been conducted to identify bills, policy and strategies that should be prioritised in the further analysis and advocacy work. Furthermore, the institutional framework surrounding legislation/policy development and implementation has been scrutinised and specific opportunities for policy advocacy are identified. Finally, recommendations for the further policy work of PfR-K are provided including a) developing a detailed advocacy activity plan with clear responsibilities, deadlines and commitments, b) nurturing and developing relations to key actors in relevant line ministries, and c) ensuring sustainability of advocacy efforts by engaging implementing partners in policy advocacy at national level and institutionalising policy advocacy into the organisational practices and procedures.

Introduction

Purpose of review

The purpose of this review is to support the policy advocacy work in the Climate-Proof Disaster Risk Reduction Programme (CPDRRP) carried out by the Partners for Resilience (PfR) in Kenya. This will be done by first reviewing the policy advocacy activities of the CPDRRP as set out in the LogFrame, the advocacy strategy and the communication plan, and point out progress and achievements. Further, the review will support the policy advocacy work of PfR-K by identifying areas of influence in development and implementation of legislation and policies. This will be done through a review of the legal framework in areas relevant for disaster risk reduction (DRR), ecosystems management and restoration (EMR) and climate change adaptation (CCA) at various government levels in Kenya. Moreover, the institutional arrangements for developing and implementing legislation and policies will be reviewed to identify opportunities for PfR-K can play an active role and lobby for the inclusion of CCA, EMR and DRR. Based on this, the review will offer at set of recommendations for further policy advocacy work.

Intervention background

Background of CPDRRP

In recent years the frequency and impact of natural and manmade disasters have increased substantially. Disasters do not only cause immediate damage and loss of life, but also set back the communities from developments achieved over a long period of time as infrastructure and social and economic structures are eroded. While environmental degradation increase the vulnerability of communities at risk, climate variation and extreme weather events increase the risk of hazards such as drought and flooding. (PfR 2011; RCCC 2012). This is not least the case in Kenya, which in recent decades has been hit by several disasters.

In response to the increased number and impact of disasters on a global level the Partners for Resilience (PfR) have come together to reduce the impact of hazards on vulnerable communities. PfR is an alliance of five Dutch-based humanitarian, development and environmental organisations that bring together their expertise in the fields of DRR, CCA and EMR. PfR consist of the Netherlands Red Cross (NLRC), The Catholic Organisation for Relief and Development Aid (Cordaid), CARE Netherlands, Red Cross/Red Crescent Climate Centre (RCCC) and Wetlands International (WI). PfR is supporting communities to become more resilient to disasters by implementing the Climate-Proof Disaster Risk Reduction Programme (CPDRRP) in nine countries: Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mali, Nicaragua, Philippines and Uganda. The programme will run from 1 January 2011 to 31 December 2015, and is supported by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (PfR 2011; RCCC 2012)

In Kenya the CPDRRP is implemented in Ewaso Nyiro North River Basin through the implementing partners Kenya Red Cross Society (KRCS) and Merti Integrated Development

Programme (MID-P)[1]. Through the implementing partners the programme is targeting 85,000 people in 13 communities. (PfR-K 2012f)

The outcome objectives of the CPDRRP are:

- To increase the resilience of communities to disasters, climate change and environmental degradation.
- To enhance the capacity of civil society organisations (CSOs) to apply DRR, CCA and EMR measures and conduct policy dialogue.
- To make the institutional environment from international to grass-root level more conducive to integrate DRR, CCA and EMR-based approaches.

(PfR-K 2012e:1)

Each outcome objective has a corresponding intervention strategy:

- Strengthening community resilience.
- Strengthening CSOs.
- Policy dialogue and advocacy for stronger DRR/CCA policies and increased resources at all levels.

(PfR-K 2012e:1)

In addition to the three intervention strategies, the programme employs two cross-cutting themes – Monitoring & Evaluation and Linking & Learning – to ensure learning and advancement internally as well as externally.

Focus of review

This review will focus on the third intervention strategy: *Policy dialogue and advocacy*. The programme component is formulated to ensure sustainability of the programme by mainstreaming the DRR/EMR/CCA approach into the national legal and institutional framework.

In response to the higher prevalence of disasters and their detrimental impact on communities in terms of loss of life, damage on property and destruction of economic and social infrastructure, the Government of Kenya has in recent years taken the initiative to improve the legislative framework governing disaster management. However, since the new Constitution came in place in 2010, the passing of these laws and policies has been down-prioritised to give space for administrative laws that are required before the general elections in 2013. Thus, while the government is on track to ensure a sound legislative and institutional framework governing disaster management and climate change adaptation, a considerable pressure from civil society is needed to ensure timely enactment and implementation. Moreover, while the topic of climate change has come to the fore, the topic of ecosystem management has gained very little attention in the legislative framework. (Abdi, pers.comm., 05-10-12; Kamau, pers.comm., 29-08-12).

---

[1] CARE Netherlands is not part of the PfR country team in Kenya.

[2] *Relevance* is another evaluation criteria recommended by the OECD/DAC (Molund & Schill 2004:25).

Based on this, the policy advocacy component of CPDRRP proves to be highly relevant[2]. The intervention logic of the programme component as formulated in the LogFrame is outlined in the table below (complete LogFrame in Appendix II):

Outcome	Output
3. Government, regional authorities, counties, CSOs, donors and communities support DRR/CCA/EMR in budgeting, policy planning and implementation.	3.1 Increased lobby and advocacy by CSOs/CBOs on integration of PfR approaches in government and other stakeholder policies and practices.
Activities	
3.1.1. PfR partners advocacy training and development of Advocacy Strategy and action plan.	
3.1.2. Journalist training on PfR approach and issues of the region.	
3.1.3. Lobby and policy dialogue of stakeholders.	
3.1.4. Establish a Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North forum to carry out advocacy and lobby activities.	
3.1.5. Facilitate implementation of Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North forum action plan.	
3.1.6. Capacity building and peer-to-peer dialogue initiatives.	
3.1.7. Documentation/dissemination of data gathered through programme for use in lobbying.	

Table 1: Intervention logic for *Policy dialogue and advocacy*. *(PfR-K 2011)*

As programme activities are still in the inception phase, this review will focus on programme inputs and immediate outputs. To give a better understanding of the achievements of the programme, Outcome Mapping (OM) will be employed to record changes in behaviour and attitudes among implementing partners and CBOs. OM focuses on incremental subtle changes, and recognises that a change in state requires a change in behaviour; change does not only happen through provision of tools, but requires that these tools are used. It acknowledges that development occurs within a variety of factors and actors through the interlinked efforts of governments, organisations, communities and events; thus, organisations have little control over processes beyond their immediate activities. (Earl et al. 2001:2-12)

With this in mind, the review seeks to highlight the achievements and progress of the PfR-K in the area of policy advocacy, while suggesting recommendations for the further advocacy work.

Methodology

Performed by an intern recently joining one of the PfR-K partners, WI, this review can be considered somewhere between an external and a participatory review (Molund & Schill 2004:19). On the one hand, the review is backed by two months' in-depth engagement with the programme, on the other it is performed by an outsider that is not yet 'absorbed' by the partnership and streamlined into the practices and procedures of the partnership. The limitations to this situation are elaborated upon below.

---

[2] *Relevance* is another evaluation criteria recommended by the OECD/DAC (Molund & Schill 2004:25).

Data sources

The data collection took place over the course of a month (see Appendix III for data collection plan), during which other tasks and responsibilities have been performed. The data collection methods were mostly desk research of policies, legislation and programme documents as well as stakeholder interviews. The programme documents used for this review includes publications (brochures, websites), status reports, LogFrame, Advocacy Strategy, Communication Plan and minutes from PfR-K team meetings. The list of policies and legislation reviewed is based on the list in the Advocacy Strategy, expanded through snowballing, and refined through a desk research (see Appendix VIII for a full list of legislation and policies). The stakeholders interviewed are PfR-K staff and regional PfR partner staff. Moreover, CSOs and government officials operating in the upstream area of Ewaso Nyiro North have contributed with inputs for the review through a number of interviews held in connection to a field visit to Nyahururu and Lake Olbolosat. A complete list of the data sources can be seen in Appendix IV.

Review questions and indicators

The evaluation questions as set out in the Terms of Reference (ToR) have been revised to reflect knowledge gained through the initial research and to accommodate for data availability and access to key informants (Molund & Schill 2004:70-72). While the original questions can be seen in the ToR (Appendix I), the revised review questions are:

1. What are the planned CPDRRP policy advocacy activities, and what have been achieved?
2. How can PfR-K improve its work on influencing the formulation and implementation of policies and legislation in the areas of disaster management, climate change adaptation and ecosystem management?
   a) What legislation and policies exist in the areas of disaster management, climate change adaptation and ecosystem management in Kenya, and what is their status?
   b) To what extent has DRR/EMR/CCA been incorporated in policies and legislation, and which policies and legislation should be prioritised in the advocacy work?
   c) What are the procedures and structures for the development of legislation and policies, and how can PfR-K influence these?
   d) How can PfR-K influence he process of implementation for acts and policies?
3. What are the internal and external challenges and opportunities for PfR-K in its policy advocacy work?

Data analysis

To answer the above question a number of quantitative and qualitative indicators have been formulated as seen in the table below. While quantitative data has been analysed through total number, frequencies and ranks, qualitative data has been analysed through categories, themes and concepts (Zarinpoush 2006:36-37).

Review question	Quantitative indicators	Qualitative indicators
1. What are the planned CPDRRP policy advocacy activities, and what has been achieved?	No. of activities completed. No. of activities scheduled for near future.	Types of activities planned and completed. Changes in attitude and

		behaviour among partners. Types of strategies employed.
2. How can PfR-K improve its work on influencing the formulation and implementation of policies and legislation in the areas of disaster management, climate change adaptation, ecosystem management?		Type of spaces for advocacy influence identified.
2.a. What legislation and policies exist in the areas of disaster management, climate change adaptation, ecosystem management and sustainable livelihoods in Kenya, and what is their status?		Status of identified policy/legislation.
2.b. To what extent has DRR/EMR/CCA been incorporated in policies and legislation, and which policies and legislation should be prioritised in the advocacy work?	No. of times DRR, EMR and CCA are mentioned in policy/legislation.	
2.c. What are the procedures and structures for the development of legislation and policies, and how can PfR-K influence these?		Procedures for developing legislation/policies.
2.d. How can PfR-K influence he process of implementation for acts and policies?		Opportunities for influencing implementation identified.
3. What are the internal and external challenges and opportunities for PfR-K in its policy advocacy work?		Partners' experience in policy advocacy. External challenges and opportunities for advocacy work identified. Action to strengthen advocacy work identified.

Table 2: Qualitative and quantitative review indicators.

Limitations

The focus of this review is to assess the policy advocacy component, thus no conclusion on the overall performance of the programme are drawn.

Data collection has been constrained by the limited timeframe and the difficulty of getting access to data such as policies and legislation and information about their status. Moreover, access to key informants such as government officials has been limited, while access to programme beneficiaries has not been possible due to security concerns. Nevertheless, the PfR-K partners interviewed represent a highly relevant segment of the stakeholders due to their direct involvement in programme activities. In addition, the stakeholders interviewed during the field visit to Nyahururu are as representative for their respective institutions relevant sources for the review. By using multiple data sources the review has been able to triangulate the data to ensure high reliability of the findings.

As the review is partly participatory, there is a risk of bias – especially in connection to PfR-K partner interviews. This includes empathy bias, self-censorship and informant's strategy (EC 2006:74-75). Being aware of this risk, triangulation has been used to reduce bias, and confidentiality and a professional approach to the interviews has been applied. Moreover, to ensure construct validity key concepts have been defined, and it is ensured that indicators reflect what they are intended to reflect (EC 2006:85).

Findings/results

CPDRRP policy advocacy activities

The policy advocacy activities outlined in the LogFrame are further refined in the draft Advocacy Strategy developed by Cordaid and the draft Communication Plan developed by WIA. According to the Advocacy Strategy the focus areas for policy advocacy are:

- Development of policy, legislative and institutional frameworks
- Implementation strategies/plans for policy, legislation and institutional frameworks
- Capacity building and awareness

(PfR-K 2012e:2)

The Communication Plan lists advocacy as one of the four objectives of Communication Plan and sets out to influence policy and stimulate knowledge in the area of DRR/EMR/CCA. In the communication draft plan the objectives under advocacy and communication are:

- Support wetlands policy ratification and implementation
- Increase public awareness discussions and interest in DRR/EMR/CCA
- Support Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North forum to carry out advocacy and lobby activities
- Document/disseminate data gathered and case studies

(PfR-K 2012a:1)

The advocacy activities from the LogFrame, Advocacy Strategy and Communication Plan are compiled in the table below:

Activity	Advocacy strategy	Communication plan
3.1.1. PfR partners advocacy training and development of advocacy strategy and action plan.	Capacity building of PfR and CSOs on policy advocacy.	
3.1.2. Journalist training on PfR approach and issues of the region.	Media engagement.	Identify journalists in the region already covering environmental issues. Establish close links with at least three local, five national and two international journalists/media houses.
3.1.3. Lobby and policy dialogue of	Engagement in policy	Support national level lobbying

stakeholders.	influencing and budget monitoring.	efforts of Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North forum related to policy ratification and implementation.
3.1.4. Establish a Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North forum to carry out advocacy and lobby activities.	Establishment of Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North River network and capacity building.	Support national level lobbying efforts of Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North forum related to policy ratification and implementation.
3.1.5. Facilitate implementation of Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North forum action plan.	Establishment of Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North River network and capacity building.	Support national level lobbying efforts of Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North forum related to policy ratification and implementation.
3.1.6. Capacity building and peer-to-peer dialogue initiatives.	Capacity building of PfR and CSOs on policy advocacy.	
3.1.7. Documentation/dissemination of data gathered through programme for use in lobbying including policy briefs, etc.	Documentation for evidence based lobby and advocacy.	Policy briefs to influence policy in the areas of DRR/EMR/CCA. Update regularly websites with PfR stories. Active participation at national, regional and international events.

Table 3: Advocacy activities from LogFrame, Advocacy Strategy and Communication Plan. *(PfR-K 2012e:2; 2012a:2-4)*

According to the Advocacy Strategy, identification of relevant policies and their status as well as opportunistic policy advocacy is scheduled to have taken place in 2011. From 2012 and beyond, the Policy Influencing Strategy should be finalised, and partners should be involved in capacity building, documentation and policy dialogue at all levels. (PfR-K 2012e:3). Moreover, the Communication Plan suggests that a public forum as well as a TV and radio talk show should place in September 2012, and proposes that press conferences are organised during international event days, such as the Wetlands Day in February 2013. During the September 2012 quarterly meeting it was agreed that a journalist training on the DRR/EMR/CCA approach will take place during December 2012. It has since then been suggested that both the journalist training and an advocacy training will take place in November 2012 (Temesgen 2012, pers.comm., 09-10-12).

While each partner allocates funding for policy advocacy activities (joint as well as individual), Cordaid is the overall lead in the policy advocacy. This means that Cordaid is responsible for capacity building on advocacy, developing community level advocacy training, developing the Policy Influencing Strategy, monitoring policy work and facilitating learning on policy advocacy during PfR-K meetings. (PfR-K 2012e:3) Whereas the implementing partners – KRCS and MID-P – focus on advocacy at community level, the PfR-K team members lobby at national level. (Sow, pers.comm., 24-09-12).

Achievements and progress
From progress reports and meeting updates the following achieved and planned activities planned have been recorded:

Achievements and planned policy advocacy activities	
3.1.1. PfR partners advocacy training and development of Advocacy Strategy and action plan.	
Achieved	1. Advocacy Strategy developed and shared. 2. Policies relevant for advocacy identified and responsibilities for further work distributed to establish policy baseline.
Planned	1. Finalise policy baseline. 2. Finalise action plan with clear targets and activities. 3. Three days advocacy training for 18 people.
3.1.2. Journalist training on PfR approach and issues of the region.	
Achieved	
Planned	1. Three days training and three days exposure visit for 12 journalists.
3.1.3. Lobby and policy dialogue of stakeholders.	
Achieved	1. Relations established with WRMA, KWS, ENNDA, KFS, ALRMP, DRSRS, KEMU, VSF and ACF. 2. Cordaid part of Adaptation Working Group on the National Climate Change Response Strategy. 3. Cordaid participated in development of concept for formulation of Community Land Bill. 4. MID-P and KRCS involved in county budgeting (preparation stage). 5. MID-P draw attention to small budget allocation for Merti County from Equalisation Fund. 6. MID-P engaged in establishment of Bio-cultural Community Protocol. 7. KRCS and MID-P members of DSGs.
Planned	1. Joint activities together with WRMA, ENNDA, ALRMP, etc. to support, adopt and promote DRR/EMR/CCA approach. 2. Policy advocacy at national level.
3.1.4. Establish a Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North forum to carry out advocacy and lobby activities.	
Achieved	1. Assessment of communities conducted and report prepared by KRCS and MID-P.
Planned	1. Community conference to establish FENN.
3.1.5. Facilitate implementation of Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North forum action plan.	
Achieved	
Planned	1. Implementation of FENN action plan
3.1.6. Capacity building and peer-to-peer dialogue initiatives.	
Achieved	1. Exposure/exchange visit to PfR site in Dire Dawa, Ethiopia. 2. Participatory video training for one community (KRCS) and one MID-P staff.
Planned	1. Recording and distributing songs about DRR/EMR/CCA. 2. Participatory video training for two communities (MID-P).
3.1.7. Documentation/dissemination of data gathered through programme for use in lobbying including policy briefs, etc.	
Achieved	1. Brochures prepared, printed and distributed. 2. Programme launched in Nairobi and Isiolo. 3. Video clip from launch uploaded on KRCS website. 4. Information provided for PfR-K and WI website.
Planned	1. Events in connection with International Day for Disaster Reduction, 13 October 2012. 2. Media invited to actively engage in donor conference 2013.

Table 4: Achievements and planned policy advocacy activities. *(KRCS 2012; MID-P 2012; NLRC 2012; PfR-K 2012b, 2012c, 2012d)*

From the above table it can be seen that a total of 15 sub-activities have taken place, and further 12 are planned for the near future, i.e. remaining part of 2012 or beginning of 2013. However, it is also clear that the sub-activities completed are unevenly distributed among the seven activity areas, and

policy advocacy training, journalist training as well as the establishment and facilitation of FENN could need more attention. In addition, more evidence-based policy work is needed. Evidence does not need to be in the form of programme achievements – it can also be documentation of current practices on the ground, e.g. wetlands encroachment (Abdi, pers.comm., 05-10-12). Overall, while the above achievements indicate considerable progress in the advocacy work of PfR, there is still a long way to achieve Outcome 3 in the LogFrame – *Government, regional authorities, counties, CSOs, donors and communities support DRR/CCA/EMR in budgeting, policy planning and implementation*. Developing legislation and policies is a long process – it can take 5-10 years, which is beyond the timeframe of the CPDRRP (Temesgen, pers.comm., 09-10-12). However, institutionalising policy advocacy among PFR-K partners at all levels is imperative to ensure that advocacy activities will be sustained beyond 2015.

While effectiveness (in terms of achieving objectives (Molund & Schill 2004:25)) is difficult to measure at current stage, progress towards achieving objectives can be recorded through Outcome Mapping (OM) (Earl et al. 2001). Ideally, the OM analysis of vision, mission, boundary partners, outcome challenges and progress markers should be developed by the PfR-K partners, but there has not been time for organising a workshop for this purpose. Instead, the analysis is based on available programme material and interviews, and should be considered a working document, which can be revised, edited and further developed by PfR-K partners. While the full OM analysis for policy advocacy can be seen in Appendix V, the following focuses on changes in behaviour and attitudes among the closest boundary partners, i.e. the implementing partners (KRCS and MID-P) and CBOs (WRUAs, community councils, etc.). Implementing partners and CBOs have been grouped together since the changes in attitudes and behaviour that PfR-K team intends to foster through its activities are similar for the two groups. The following table has been developed to show incremental progress in attitudinal and behavioural changes among the implementing partners and CBOs:

Progress markers for implementing partners and CBOs in policy advocacy		
Outcome challenge: *Implementing partners and CBOs embrace, apply and advocate for the DRR/EMR/CCA approach in their networks.*		
Expect to see:		**Progress**
1	Participating in three day policy advocacy training	○○○
2	Engaging with local government (district/county) officials to influence budgeting and action plan in disaster management and resilience strengthening	✔○○
3	Engaging with government lead agencies to influence implementation of strategies/plans and advocate for the inclusion of DRR/EMR/CCA approaches	✔○○
4	Assessing communities to facilitate the establishment of FENN	✔✔○
5	Organising community conference to establish FENN	✔○○
6	Facilitating the establishment of funding mechanisms for the sustainability and further work of the forum	○○○
Like to see:		**Progress**
7	Promoting the DRR/EMR/CCA approach locally and regionally	✔○○
8	Capacity building local communities to engage in policy dialogue	○○○
9	Influencing other NGOs operating in the area to incorporate the DRR/EMR/CCA approach	✔○○
10	Identifying opportunities for cooperating with research institutions	○○○
11	Sharing experiences with other communities nationally and internationally	✔○○
Love to see:		**Progress**

| 12 | Influencing national policy through networks and mobilisation | ○○○ |
| 13 | Engage in joint activities with WRMA, ENNDA and ALRMP | ○○○ |

Table 5: Progress markers for KRCS, MID-P and CBOs in policy advocacy. *(Adan, pers.comm., 26-09-12; KRCS 2012; MID-P 2012; PfR-K 2012e, 2012d, 2012a; Shandey, pers.comm., 27-09-12)*

From the above table it can be seen that there has been a change in attitude and behaviour among the implementing partners and the CBOs. First of all, they have embraced the DRR/EMR/CCA approach and have started to advocate for its use in other forums. Moreover, the implementing partners and CBOs are changing their behaviours by engaging in policy advocacy at new levels. They have become more confident and are able to take control of their own lives. These changes have long-term impacts on the communities – impacts that will last way beyond the programme period. (Adan, pers.comm., 26-09-12; Shandey, pers.comm., 27-09-12; Temesgen, pers.comm., 09-10-12). However, the observed changes cannot be attributed to the programme activities alone (EC 2006:79). External factors such as the 2010 Constitution creating new space for influencing budgeting following the introduction of counties, and demanding increased participation are crucial factors contributing to change.

To further evaluate the progress on policy advocacy a strategy map has been developed to assess the strategies employed by the PfR (Earl et al. 2001:62-63). Again the focus is on the strategies employed to influence implementing partners and CBOs in the area of policy advocacy. Whereas causal strategies are the only ones PfR have direct control of, persuasive and supportive strategies are the ones where PfR can try to facilitate change, but the ultimate responsibilities lies within the implementing partners and CBOs. The strategies are further divided into those that are aiming at individuals (I) or the surrounding environment (E). (Earl et al. 2001:62)

Strategy map for implementing partners and CBOs			
Strategy	**Causal**	**Persuasive**	**Supportive**
Aimed at individual/group	I-1	I-2	I-3
	Fund activities. Development of advocacy strategy and action plan.	Policy advocacy training. Capacity building on policy advocacy.	
Aimed at surrounding environment	E-1	E-2	E-3
	Policy advocacy and budget monitoring.	Brochures about PfR produced and distributed. Documentation of PfR case stories. Produce and circulate policy briefs. Participate in national and international events. Update website with PfR stories.	Establish FENN.

Table 6: Strategy map for KRCS, MID-P and CBOs in policy advocacy. *(PfR-K 2011, 2012e, 2012a)*

As seen in the table above the PfR employs a wide variety of strategies for influencing and supporting implementing partners are CBOs in the area of policy advocacy. However, it should be noted that the table lists both strategies that have been employed, and that are still waiting to be implemented. A further move from here would then be to plan and implement the use of the remaining activities. Moreover, while the strategies suggested for influencing and supporting implementing partners and CBOs in the area of policy advocacy, the strategies for the remaining

boundary partners are still limited as seen in Appendix V. Developing further strategies for these actors could potentially strengthen policy advocacy for these groups.

Opportunities for policy advocacy

The following section focuses on activity 3.1.3: *Lobby and policy dialogue of stakeholders*, and suggests priority areas for policy advocacy and points to opportunities for influence. This will be done in four steps:

1. Determining the status of legislation/policies in the area of DRR, EMR and CCA.
2. Evaluating the use of DRR/EMR/CCA in the legislation/policies.
3. Identifying the process for developing legislation/policies and mechanisms of influencing it.
4. Identifying the institutional arrangements for implementation and ways of influencing them.

Bill/policy priorities

A number of laws and policies are found in the area of DRR, EMR and CCA in Kenya. From the full list of legislation and policies in Appendix VI, five bills and eight policies have been shortlisted for advocacy in the development phase due to their status as not yet enacted/approved.

In the tables below these have been further analysed to determine the use of the DRR, EMR and CCA approaches and the appearance of the concepts *disaster*, *ecosystem* and *climate* to accommodate for the use of the concepts, even when the specific DRR, EMR or CCA approach is not employed. This quantitative study will be complemented by a qualitative study after the first draft to evaluate the ways in which the abbreviations and words are used.

Bill	Status	Appearance of the concept						
		DRR	Disaster	EMR	Ecosystem	CCA	Climate	Total
Water Bill 2012	Awaiting first reading				1			**1**
Community Land Bill 2011	Awaiting first reading				3			**3**
Wildlife (Conservation and Management) Bill 2011	Awaiting second reading		1		62		2	**65**
National Drought Management Authority Bill 2012	Awaiting third reading							**0**
Climate Change Authority Bill 2012	Awaiting first reading				1		88	**89**
Total		**0**	**1**	**0**	**67**	**0**	**90**	

Table 7: Quantitative analysis of the use of DRR, EMR and CCA concepts in bills.

Policy	Version	Appearance of the concept						
		DRR	Disaster	EMR	Ecosystem	CCA	Climate	Total
National Policy for the Sustainable Development of ASALs of Kenya 2004	Draft		29		3		5	**37**
National Livestock Policy 2008	Session paper no. 2		9		1		1	**11**
National Environment Policy 2012	Revised draft no. 4				81		33	**114**
National Water Policy 2012	Draft		9		15		10	**34**
National Wetlands Conservation and Management Policy 2008	Final draft (revised); sessional paper							**0**
Forest Policy 2007	Sessional paper no. 1				4		2	**6**
Wildlife Policy 2011	Draft		7		65		9	81
National Disaster Management Policy 2009	Final draft	28	337		2		22	**389**
Total		**28**	**391**	**0**	**171**	**0**	**82**	

Table 8: Quantitative analysis of the use of DRR, EMR and CCA concepts in policies.

From the quantitative analysis it is clear that appearance of the DRR, EMR and CCA approaches/concepts is unevenly distributed, and some documents hardly mention them. This provides a good background to determine where the advocacy efforts should be put. Based on this the bills and policies suggested for further qualitative analysis and policy advocacy are:

- Water Bill 2012
- Community Land Bill 2011
- National Drought Management Authority Bill 2012
- National Wetlands Conservation and Management Policy 2008
- Forest Policy 2007
- National Livestock Policy 2008
- National Policy for the Sustainable Development of ASALs of Kenya 2004
- National Environment Policy 2012

Bill/policy development process
The legislation and policy development process starts with a draft bill proposed by a ministry or another sponsoring institution/MP. According to the 2010 Constitution, the institution is required to obtain the views of the public before generating a draft; therefore it is important to have good connections to the relevant line ministries to be able to influence the policies at this stage (Abdi, pers.comm., 05-10-12). Kenya Law Reform Commission (KLRC) and the Attorney-General (AG) often assist in the development of draft bill, and are the final institutions in the preparations of bills. Next, the Commission for the Implementation of the Constitution (CIC) ensures the constitutionality of the bill, and releases the draft bill to stakeholders that may not have been consulted by the ministry/institution and publishes the draft on its website (CIC 2012b). This is

another important opportunity of policy advocacy (Abdi, pers.comm., 05-10-12). A bill may be given low priority and put on hold if it is not appointed a specific timeframe in Schedule 5 of the Constitution, i.e. not required for the implementation of the constitution. (Abdi 2012; Kamau 2012b). Based on the internal and external consultations, CIC convenes a roundtable with KLRC, AG, the line ministry and other institutions involved in the generation of the bill to incorporate the comments generated through the consultations. From here the Attorney General (AG) finalises the bill and passes it on to the Cabinet for approval. The Cabinet approves the bill as it is or incorporates its' own amendments. If the amendments influence the constitutionality of the bill, CIC will be consulted to ensure the bill respects the Constitution. Following this, the bill is taken to Parliament, and scheduled for three debates/readings before it is enacted. (CIC 2012a; NCLR 2012). From here, AG prepares the final bill before it is given to the President for final assent, whereafter it becomes an Act of Parliament. Finally, it is published by the AG either with immediate effect or with notification given through a legal notice by the minister of the line ministry. (CIC 2012a; NCLR 2012). From then the law can be found on the National Council for Law Report (NCLR) website: www.kenyalaw.org.

When it comes to policies, the process is significantly reduced. Most policies need only to be approved by the Cabinet, while a few – mostly sessional papers that carry more weight than other policies – are take to Parliament for approval. (Abdi, pers.comm., 05-10-12)

Thus, to influence legislation and policy development the first step is to target the sponsor/ministry/government department. This can be done through events, round tables and meetings, inviting representatives from the ministry/institution in question. Other options include policy briefs or memorandums, which can either be developed in writing or presented in person. In general, it is difficult to track legislation and policies under development; sometimes they appears on CIC, NCLR or ministry's websites, but not always. Therefore, the best thing is to have good connections in the ministry, get an insider position and be invited to comment on bills and policy drafts. Sometimes it is even necessary to fund the review to ensure it takes place. Thus, policy advocacy is hard work – it requires knowing people, engaging and following the legislation/policy process closely. (Abdi, pers.comm., 05-10-12)

Acts/strategies prioritised

As seen in the tables below, eight acts and 11 strategies have been shortlisted for policy advocacy due to their relevance for the CPDRRP.

Act	Dated	Appearance of the concept						
		DRR	Disaster	EMR	Ecosystem	CCA	Climate	Total
County Government Act	19.06.2012							**0**
Local Government Act	Revised 2010 (1998)							**0**
Environmental Management and Coordination Act	1999		1		16		2	**19**
Water Act	17.10.02							**0**
Environment and Land Court Act	25.08.11							**0**
Land Act	26.04.12		5		1		1	**7**

Forest Act	04.08.05				2		2	**4**
Wildlife (Conservation and Management) Act	Revised 2009 (1985)				1			**1**
Total		**0**	**6**	**0**	**20**	**0**	**5**	

Table 9: Quantitative analysis of the use of DRR, EMR and CCA concepts in acts.

Strategy/plan	Dated	Appearance of the concept						
		DRR	Disaster	EMR	Ecosystem	CCA	Climate	Total
Ewaso Nyiro North Development Authority Integrated Regional Development Plan (ENNDA-IRDP) 2010-2040	2010							**0**
Agricultural Sector Development Strategy 2010-2020	2010		6		16		20	**42**
County Livestock Development Plan for Turkana, West Pokot, Samburu and Baringo 2013-2017	2012		12					**12**
National Environmental Action Plan Framework 2009-2013	2009		17		1			**18**
ASAL National Vision and Strategy 2005-2015 – Natural Resource Management	2005				2			**2**
National Water Quality Management Strategy 2012-2016	2012		2		10		3	**15**
Disaster Risk Reduction Strategy for Kenya 2006-2016 – 'A Resilient and Safer Nation'	2006	35	327		3		47	**412**
National Action Programme – A Framework for Combatting Desertification in Kenya	2002		3		16		5	**24**
National Climate Response Strategy	2010	2	8		2		141	**153**
National Climate Change Response Strategy Action Plan – SC3 National Adaptation Plan	2011		2		4		97	**103**
Kenya Climate Change Action Plan – SC8 Finance	2012				1		570	**571**
Total		**37**	**377**	**0**	**55**	**0**	**883**	

Table 10: Quantitative analysis of the use of DRR, EMR and CCA concepts in strategies.

From the quantitative study of the use of the DRR, EMR and CCA approaches and concepts, it is clear that a lot of advocacy work needs to be done. Only the concept of ecosystem appear more than a handful of times in the eight acts, with the majority of these being in the Environmental Management and Coordination Act (EMCA). The DRR approach has been adopted by two strategies, while the EMR and CCA are non-existing in the 11 selected strategies/plans. While PfR-K cannot alter enacted laws, it can support their enforcement and ensure that the DRR/EMR/CCA approach is considered in the implementation of policy strategies. Based on this and the quantitative analysis, the strategies prioritised for further qualitative analysis and policy advocacy are:

- ENNDA Integrated Regional Development Plan 2010-40
- National Environmental Action Plan Framework 2009-13
- ASAL National Vision and Strategy 2005-15
- National Action Programme – A Framework for Combatting Desertification in Kenya 2002

- National Climate Change Response Strategy Action Plan – National Adaptation Plan 2011

Implementation process

The first step in influencing the implementation process is to identify the key authorities/institutions responsible for the implementation. The space for influencing implementation has increased significantly with the 2010 Constitution as it now is a requirement that government institutions report annually and consult the public when developing and implementing policies and strategies. Moreover, budgets are to be open to the public – both at national and at local level. However, though a good number of policies and legislations are in place, the implementation is not always successfully carried out. The monitoring frameworks are not fully developed and old practices easily take over. It requires a lot of legwork to get access to the right people and key documents, and again good connections to key institutions are crucial. Apart from this, people are seldom aware of their right to have their voices heard and influence policies and budgets, thus awareness creation and capacity building at community level can help strengthening policy advocacy efforts. (Abdi, pers.comm., 05-10-12)

The space for influencing policy implementation has increased significantly with the 2010 Constitution. It is now a requirement that government institutions report annually and consult the public when developing and implementing policies and strategies. Moreover, budgets are supposed to be public – both at national and at local level. However, though a good number of policies and legislative framework is in place, the implementation is not always successfully carried out. The monitoring frameworks are not fully developed and old practices easily take over. It requires a lot of legwork to get access to the right people and key documents, and again good connections to key institutions are crucial. Apart from this, people are seldom aware of their right to have their voices heard and influence policies and budget, so awareness creation and capacity building at community level will also strengthen the policy advocacy efforts of the programme. (Abdi, pers. comm., 5 Oct 2012)

Challenges and opportunities for advocacy

One of the main internal challenges in the PfR-K team is the high staff turnover present in almost all partner organisations. High staff turnover means loss of knowledge and experience, and discontinuation/abruption of programme activities. On the other hand, staff turnover opens the door for new staff to be acquainted with the DRR/EMR/CCA approach, and widens the network and increases knowledge of DRR/EMR/CCA approach outside the partnership. In general, the PfR-K staff comes from many different backgrounds and all have different prerequisites for doing policy advocacy work. While some have worked with advocacy on community level in terms of changing attitudes or creating awareness, others are completely new to the art. Others again have been involved in policy advocacy on national level through other programmes, and one former PfR-K staff member has been deeply involved in policy advocacy in the areas of disaster management and climate change. (Abdi, pers.comm., 05-10-12; Adan, pers.comm., 26-09-12; Arrighi, pers.comm., 27-09-12; Kamau, pers.comm., 03-10-12; Shandey, pers.comm., 27-09-12; Temesgen 2012, pers.comm., 09-10-12). Based on this, high staff turnover offer both challenges and opportunities for advocacy, and there is plenty of space for exploring individual competences and learning from each other. Thus, to ensure that all PfR-K partners are moving in the same direction more capacity building and training in policy advocacy is needed – both at PfR-K team and implementing partner level (Abdi, pers.comm., 05-10-12; Sow, pers.comm., 24-09-12). In this it should be noted that

capacity building does not end with training, but requires processes that ensure good governance structures, increase confidence and ensures deliverance of results (Ndiaye, pers.comm., 24-09-12).

Another internal challenge identified is the fact that most PfR-K staff has other duties and responsibilities. The reduced the efforts and resources that can be put into the programme, (joint) activities are down-prioritised. For instance, the policy analysis responsibilities, which were delegated to the different partners during the July 2012 monthly meeting, have been follow up with actual analysis. This is also partly due to the change of staff in the thematic lead organisation. Likewise, the advocacy activities mentioned in the Communication Plan suggested to take place in September 2012 were not followed up with planning and implementation. One reason for this could be that these activities are implemented jointly, and the responsibility felt by each organisation is reduced. Nevertheless, all PfR-K team members mention joint planning and joint activities as central features and the strength of the partnership, as it allows for all partners to be involved and have a voice at the table. (Abdi, pers.comm., 05-10-12; Arrighi, pers.comm., 28-09-12; Kamau, pers.comm., 03-10-12; Temesgen, pers.comm., 09-10-12). Thus, while joint activities should remain central to the work of the partnership, there is a need for clearer responsibilities, commitment and firm deadlines to ensure delivery.

When it comes to external challenges the 2010 Constitution and upcoming elections in March 2013 are the main challenges. While the elections take a lot of attention and requires many laws to be prioritised and enacted, the Constitution offers a range of opportunities in terms of more community involvement, participation and a new platform for influence: the county level.

Conclusion

Through this review, progress in the PfR-K policy work has been documented and suggestions for the further advocacy work have been presented. While more efforts need to be done to achieve the outcome that the government and other stakeholders support DRR/EMR/CCA in budgeting, policy planning and implementation, there is already now significant progress recorded in behavioural and attitudinal changes. Concerning the advocacy work under activity 3.1.3, three bills, five policies and five policy strategies have been suggested for further analysis and advocacy work. In-depth advocacy work will require good connections in key ministries and continuous engagement. Moreover, awareness creation and advocacy training at local level is crucial to ensure the sustainability of the programme achievements. Finally, the main challenges for PfR-K policy advocacy identified are high staff turnover, other staff duties, and legislative reforms induced by 2010 Constitution and the upcoming elections. However, all of these challenges offer opportunities such as increased networking, dissemination of DRR/EMR/CCA approach, and new platforms for policy dialogue and budget monitoring. In the following, specific recommendations for the further work of PfR-K in policy advocacy are highlighted.

Recommendations

- As neither human nor financial resources are unlimited, the policy advocacy efforts must be concentrated in strategic prioritised areas. Based on their relevance, status and limited use of the DRR, EMR and CCA approaches, three bills, five policies and five policy strategies/plans are suggested for further analysis and focused policy advocacy. These are:
    - o Water Bill 2012
    - o Community Land Bill 2011
    - o National Drought Management Authority Bill 2012
    - o National Wetlands Conservation and Management Policy 2008
    - o Forest Policy 2007
    - o National Livestock Policy 2008
    - o National Policy for the Sustainable Development of ASALs of Kenya 2004
    - o National Environment Policy 2012
    - o ENNDA Integrated Regional Development Plan 2010-40
    - o National Environmental Action Plan Framework 2009-13
    - o ASAL National Vision and Strategy 2005-15
    - o National Action Programme – A Framework for Combatting Desertification in Kenya 2002
    - o National Climate Change Response Strategy Action Plan – National Adaptation Plan 2011
- To ensure the implementation of joint advocacy activities, a detailed advocacy activity plan should be developed by the thematic lead assigning clear responsibilities and firm deadlines. Deadlines should be kept and expectations of fulfilment of tasks should be articulated to ensure delivery and accountability.
- As part of the planning and implementation of joint advocacy activities, advocacy training of PfR-K partners (PfR-K team and implementing partners) as well as the journalist training should be planned and implemented.
- To strengthen voice in policy dialogue, evidence-based advocacy should be enhanced. This includes evidence of programme achievements as well as evidence of environmental degradation e.g. documentation of wetlands encroachment.
- To ensure that no information or opportunities for policy dialogue are overlooked, the development of legislation and policies at national and regional level should be closely monitored.
- To ensure that PfR-K can play a role in legislation and policy formulation and implementation, existing relations to connections in ministries should be nurtured and new relations developed through strategic events and continuous engagement.
- As many people are not aware of their rights under the 2010 Constitution, the advocacy strategy should bear an element of awareness creation and capacity building at community level in the area of policy advocacy.
- To ensure the sustainability of the advocacy efforts after the programme terminates, the implementing partners and CBOs should be engaged in policy advocacy work on national level. This should be further secured by institutionalising policy advocacy through the allocation of human and financial resources in the implementing partners.

References

Literature

Earl, S., Carden, F. & Smutylo, T. (2001): *Outcome Mapping: Building Learning and Reflection into Development Programs*, International Development Research Centre, Ottawa.

EC (2006): *Evaluation Methods for the European Union's External Assistance*, Methodological Bases for Evaluation: 1, Joint Evaluation Unit, European Commission, European Communities, Luxemburg.

Molund, S. & Schill, G. (2004): *Looking Back, Moving Forward - Sida Evaluation Manual*, Sida, Stockholm.

Zarinpoush, F. (2006): *Project Evaluation Guide for Non-Profit Organizations - Fundamental Methods and Steps for Conducting Project Evaluation*, Imagine Canada, Toronto.

Programme documents

KRCS (2012): *KRCS presentation, planning meeting at IFRC offices: Achievements, Gaps and Challenges*, [presentation], Kenya Red Cross Society.

MID-P (2012): *MID-P progress on program implementation*, [presentation], Merti Integrated Development Programme.

NLRC (2012): *NLRC Achievements Sept 2012*, [presentation], Netherlands Red Cross.

PfR (2011): *A New Partnership for Resilience*, [brochure], Partners for Resilience.

PfR-K (2011): *LogFrame PfR Kenya*, [excel file], Partners for Resilience - Kenya.

PfR-K (2012a): *By-Annual Report: January - June 2012*, [programme document], Partners for Resilience - Kenya.

PfR-K (2012b): *Joint Activities Implementation Status* [presentation], Partners for Resilience - Kenya.

PfR-K (2012c): *Minutes of PfR Kenya monthly meeting, Wetlands International Africa - Kenya Office, 12 July 2012*, [meeting minutes], Partners for Resilience - Kenya.

PfR-K (2012d): *PfR Communication Draft*, [programme document], Partners for Resilience - Kenya.

PfR-K (2012e): *Draft PfR Kenya Advocacy Concept/Strategy*, [programme document], Partners for Resilience - Kenya.

PfR-K (2012f): *A New Partnership for Resilience in Kenya*, [brochure], Partners for Resilience - Kenya.

Government/legal documents

ALRMP (2005): *ASAL National Vision and Strategy 2005-2015 – Natural Resource Management*, Arid Lands Resource Management Project, Ministry of State for Special Programmes, Government of Kenya.

ENDDA (2010): *Ewaso Nyiro North Development Authority Integrated Regional Development Plan (ENNDA-IRPD) 2010-2040*, Ewaso Nyiro North Development Authority, Ministry of Regional Development Authorities, Government of Kenya.

Ganya, F.C. (2012): *National Drought Management Authority Bill*, [MP sponsored].

GoK (1963a): *Agriculture Act*, Government of Kenya.

GoK (1963b): *Crop Production and Livestock Act*, Government of Kenya.

GoK (1967a): *Fertilizers and Animal Foodstuffs Act*, Government of Kenya.

GoK (1967b): *Irrigation Act*, Government of Kenya.

GoK (1983): *Pest Control Products Act*, Government of Kenya.

GoK (1986): *Public Health Act*, Government of Kenya.

GoK (1989): *Ewaso Nyiro North River Basin Development Act*, Government of Kenya.

GoK (1991): *Fisheries Act*, Government of Kenya.

GoK (1999): *Environmental Management and Coordination Act*, Government of Kenya, National Council for Law Reporting, Nairobi.

GoK (2002): *Water Act*, Government of Kenya.

GoK (2005): *Forest Act*, Government of Kenya.

GoK (2006): *Energy Act*, Government of Kenya.

GoK (2009a): *Wildlife (Conservation and Management) Act*, Government of Kenya, National Council for Law Reporting.

GoK (2009b): *Land Adjudication Act*, Government of Kenya, National Council for Law Reporting.

GoK (2010a): *Land Acquisition Act*, Government of Kenya, National Council for Law Reporting.

GoK (2010b): *Constitution of Kenya*, Government of Kenya, National Council for Law Reporting, Nairobi, Kenya.

GoK (2010c): *Local Government Act*, Government of Kenya, National Council for Law Reporting.

GoK (2010d): *Land Consolidation Act*, Government of Kenya, National Council for Law Reporting.

GoK (2010e): *Land Control Act*, Government of Kenya, National Council for Law Reporting.

GoK (2010f): *Land (Group Representatives) Act*, Government of Kenya, National Council for Law Reporting.

GoK (2011a): *Tourism Act*, Government of Kenya.

GoK (2011b): *Community Land Bill*, Government of Kenya.

GoK (2011c): *Environment and Land Court Act*, Government of Kenya.

GoK (2012a): *Land Registration Act*, Government of Kenya, Kenya Gazette Supplement, The Government Printer, Nairobi, Kenya.

GoK (2012b): *Land Act*, Government of Kenya, National Council for Law Reporting.

GoK (2012c): *County Government Act*, Government of Kenya.

GoK (2012d): *National Land Commission Act*, Government of Kenya.

Kaino, B. (2011): *Wildlife (Conservation and Management) Bill*, [MP sponsored].

LTS International, Acclimatise & CDKN (2011): *National Climate Change Response Strategy Action Plan – SC3 National Adaptation Plan*, LTS International, Acclimatise, Climate and Development Knowledge Network.

Ministry of Agriculture, et al. (2010): *Agricultural Sector Development Strategy 2010-2020*, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Lands, Ministry of Livestock Development, Ministry of Fisheries Development, Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources, Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife, Ministry of Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Areas, Ministry of Cooperative Development, Government of Kenya.

Ministry of Energy (2012): *National Energy Policy*, Ministry of Energy, Government of Kenya.

Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources (2002): *National Action Programme – A Framework for Combatting Desertification in Kenya*, National Environment Secretariat, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, Government of Kenya.

Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources (2008): *National Wetlands Conservation and*

Management, Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources, Government of Kenya.

Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources (2010): *National Climate Response Strategy*, Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources, Government of Kenya.

Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources (2012): *National Environment Policy*, Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources, Government of Kenya.

Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources & Ministry of Finance (2012): *Kenya Climate Change Action Plan – SC8 Finance*, Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources, Ministry of Finance, Government of Kenya.

Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (2007): *Forest Policy*, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, Government of Kenya.

Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife (2011): *Wildlife Policy*, Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife, Government of Kenya.

Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development (2005): *Kenya Fisheries Policy*, Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development, Government of Kenya.

Ministry of Livestock Development (2008): *National Livestock Policy*, Ministry of Livestock Development, Government of Kenya.

Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife (2006): *National Tourism Policy*, Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife, Government of Kenya.

Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife (2007): *Wildlife Policy*, Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife, Government of Kenya.

Ministry of Water and Irrigation (2007): *National Water Services Strategy*, Ministry of Water and Irrigation, Government of Kenya.

Ministry of Water and Irrigation (2009): *Ministerial Strategic Plan 2009-2012 – 'Water for All'*, Ministry of Water and Irrigation, Government of Kenya.

Ministry of Water and Irrigation (2012a): *National Water Policy*, Ministry of Water and Irrigation, Government of Kenya.

Ministry of Water and Irrigation (2012): *National Water Quality Management Strategy 2012-2016*, Department of Water Resources, Ministry of Water and Irrigation, Government of Kenya.

MoSSP (2004): *National Policy for the Sustainable Development of ASALs of Kenya*, Ministry of State for Special Programmes, Office of the President, Government of Kenya.

MoSSP (2006): *Disaster Risk Reduction Strategy for Kenya 2006-2016 – 'A Resilient and Safer Nation'*, Department for Disaster Risk Reduction, Ministry of State for Special Programmes, Office of the President, Government of Kenya.

MoSSP (2008): *Strategic Plan 2008-2012 – 'Building Resilient Communities in Kenya'*, Ministry of State for Special Programmes, Office of the President, Government of Kenya.

MoSSP (2009a): *National Disaster Management Policy* Ministry of State for Special Programmes, Office of the President, Government of Kenya,.

MoSSP (2009b): *National Policy for Disaster Management in Kenya*, Ministry of State for Special Programmes, Office of the President, Government of Kenya.

NEMA (2009a): *National Environment Action Plan - Framework*, National Environment Management Authority, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, Government of Kenya, Nairobi.

NEMA (2009b): *Samburu District Environment Action Plan 2009-2013*, National Environment Management Authority, Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources, Government of Kenya.

NEMA (2011): *National Guidelines for Strategic Environmental Assessment in Kenya*, National Environment Management Authority, Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources, Government of Kenya.

Ng'ong'o, J.M. (2012): *Water Bill*, [MP sponsored].

Ottichilo, W. (2012): *Climate Change Authority Bill*, [MP sponsored], Kenya Gazette Supplement, The Government Printer, Nairobi, Kenya.

Provincial Directorate Rift Valley (2012): *County Livestock Development Plan for Turkana, West Pokot, Samburu and Baringo 2013-2017*, Provincial Directorate, Rift Valley, Government of Kenya.

The National Economic and Social Council of Kenya, et al. (2007): *Vision 2030*, The National Economic and Social Council of Kenya, Office of the President, The Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Planning and National Development, Government of Kenya.

Personal communication/interviews

Abdi, S. (2012): *Interview about PfR partnership and CPDRR programme*, [interview] (personal communication, Nairobi, 5 October 2012).

Adan, M. (2012): *Interview about PfR partnership and CPDRR programme*, [interview] (personal communication, Nairobi, 26 September 2012).

Arrighi, J. (2012): *Interview about PfR partnership and CPDRR programme*, [interview] (personal communication, Nairobi, 27 September 2012).

Kamau, P. (2012a): *Interview about PfR partnership and CPDRR programme*, [interview] (personal communication, Nairobi, 3 October 2012).

Kamau, P. (2012b): *Discussion on progress on passing of laws and policies*, [conversation] (personal communication, Nairobi, August 2012).

Ndiaye, A. (2012): *Interview about PfR partnership and CPDRR programme*, [interview] (personal communication, Nairobi, 24 September 2012).

Shandey, A. (2012): *Interview about PfR partnership and CPDRR programme*, [interview] (personal communication, Nairobi, 27 September 2012).

Sow, F. (2012): *Interview about PfR partnership and CPDRR programme*, [interview] (personal communication, Nairobi, 24 September 2012).

Temesgen, S. (2012): *Interview about PfR partnership and CPDRR programme*, [interview] (personal communication, Nairobi, 9 October 2012).

Internet sources

CIC (2012): *Mandate*, Commission for the Implementation of the Constitution, webpage: http://www.cickenya.org/mandate, accessed 08-10-2012.

NCLR (2012): *Kenya Law Reports: The legisltive process*, National Council for Law Reporting, http://www.kenyalaw.org/klr/index.php?id=112, accessed 08-10-2012.

RCCC (2012): *Partners for Resilience*, Red Cross/Red Crescent Climate Centre, webpage: http://www.climatecentre.org/site/partners-for-resilience, accessed 04-10-2012.

Appendices

Appendix I: Terms of Reference

Appendix II: LogFrame

Appendix III: Data collection plan

Appendix IV: Stakeholder interviews

Appendix V: Outcome Mapping analysis

Appendix VI: List of legislation and policies

Appendix I: Terms of Reference

Inge-Merete Hougaard
Lund University

5 September 2012

Terms of Reference
Review of the PfR programme *Climate-Proof Disaster Risk Reduction*, Kenya

Summary

Programme:	Climate-Proof Disaster Risk Reduction
Programme location:	Ewaso Nyiro North River Basin, Kenya
Implementing partners:	Partners for Resilience – Kenya
Review purpose:	Identify areas of influence for PfR in policy-making and policy implementation process within the areas of climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction and ecosystems management.
Methodology:	Desk research, interviews, etc.
Review start and end dates:	10 September 2012 –10 October 2012
Expected review report release date:	5 November 2012

Purpose and objectives

The purpose of this review is to support the policy advocacy work in the Climate-Proof Disaster Risk Reduction Programme (CPDRRP), and identify areas of influence for the Partners for Resilience (PfR) in the policy-making and policy implementation process. This will be done through a review of the legal framework in the areas of climate change adaptation (CCA), disaster risk reduction (DRR) and ecosystems management and restoration (EMR) in Kenya, including strategies and policies at all government levels. The review aims to assess the status and the implementation strategy of the different acts, bills and policies, as well as the institutional arrangements to secure the implementation. The objective is to identify areas of influence in both the policy-making process and in the implementation where PfR can play an active role and lobby for the inclusion of CCA, EMR and DRR. In addition, the CPDRRP policy advocacy strategy as set out in the LogFrame, the advocacy strategy and the communication strategy will be reviewed along with the policy advocacy activities to date to outline achievements, and recommendations for further work in the area will be proposed.

Intervention background

The Partners for Resilience (PfR) is an alliance of five Dutch-based humanitarian, development and environmental organisations that bring together their expertise in the fields of DRR, CCA and EMR. The PfR consist of the Netherlands Red Cross (NLRC), The Catholic Organisation for Relief and Development Aid (Cordaid), CARE Netherlands, Red Cross/Red Crescent Climate Centre (RCCC) and Wetlands International (WI). PfR is supporting communities to become more resilient to disasters by implementing the Climate-Proof Disaster Risk Reduction Programme (CPDRRP) in nine countries: Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mali, Nicaragua, Philippines and Uganda. The programme will run from 1 January 2011 to 31 December 2015, and is supported by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

In Kenya the CPDRRP is implemented in Ewaso Nyiro North River Basin through the local partners Kenya Red Cross Society (KRCS) and Merti Integrated Development Programme (MID-P) (CARE Netherlands is not part of the country team in Kenya). The programme aims at increasing resilience of vulnerable communities to address increased disaster risks, effects of climate change

1

Inge-Merete Hougaard   5 September 2012
Lund University

and environmental degradation. The goal is to break the vicious cycle of disaster-emergency response-disaster by combining the three approaches CCA, EMR and DRR. The programme objectives are:

1. To increase the resilience of communities to the impact of disasters, climate change and environmental degradation.
2. To enhance the capacity of civil society organisations to apply CCA, EMR and DRR measures and conduct policy dialogue.
3. To make the institutional environmental from international to grass-root level more conducive to use CCA, EMR and DRR approaches.

The programme employs three intervention strategies, each linked to one of the specific objectives:

1. Strengthening community resilience.
2. Strengthening civil society.
3. Policy dialogue and advocacy for stronger DRR/CCA policies at all levels.

In addition to the three intervention strategies, the programme employs two cross-cutting themes – Monitoring & Evaluation and Linking & Learning – to ensure learning and advancement internally in the partnership as well as externally.

This review will focus on the third intervention strategy, *policy dialogue and advocacy*. The intervention logic of this intervention strategy is outlined in the table below:

Logic for intervention strategy 3: *Policy dialogue and advocacy*

Activities	Output	Outcome
Advocacy training and development of advocacy strategy and action plan	Increased lobby and advocacy by CSOs/CBOs on integration of PfR approaches in government and other stakeholder policies and practices	Government, regional authorities, counties, CSOs, donors and communities support DRR/CCA/EMR in budgeting, policy planning and implementation
Journalist training on PfR approach		
Lobby and policy dialogue of stakeholders		
Establishment of Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North forum for advocacy and lobby activities		
Facilitate implementation of Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North action plan		
Capacity building		
Documentation of data gathered during programme for use in lobbying		

The review will focus on mapping the area of influence for policy dialogue and advocacy to support the further lobby and advocacy work. Moreover, completed activities will be reviewed to determine achievements and outline recommendations for further work.

Evaluation questions

The review will focus on the following questions:

- What government acts, bills and policies exist in the areas of CCA, DRR and EMR in Kenya and what is their current status?

2

- What are the implementation strategies and are there clear institutional arrangements to secure the implementation?
- What are the procedures and structures for government law- and policy-making, and what mechanisms exist for PfR to influence these?
- How can PfR influence the implementation of government policies to be conducive to DRR, CCA and EMR approaches?
- What CPDRRP policy advocacy activities have taken place and what are the lessons learned?
- To what extent is the CPDRRP policy advocacy strategy as set out in the LogFrame, the advocacy strategy and the communication strategy in line with the findings from above questions, and how can they be better reflected?

Recommendations and lessons

This review is expected to result in recommendations on where PfR can enter into policy dialogue with government entities in the legislation process to lobby for the inclusion of CCA, EMR and DRR, and on how PfR can influence the implementation of policies. Moreover, the review is expected to propose ideas on how the CPDRRP policy advocacy strategy can incorporate the findings from the study.

Methodology

The review will mainly be based on desk research and document review (government acts, bills, policies and CPDRRP documents) supplemented by stakeholder interviews (PfR staff and, if possible, government entities). The data collection will be constrained by the limited timeframe and challenges of getting access to key government entities. Furthermore, the review bears a risk of bias due to my limited knowledge of the Kenyan society, and the fact that it is not possible to get inputs from all stakeholders. Moreover, the scope of the review is limited to focus only on the third intervention strategy (*policy dialogue and advocacy*), and will thus not draw any concluding remarks on the overall performance of the programme.

Work plan and schedule

The review will be conducted in the weeks 37-41. Interviews with PfR staff will be conducted in week 39-40, while the remaining time will be focussed on desk research, document reviews and draft report writing. The review will take place along with other programme activities.

Reporting

The review will result in a 4000 words draft report, which will be presented to PfR in mid-October 2012. From here the stakeholders have the opportunity of giving feedback and input to the review report, before the final report will be delivered 5 November 2012. The format of the report will be based on the Sida Evaluation Manual (2004) when applicable.

Inge-Merete Hougaard   Sirak Abebe Temesgen
Student, Lund University   Netherlands Red Cross (PfR Kenya lead)

3

Appendix II: LogFrame

Target group/ Intervention Area	Output	Output Indicators	Outcome	Outcome Indicators
Direct Poverty Alleviation Communities	1.1communities able to identify, plan and implement risk reduction measures based on community risk assessment / VCA.	1.1.a. # Communities conducted community risk assessment / VCA (2011 = ….)	1. Communities are more resilient to climate induced hazards	1.a. # mitigation measures have been implemented per community (2015 = 3 per community on average)
		1.1.b. # communities developed collective risk reduction plans based on community risk assessment / VCA. (2011- 2013 = ….)		1.b. All community mitigation measures satisfy PfR environmental sustainability criteria (2015 = %)
		1.1.c. # of community members covered by risk plans (2015 = ….)		1.c. # community members reached with DRR/CCA/EMR activities (2015 = 75,000 of which …… men and …… women)
		1.1.d. # of community projects identified and implemented by 2015.		
	1. 2. Communities are capable to protect and adapt their livelihoods in synergy with the natural environment	1.2.a. # Community members (committees) trained in DRR, ecosystem management and CCA (2015 = ….)		
		1.2.b. # community members have undertaken actions to adapt their livelihoods (2015 = ….)		
ACTIVITIES				Risk & Assumptions Strategic Direction 1
1.1.1.	Identify and mobilise communities			1. Political stability, 2. Communities' willingness, 3. Support by all stakeholders
1.1.2.	Conduct community risk assessment / VCA			
1.1.3.	Provide feedback on findings and facilitate communities to develop action plans			
1.1.4.	Support community action plans			
1.2.1.	Training of selected communities on DRR, CCA and EMR approaches			
1.2.2.	Support community awareness campaigns on DRR, CCA and EMR			
1.2.3	Support community actions in livelihood adptation			
Civil Society Strengthening Southern Partners/ CBOs	2.1. 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	2.1.a. # of PfR partners and non PfR partners staff trained on DRR/CCA/EMR approaches. (2014 = ….)	2. (Partner) NGOs/ CBOs apply DRR/CCA/EMR in their interventions and advocacy with communities and government institutions.	2.a. # Partner NGOs/CBOs facilitating access to knowledge on disaster trends, climate projections, ecosystem data in the target communities (2014 = ….)
		2.1.b. # (Partner) NGO/CBOs (e.g. MID-P, KRCS, WI -Kenya and its local community reps, Local Water Users Associations) in Ewaso Nyiro Basin have established cooperation with knowledge & resource organizations (e.g Arid Lands (FEWS-Net), ENNDA, AWF, RCCC interns, KWSTI,) (2014 = ….)		2.b. # Network/umbrella organisations, developed and active (2015 = ….)
				2.c. % of Partner NGOs/CBOs engaged in structured dialogue with government and other stakeholders on DRR/CCA/EMR (2014 = 80%

	2.2. 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)	2.2.a. # organisations (PfR and non PfR in Ewaso Nyiro Basin (e.g. DSG, AWF Isiolo branch, Arid lands, ENNDA, NWSB) involved in DRR/CCA/EMR coalitions. (2014 = ….) 2.2.b. # of times DRR/CCA/EMR related topics are on agenda of platforms/ networks (e.g. DSG, FBOs platforms, District NGO coordination board, DO and chiefs meetings) (2014 = ….)		
ACTIVITIES				Risk & Assumptions Strategic Direction 2
2.1.1.	Training of partner (PfR) organisations on DRR/CCA/EMR approaches			
2.1.2	Training of non PfR (e.g. Government institutions, schools, organised groups) on DRR/CCA/EMR approaches and other skills (e.g. advocay and fund raising)			
2.1.3.	Adapt/enrich current training material (Ecosystem, CCA etc)			
2.1.4	Field visits/exchange visits			
2.1.5	Documentation of best practices (e.g. through learning forums, etc)			
2.1.6	Adaptation of technical information into locally understandable IEC materials (e.g. bill boards, pictures and local language)			
Advocacy of CSOs/CBOs on Governments/ Institutions	3.1 Increased lobby and advocacy by CSOs/CBOs on integration of PfR approaches in Government and other stakeholders policies and practice	3.1.a # Governments/ institutions reached with advocacy activities by Civil Society and their networks and platforms (2015 = ….)	3. Government, regional authorities, counties, CSOs, donors and communities support DRR/CCA/EMR in budgeting, policy planning and implementation	*3.a. # of processes started to reduce identified national and local institutional obstacles to DRR/CCA/EMR activities in the communities (e.g. non-communication between departments, obstructive laws, concessions to private parties) (2015 = ….)*
		3.1.b # of institutions in the counties (Isiolo, Laikipia and Wajir) engaged in DRR, CCA and EMR activities and policy discussions (2015 = ….)		3.b. % of increased local government budgets in target areas on either early warning, mitigation of natural hazards and/or natural resource mgt on community level (2015 = 100% increase)
		3.1.c. # of official government/donors documents that explicitly mention DRR, CCA and EMR (2015 = x)		3.c. # of national lobby trajectories towards governance bodies and donors that have started to undo adverse impact for DRR/CCA/EMR (2015 = ….)
ACTIVITIES				Risk & Assumptions Strategic Direction 3
3.1.1.	Pfr partners advocacy training and development of advocacy strategy and action plan			
3.1.2.	Journalist training and exposure on Pfr approach and issues of the region			
3.1.3	Lobby and policy dialogue of targeted stakeholders			
3.1.4	Establish a Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North forum to carry out advocacy and lobby activities			
3.1.5	Facilitate implementation of Friends of Ewaso Nyiro North forum action plan			
3.1.6	Capacity building and peer to peer dialogue initiatives (Learning visits between upstream and downstream communities/ Exposure visits by parliamentarians/Use of theater and exhibitions/Community radio)			
3.1.7	Documentation/dissemination of data gathered through programme for use in lobbying including policy briefs etc. (Communication of documented knowledge base through printed materials, website articles, videos – external stakeholders/policymakers/donors)			

(PfR-K 2011)

Appendix III: Data collection plan

Week	Location	Activity
Previously	Nairobi	Observations and personal communications
Week 37	Nairobi	Review policies and legislation.
	Nyahururu	Explore implementation of policies and legislation.
Week 38	Nairobi	Review policies and legislation.
		Review programme documentation.
Week 39	Nairobi	Review policies and legislation.
		Review programme documentation.
		Interview staff from WIA, KRCS, MID-P and RCCC.
Week 40	Nairobi	Interview staff from WI and Cordaid.
		Review programme documentation.
		Review policies and legislation.
Week 41	Nairobi	Interview staff from NLRC.
		Write report.
Week 42		*Vacation*
Week 43	Nairobi	Present report and receive feedback from PfR-K partners.
Week 44	Nairobi	Receive feedback from PfR-K partners.
Week 45	Nairobi	Deliver final review report.

Appendix IV: Stakeholder interviews

Name	Organisation	Date of interview
Abdi, Safia	Cordaid	05-10-2012
Adan, Malik	Kenya Red Cross Society	26-09-2012
Arrighi, Julie	Red Cross/Red Crescent Climate Centre	28-09-2012
Kamau, Peter	Wetlands International Africa – Kenya Office	03-10-2012
Ndiaye, Abdoulaye	Wetlands International Africa – Regional Office (Senegal)	24-09-2012
Shandey, Abdullahi	Merti Integrated Development Programme	27-09-2012
Sow, Fatima	Wetlands International Africa – Regional Office (Senegal)	24-09-2012
Temesgen, Sirak	Netherlands Red Cross	09-10-2012

Appendix V: Outcome Mapping analysis

Programme framework: CPDRR programme – policy advocacy component	
Vision: *The DRR/EMR/CCA approach is proven to significantly boost resilience i.e. increase the ability of communities to withstand shocks to their immediate environment.*	
Mission: *Government, regional authorities, counties, CSOs, donors and communities support DRR/CCA/EMR in budgeting, policy planning and implementation.*	
Boundary partner	**Outcome challenge**
Intermediary institutions: Implementing partners (KRCS and MID-P) and community organisations (WRUAs, community councils, etc.).	Implementing partners and CBOs embrace, apply and advocate for the DRR/EMR/CCA approach in their networks.
Beneficiaries: 13 communities identified by MID-P and KRCS.	Communities embrace, support and advocate for the DRR/EMR/CCA approach.
Gatekeepers/development agents: Other NGOs working in the area, government institutions (local government (district, county), lead agencies (WRMA, KWS, KFS, ENNDA) and ministries (Agriculture, Water and Irrigation, Environment and Mineral Resources, Forestry and Wildlife, …)), private sector (tourism, forestry, fisheries, farmers).	Other NGOs, government institutions and the private sector endorse the DRR/EMR/CCA approach in their work, policy development and implementation.
Applied research community: knowledge institutions (universities, research centres) and media.	Knowledge institutions and media direct their research and awareness creation towards the DRR/EMR/CCA approach.

(Inspired by Earl et al. 2001:41-43)

Progress markers for communities in policy advocacy		
Outcome challenge: *Communities embrace, support and advocate for the DRR/EMR/CCA approach.*		
Expect to see:		**Progress**
1	Supporting the establishment of FENN	○○○
Like to see:		**Progress**
2	Participating in trainings in policy dialogue	○○○
3	Engaging in policy dialogue at local level	○○○
Love to see:		**Progress**
4	Engaging with local government (district/county) officials to influence budgeting and action plan in disaster management and resilience	○○○
5	Influencing other NGOs operating in the area to incorporate the DRR/EMR/CCA approach	✔○○
6	Influencing national policy through networks and mobilisation	○○○

(Inspired by Earl et al. 2001:53-59)

Progress markers for other NGOs, government institutions and private sector in policy advocacy	
Outcome challenge: *Other NGOs, government institutions and private sector endorse the DRR/EMR/CCA approach in their work, policy development and implementation.*	

	Expect to see:	**Progress**
1	Showing interest in and willingness to hear about DRR/EMR/CAA approach	✔○○
2	Supporting the establishment of FENN	○○○
3	Pushing for the enactment of pending legislation and policies	○○○
4	Giving space for communities and CBOs to participate in policy formulation	✔○○
5	Involving communities and CBOs in implementation of policies	○○○
	Like to see:	**Progress**
6	Incorporating DRR in county planning and coordinating disaster/drought at county level	○○○
7	Allocating appropriate funding for disaster management and resilience strengthening including through contingency fund	○○○
8	Ensuring the implementation of policies and legislation	○○○
9	Cooperating with PfR-K partners to integrate the DRR/EMR/CCA approach in work and policies	○○○
10	Adopting the DRR/EMR/CCA approach locally and regionally	○○○
	Love to see:	**Progress**
11	Adopting the DRR/EMR/CCA approach nationally	○○○
12	Ensuring that the Equalisation Fund will be shared among marginalised counties and finance community resilience	○○○
13	Sharing experiences nationally and internationally	○○○

(Inspired by Earl et al. 2001:53-59)

Progress markers for knowledge institutions and media in policy advocacy	
Outcome challenge: *Knowledge institutions and media direct their research and awareness creation towards the DRR/EMR/CCA approach.*	

	Expect to see:	**Progress**
1	Show interest in and willingness to hear about DRR/EMR/CAA approach	✔○○
2	Increase awareness about the existence of the DRR/EMR/CAA approach	
	Like to see:	**Progress**
3	Supporting the promotion of DRR/EMR/CCA approach locally and regionally	○○○
4	Directing their research and awareness creation towards the DRR/EMR/CCA approach	○○○
	Love to see:	**Progress**
5	Supporting the promotion of DRR/EMR/CCA approach nationally and internationally	○○○

(Inspired by Earl et al. 2001:53-59)

Strategy map for communities			
Strategy	**Causal**	**Persuasive**	**Supportive**
Aimed at individual/group	I-1	I-2	I-3
		Policy advocacy training Capacity building on policy advocacy	Establish FENN

Aimed at surrounding environment	E-1	E-2	E-3
	Policy advocacy and budget monitoring.		

(Inspired by Earl et al. 2001:62-63)

Strategy map for other NGOs, government institutions and private sector			
Strategy	**Causal**	**Persuasive**	**Supportive**
Aimed at individual/group	I-1	I-2	I-3
	Produce and circulate policy briefs	Lobbying and policy advocacy Organising round tables	Linking with research institutions
Aimed at surrounding environment	E-1	E-2	E-3
	Policy advocacy and budget monitoring.	Brochures about PfR produced and distributed Launching the PfR Documentation of PfR case stories Participate in national and international events Update website with PfR stories	Networking to promote the DRR/EMR/CCA approach

(Inspired by Earl et al. 2001:62-63)

Strategy map for knowledge institutions and media			
Strategy	**Causal**	**Persuasive**	**Supportive**
Aimed at individual/group	I-1	I-2	I-3
		Journalist training on PfR approach	Establish close links with at least three local, five national and two international journalists/media houses. Engage with research institutions
Aimed at surrounding environment	E-1	E-2	E-3
	Policy advocacy and budget monitoring	Brochures about PfR produced and distributed Produce and circulate policy briefs Documentation of PfR case stories Participate in national and international events Update website with PfR stories	

(Inspired by Earl et al. 2001:62-63)

Appendix VI: List of legislation and policies

Laws and policies in bold are shortlisted for policy advocacy at the development stage. Laws and strategies in italics and bold are shortlisted for policy advocacy at the implementation stage.

Legislation	Sponsor	Dated	Status
Governance			
Constitution of Kenya	Minister for Justice	27/08/2010	Enacted
County Government Act	Deputy Prime Minister; Minister for Local Government	19/06/2012	Enacted (in effect after 2013 elections)
Ewaso Ngiro North River Basin Development Authority Act	–	01/12/1989	Enacted
Local Government Act	–	Revised 2010 (1998)	Enacted
Livelihoods			
Agriculture Act	–	18/06/1963	Enacted
Crop Production and Livestock Act	–	1963	Enacted
Fertilisers and Animal Foodstuff Act	–	04/08/1967	Enacted
Pest Control Products Act	–	19/05/1983	Enacted
Irrigation Act	–	Revised 1967	Enacted
Fisheries Act	–	01/01/1991	Enacted
Tourism Act	Minister for Tourism	16/09/2011	Enacted
Public Health Act	–	1986	Enacted
Natural resource management			
Environment Management and Coordination Act	–	1999	Enacted
Water Act	–	17.10.02	Enacted
Water Bill	MP John Mbadi Ng'ong'o	01.03.12	Awaiting first reading
Land Adjudication Act	–	Revised 2009 (1977)	Enacted
Land Consolidation Act	–	Revised 2010 (1977)	Enacted
Land Control Act	–	Revised 2010 (1989)	Enacted
Land (Group Representatives) Act	–	Revised 2010 (1970)	Enacted
Trust Land Act	–	Revised 2010 (1970)	Enacted
Community Land Bill	–	2011	Awaiting first reading
Environment and Land Court Act	Minister for Lands	25.08.11	Enacted
National Land Commission Act	Minister for Lands	25.04.12	Enacted
Land Act	Minister for Lands	26.04.12	Enacted
Land Registration Act	Minister for Lands	25.04.12	Enacted
Forest Act	Minister for Environment and Natural Resources	04.08.05	Enacted
Energy Act	Minister for Energy	30.12.06	Enacted
Wildlife (Conservation and Management) Act	–	Revised 2009 (1985)	Enacted
Wildlife (Conservation and Management) Bill	MP Boaz Kaino	July 2011	Awaiting second reading
National Drought Management Authority Bill	MP Francis Chachu Ganya	05.09.12	Awaiting third reading

Climate Change Authority Bill	MP Dr. Wilbur Ottichilo	18.06.12	Awaiting first reading

Policy	Authority	Dated	Status
Governance			
National Policy for the Sustainable Development of Arid and Semi-Arid Lands of Kenya	Ministry of State for Special Programmes, Office of the President	2004	Draft
Vision 2030	The National Economic and Social Council of Kenya, Office of the President; The Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Planning and National Development	2007	'The popular version'
Strategic Plan 2008-2012 – 'Building Resilient Communities in Kenya'	Ministry of State for Special Programmes, Office of the President	2008	–
Ewaso Nyiro North Development Authority Integrated Regional Development Plan (ENNDA-IRPD) 2010-2040	Ewaso Nyiro North Development Authority, Ministry of Regional Development Authorities	2010	–
Livelihoods			
Agricultural Sector Development Strategy 2010-2020	Ministry of Agriculture; Ministry of Lands; Ministry of Livestock Development; Ministry of Fisheries Development; Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources; Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation; Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife Ministry of Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Areas; Ministry of Cooperative Development;	2010	
National Livestock Policy	Ministry of Livestock Development	2008	Session paper no. 2
County Livestock Development Plan for Turkana, West Pokot, Samburu and Baringo 2013-2017	Provincial Directorate, Livestock Production, Rift Valley; Provincial Directorate, Veterinary Services, Rift Valley	2012	–
Kenya Fisheries Policy	Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development (today: Ministry of Fisheries Development)	2005	Draft
National Tourism Policy	Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife (today: Ministry of Tourism)	2006	Final draft
Natural resource management			
National Environmental Action Plan Framework 2009-2013	National Environment Management Authority, Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources	2009	–
ASAL National Vision and Strategy 2005-2015 – Natural Resource Management	Arid Lands Resource Management Project, Ministry of State for Special Programmes	2005	–
Samburu District Environment Action	National Environment Management	2009	–

Plan 2009-2013	Authority, Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources		
National Guidelines for Strategic Environmental Assessment in Kenya	National Environment Management Authority, Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources	2011	Revised
National Environment Policy	Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources	2012	Revised draft no. 4
National Water Services Strategy	Ministry of Water and Irrigation	2007	–
Ministerial Strategic Plan 2009-2012 – 'Water for All'	Ministry of Water and Irrigation	2009	–
National Water Policy	Ministry of Water and Irrigation	2012	Draft
National Water Quality Management Strategy 2012-2016	Department of Water Resources, Ministry of Water and Irrigation	2012	
National Wetlands Conservation and Management Policy	Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources	2008	Final draft (revised); sessional paper
Forest Policy	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	2007	Sessional paper no. 1
National Energy Policy	Ministry of Energy	2012	Third draft
Wildlife Policy	National Wildlife Policy Steering Committee and Secretariat, Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife	2007	Final draft (repealed for the 2011 version)
Wildlife Policy	Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife	2011	Draft
National Climate Response Strategy	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	2010	Executive brief
National Climate Change Response Strategy Action Plan – SC3 National Adaptation Plan	LTS International; Acclimatise; Climate and Development Knowledge Network	2011	Inception report
Kenya Climate Change Action Plan – SC8 Finance	Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources; Ministry of Finance	2012	Final reports and annexes
National Action Programme – A Framework for Combatting Desertification in Kenya	National Environment Secretariat, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	2002	–
Disaster Risk Reduction Strategy for Kenya 2006-2016 – 'A Resilient and Safer Nation'	Department for Disaster Risk Reduction, Ministry of State for Special Programmes	2006	–
National Policy for Disaster Management in Kenya	Ministry of State for Special Programmes, Office of the President	2009	Draft
National Disaster Management Policy	Ministry of State for Special Programmes, Office of the President	2009	Final draft