



Evaluation of the World Bank's Arid Lands Resource  
Management Project – Natural Resources and Drought  
Management Component for the identification and preparation  
of the Danish support to a Natural Resource Management  
Programme (2010 – 2015)

Ben Watkins and Margaret Mwangi

Submitted to DANIDA

17<sup>th</sup> March, 2009

Kimetrica Limited  
PO Box 1327 Village Market  
Nairobi 00621

Phone: +1.703.635.7976

Fax: +254 (0) 726 879 840

Email: [info@kimetrica.org](mailto:info@kimetrica.org) or [ben.watkins@kimetrica.org](mailto:ben.watkins@kimetrica.org)

Kimetrica specializes in results-based management and knowledge solutions.

[www.kimetrica.org](http://www.kimetrica.org)

VAT: 0158862B. PIN: P051185575J. Registration No: 124784

## Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	The ASAL Challenges	4
1.2	Background to the Report	5
1.3	Methodology	6
2	Strategic Fit of DANIDA Areas of Focus and ALRMP	7
3	Review of the Project's Execution Modalities	8
3.1	Overview of ALRMP Finances	8
3.2	NRM Financing	8
3.3	Funding Mechanisms	9
3.4	Monitoring and Evaluation	13
3.5	Coordination Structures	14
4	Investment Analysis by Component	15
4.1	Drought Management Component	15
4.1.1	Early Warning System	15
4.1.2	Training	15
4.1.3	Conflict Management	16
4.1.4	Micro Project Investments	16
4.1.5	The KACCAL Project	17
4.2	Community Driven Development	17
5	Summary of Recommendations on Future Directions	19
5.1	The Focus of Possible DANIDA Support	19
5.2	Phase-out Strategy	19
5.3	Coordination between DANIDA and World Bank in the ALRMP	20
5.4	Possible Technical Assistance for ALRMP	20
Annex 1:	Note on Conflict Management	22
Annex 2:	Quantitative Analysis of Funding Gaps	24
Annex 3:	SWOT Analysis for Early Warning	26
Annex 4:	SWOT Analysis for Monitoring and Evaluation	26
Annex 5:	SWOT analysis for Structures and Institutions	27
Annex 6:	SWOT Analysis for Natural Resource Management	28
Annex 7:	Documents Reviewed for the Assignment	31

## ACRONYMS

ALRMP	Arid Lands Resource Management project
ASAL	Arid and Semi arid areas
CAP	Community Action Plan
CAP	Community Action Plan
CDD	Community driven development
CDF	Constituency Development Fund
CDO	Community Development Officer
CPMU	Central Planning and Monitoring Unit
DCU	District Coordination Unit
DEMC	District Environmental Management Committee
DM	Drought Management
DMO	Drought Management Officer
DSG	District Steering Group
GEF	Global Environmental Fund
IGA	Income Generating Activity
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
KFSM	Kenya Food Security Meeting
KFSSG	Kenya Food Security Steering Group
KNBS	Kenya National Bureau of Statistics
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MET	Mobile Extension Team
MIS	Management Information System
NR	Natural Resource
NRM	Natural Resource Management
PCU	Project coordination Unit
PICD	Participatory Integrated Community Development
PRA	Participatory rural appraisal
SCCF	Special Climate Change Fund
SWAP	Sector Wide Approach to Programming
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 The ASAL Challenges

The Arid and Semi Arid Lands (ASALs) of Kenya include the poorest and most food insecure populations in Kenya. The ASALS have a history of political marginalisation and economic isolation, reflected in low levels of public and commercial investment, and a dilapidated infrastructure. The absolute poverty in these areas in 1994 was estimated to be at 64%<sup>1</sup>, but increased to 74% in 2005/2006, although the Kenyan economy as a whole grew in that period. In Turkana District, for example, poverty and malnutrition rates are the highest in Kenya. Episodes of drought and insecurity compound problems of acute food insecurity and emergency food aid has been distributed in the ASAL districts in nine of the past ten years.

The natural resource base of these districts is limited, although they account for 84% of Kenya's land mass of approximately 370,000 km<sup>2</sup>. The majority of ASAL residents depend on livestock production for their livelihood and the annual turnover of the livestock industry is estimated at Ksh 10 billion<sup>2</sup>. In the semi arid districts of Eastern and Coast Provinces, marginal crop production is also an important, though an unreliable, mainstay due to poor rainfall distribution. The livelihoods of almost 10 percent of Kenya's population depend on a fragile natural resource base with low and highly unreliable rainfall patterns and virtually no irrigation.

The Government of Kenya (GOK) has begun to focus more attention on the ASALs. An ASAL policy has been in the pipeline since 2005. In 2008, the Ministry of State for the Development of Northern Kenya and other arid areas was established. The Ministry has established a strategic plan that will be used for the next two years; a full master plan will be incorporated in the Vision 2030. The interim plan is focussed in achieving the Millennium Development Goals with respect to hunger, poverty, education, health and the environment. The Ministry has recruited some of the required technical personnel; plans are ongoing to fill the remaining positions to make it fully operational<sup>3</sup>. The raised profile of the ASALs on the government's agenda will ease and hasten implementation of investments, as it puts in place mechanisms to aggressively channel resources to the ASALs.

The Arid Lands Resource Management Project II (ALRMP II) now falls under the Ministry, which appreciates the importance of strong natural resource management systems to support people's livelihoods in highly drought-prone areas. The ALRMP II is the second phase of the ALRMP I Project, which closed in June 2003. The objective of Phase I was to build the capacity of communities in the ASAL areas to better cope with climate variability and drought. The second phase (ALRMP II) was budgeted for six years but was extended for a seventh year. It is scheduled to close in June 2010. Following on the first phase, Phase II's objectives are to empower communities to articulate and implement their priority development initiatives through Community Driven Development (CCD),

---

<sup>1</sup> Interim Strategic Plan 2008-2012. Ministry of State for Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands December 2008

<sup>2</sup> ASAL Policy

<sup>3</sup> Interim Strategic plan 2008-2012 opp.cit.

provide policy support and advocacy to foster an environment conducive for investment and service delivery, and drought management. The ALRMP II has to a large extent met these objectives.

During the mid-term review of the ALRMP, Natural Resource Management (NRM) became a standalone component of ALRMP (separated from Drought Management). The NRM component has, from 2006 to December 2008, made investments totalling Ksh. 129,154,376.05<sup>4</sup> in NRM initiatives.

The challenge is for the NRM component to focus on NRM interventions that are not only reactive or responsive to drought but are focussed on long term prevention, disaster risk reduction (e.g. adaptation to climate change) and conservation (e.g. renewable energy sources). To effectively achieve this, the component needs to be strengthened and properly focussed on the key NRM drivers.

This report reviews the NRM component based on current performance and makes recommendations in areas that require special focus; it also proposes required investments to ensure that the NRM component and investments are successful and sustainable.

## 1.2 Background to the Report

DANIDA has invested in the Natural Resource (NR) sector in Kenya for many years, both directly through the GOK and indirectly, through the GEF and other funding facilities. During the ALRMP Phase II, DANIDA began dialogue to establish whether there was a need for additional support. Phase III of ALRMP is expected to start in 2010. Under the Kenya Joint Assistance Strategy (KJAS), DANIDA has been assigned a lead role in donor investment in the environmental/NR sector. The policy context and DANIDA's interests in NRM in Kenya and in the ALRMP in particular are thoroughly described in DANIDA's "Concept Note Natural Resource Management Programme, Kenya 2010 – 2015", released in January 2009.

It is within this context that the current report assesses the strategic fit between ALRMP (including its current areas of focus and likely developments in the next phase) and DANIDA's investment priorities.

Kimetrica was assigned the following tasks:

- Identify ARLMP areas of strengths and weakness and areas for improvement *viz-a-viz* the Natural Resource and Drought Management (NRDM) component.
- Assess/analyze the effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation and financial delivery mechanisms of the ALRMP in ASAL Districts. Review the project's execution modalities (from its initial formulation to date), and examine/analyze the institutional set-up (cost-effectiveness, location/affiliation and role of the national management steering committee) and how it enhances full involvement of the stakeholders (the project's ability to bring together various partners across sector lines to address environmental concerns in a holistic manner and how ARLMP NRM component relates to linked efforts and initiatives lead by other players in the environment sector in the ASALs).

---

<sup>4</sup> Progress on Implementation of Natural Resource Management Component, February 2009.

- Provide recommendations on the future direction(s) given the continued relevance of the NRM component in the ALRMP and the expressed needs for the integration of DANIDA's support to the ASALs.
- Recommend measures to enhance coordination between DANIDA and the World Bank (WB) in the ALRMP.
- Provide a list of key findings regarding how ALRMP may improve its support to improve the management of natural capital, reduce the impact of natural shocks, and diminish acute vulnerability by reinforcing preparedness and mitigation activities to climate change.
- Review the operational support, and make recommendations on possible contribution of technical assistance (TA) and capacity development into the ALRMP.

### 1.3 Methodology

The following research methodologies were used:

1. **Key Informant Interviews:** Interviews and discussions were held with the following key informants<sup>5</sup>:
  - Mohammed Halakhe – Natural Resource Management Coordinator
  - Godfrey Leemiso – Conflict Management Officer
  - Vincent Wechabe – Natural Resource Management Officer
  - James Oduor – Drought Management Coordinator
  - Josephat Onyari – Assistant Finance Officer
  - Dr. Wanjigi – Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
  - Various DANIDA staff and consultants
2. **Literature/Desk Review** of the following documents. For a complete list, see Annex 7: *Documents Reviewed for the Assignment*.
3. **Quantitative Analysis** from the following data:
  - District Strategic plans, 2004, ALRMP.
  - Summary of Micro-projects 2007-2008, ALRMP.
  - Arid lands resource management project financial status as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2008, ALRMP.
  - Totals of Achieved Project Activities for 2007- 2008, ALRMP.

For each of the key potential areas of DANIDA investment within ALRMP, we conducted an analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats/Risks (SWOT). The detailed results of the SWOT analysis are contained in annexes, while the main text summarises the results. Each investment area was ranked according to its perceived importance as gauged by ALRMP staff.

---

<sup>5</sup> The availability of staff for interview was limited as there were several competing missions at the time of this assignment.

## 2 Strategic Fit of DANIDA Areas of Focus and ALRMP

DANIDA’s priority areas of investment are broadly in line with the current emphasis of the ALRMP (reflected in the Project Appraisal Document (PAD), the mid-term review and the most recent Implementation Review Mission).

Table 1: Current fit of ALRMP to DANIDA's areas of focus

DANIDA AREA OF FOCUS	ALRMP Current Fit
<b>Adaption to climate change</b>	Although ALRMP is not explicitly designed to combat climate change, there is close strategic fit as the project has long focused on increasing long-term resilience to drought as well as short-term mechanisms. All the project components contribute to the broader goal of dealing with highly variable and unpredictable climates. Flood risks, which appear to be increasing in the ASALs, are also an emerging issue on the ALRMP agenda. Much of the traditional emphasis of ALRMP on sustainable water resource management is directly relevant to tackling climate change and climate variability.
<b>Gender -- particularly mainstreaming gender in NRM</b>	ALRMP has a relatively strong focus on gender, which is mainstreamed in the projects main components. Under CDD there are particular efforts to ensure that women participate fully in the decision-making processes. Women account for some 49 percent of all CDD trainees, which is impressive given the frequent exclusion of women from public events in many of the ASAL districts. The issue of gender mainstreaming, specifically in NR, will be addressed by a forthcoming consultancy.
<b>Enhanced food security and sustainable livelihoods</b> (DANIDA has been funding agricultural sector projects and may look to build on previous DANIDA investments)	ALRMP recognises the importance of livelihood diversification in the marginal agricultural areas where yields of food crops are low and variable. ALRMP is increasingly involved in promoting non-traditional agricultural production and value added options in these areas. NR investments have been made in beekeeping and Aloe production, for example. The geographic areas of the expanded ALRMP include the marginal agricultural areas that were supported under previous DANIDA grants, so there would be the opportunity to build on existing structures.
<b>Private sector engagement</b>	ALRMP is already engaged in private/public sector partnership projects, particularly in areas relating to livestock and meat production. It was identified as an area for additional focus during the mid-term evaluation.
<b>Renewable energy</b>	Renewable energy has not been a primary focus of the ALRMP, but is an emerging area of interest for the NR component, given the significant pressures on tree and shrub species from excessive harvesting and charcoal production. Bio-fuel and briquette production are areas requiring additional consideration.

## 3 Review of the Project's Execution Modalities

### 3.1 Overview of ALRMP Finances

The initial project budget for ALRMP II was USD 77 million; in 2006 an additional request was made for USD 60 million. This was requested for the drought emergency, with the funds being used for expanding the project's geographic coverage to 28 districts, scaling up the drought contingency fund, and reimbursing non-food expenditure<sup>6</sup>. This extended the closure of ALRMP II from June 2009 to June 2010 and raised the total budget to USD 142.85 million (including community contributions to CDD projects of USD 5.05 million). As at 31 December 2008, USD 103,269,270 had been disbursed. With the additional funding the objective of the ALRMP II was enhanced to take into account its actual activities from "To enhance food security and reduce livelihood vulnerability in drought prone and marginalized communities in 22 arid and semiarid districts" to "To reduce livelihood vulnerability, enhance food security, and improve access to basic services in 28 drought prone arid and semi-arid districts in Kenya".

Funding ALRMP has come from the WB and GOK: USD 120 million from the WB Credit and USD 17.8 million from the GOK. With respect to sustainability, currently government staff salaries and allowances are paid by both the GOK and IDA. The breakdown is 60% GOK and 40% IDA. For the next financial year, the GOK is aiming to get the IDA proportion down to 10-20%. A review of ALRMP financial systems was carried out in June 2006; no major weaknesses were found, however, some changes were proposed. A detailed assessment of how successful the changes from the financial improvement action plan are yet to be determined.

### 3.2 NRM Financing

The natural resource management component had an initial proposed budget of USD 3.8 million for phase II<sup>7</sup>. The total budget for the natural resource and drought management component was USD 38.9 million. Only about 10% of these funds were to be allocated to NRM activities. At the end of 2008, the project reported that it had disbursed 72% of the funds. By late February 2009, these levels had reached 85%, and the ALRMP finance officers do not foresee any resourcing gaps prior to project closure in June 2010.

Still, however, NR funding under ALRMP only meets a very small fraction of the needs. District strategic plans were drawn for the period 2005 – 2015. Kimetrica made an estimate of the resourcing gaps from five sample districts from 2009 to 2015, based on the funds required to realise the District Strategic Plans for the NR sector. The results are presented in Annex 2: Quantitative Analysis of Funding Gaps.

---

<sup>6</sup> Arid Lands Resource Management Project Phase Two: Additional financing for the drought emergency. ESSD Operations for Eastern Africa, July 10, 2006

<sup>7</sup> Arid Lands Resource Management Project Phase Two Project Appraisal Document Africa Regional Office, May 23, 2003

### 3.3 Funding Mechanisms

This section discusses funding mechanisms within the context of potential DANIDA support to the ALRMP. It discusses mechanisms for funding ALRMP and then approaches for disbursing funds within ALRMP.

From consultations with DANIDA, the following criteria were identified as desirable qualities of funding mechanisms:

1. Well-established GOK mechanism with effective disbursement and adequate controls;
2. Opportunity for rapid set-up and disbursement since the grant is scheduled for disbursement in early 2010;
3. Flexible enough to support a range of NR, CCA and livelihood support investments and partners within the KJAS framework (DANIDA is focusing on the NR sector); and
4. De-centralised to ensure that funds are directly beneficial to local communities.

The mechanisms for fund disbursement from the WB to the Treasury are currently under review. At present, there are two mechanisms for fund disbursement. The first is from an off-shore account where funds can be disbursed directly to the Ministry. The second mechanism is through the Pay Master General with funds transferred to an account in the Central Bank, which is managed by the Pay Master General, who then transfers the funds to the Ministry. The GOK wants to close the off-shore option and focus on one fund disbursement method through the Treasury and Central Bank. At present, it is not clear if the Pay Master General account will be exclusively at the Central Bank or if it will be possible to hold funds at a commercial bank. The current Treasury review will provide guidance on what method or methods are most efficient and effective.

On funding to ALRMP, a Sector Wide Approach to Programming (SWAP) is probably advisable using the existing WB finance channels. All the funding mechanisms within ALRMP capture some important aspect of DANIDA's core interests, and so we suggest that any grant funding is not tied to a particular component or disbursement mechanism.

ALRMP has expressed concern about multiple donors including WB, DFID, UNDP and others, and has a preference for a single and harmonised funding channel to avoid the transactions costs associated with multiple reporting requirements and the administrative burden of tracking and reporting on funds from multiple sources. One of the key characteristics of the ALRMP PMU is that it is still relatively lean, with low administrative overheads. A SWAP approach seems to be fully justified, with DANIDA using the existing WB arrangements. This of course depends on the continuity of WB funding (see below).

An additional advantage of using the existing arrangement is that DANIDA could benefit from the WB's monitoring and compliance mechanisms. Given the nature of the project, with highly de-centralised allocation, disbursement and procurement, risks assessment must be a continuous process. Financial tracking is quite thorough at all levels down to the district. The most recent audit report (December 2008) was accepted by the WB with a qualifying statement concerning failure to account for funds. Kimetrica is not in a position to comment on the transparency, probity, and

efficiency of the disbursement processes within ALRMP. The WB is currently conducting a financial risk assessment which should shed more light on these issues.

A key strategic question for DANIDA is whether to link its funding to a particular funding mechanism within ALRMP (i.e. the NR Component), or whether to provide untied funding. To answer this question we assessed which of the funding mechanisms are consistent with DANIDA's areas of interest, including climate change adaptation, decentralisation of funding, support to sustainable livelihoods, support to private/public investments and livelihood diversification/Income Generating Activities (IGA) and gender.

The NR Component of ALRMP has three staff dedicated to NRM at the national level. These are a Programme Coordinator, Conflict Management Officer, and Programme Officer. National level coordination is complex because the ALRMP is not fully institutionalised, the ASAL Policy is not finalised, and there are numerous ministries involved in NRM and in the ASALs. However, ALRMP's lead position in coordinating investment in the ASAL districts is generally acknowledged, in the NR as in other sectors. ALRMP does not have dedicated NR staff at the district level but works closely with District Environment Officers, providing significant logistical and material support to them. In the current phase, ALRMP has built a strong framework for district level investment in the ASALs through training and building of NR strategies in 28 ALRMP districts. Funding decisions are made at the district level by District Steering Groups (DSG). All work plans are reviewed at the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) level, approved and sent back to DSG for completion and re-budgeting if necessary. Part of the much needed formalisation of district level coordination structures should entail clarification of the relationship between the DSG and the District Development Committees and sub-groups such as the District Environmental Committees.

The flow of funds disbursement from the national government to the districts follows a formal process. The PCU guides the district committees on the preparation of work plans and budgets. The district committees submit their annual work plans and budgets to the project coordination office. A budget and work plan review process is held at the PCU where the budgets are assessed against the district priorities and capacity within the district to implement activities. Following the review, the budgets are then adjusted at the district level and resubmitted for funding. The ALRMP consolidates the work plans and requests for funds from the Treasury, which then access the funds from the ALRMP offshore account. Once ALRMP receives the funds it disburses the funds to the district account for use for the specific project detailed on the district work plan. Data capture of expenditure is done at the district accountant's office on the financial management system under the Ministry's allocation. The district then disburses the funds to the communities after it has drafted financial agreements with the communities on how the funds are to be used and accounted for. Quarterly financial management reports are sent from the Districts which are consolidated and sent to the bank.

Although the NR Component appears to be closest to DANIDA’s strategic priorities, the component has focused mainly on capacity building and training at the district and community levels. The reality is that investments falling within the broad headings of NRM and adaption to climate change also fall under other disbursement mechanisms. These include:

- Drought Management (DM). This is for longer-term investments mainly in drought risk reduction, and has focused on public works, such as boreholes, pans, and shallow wells. Funds are allocated annually according to district level priorities and can be disbursed to various institutions including line ministries and NGOs and at various levels of scale. DM could also provide funds for some private-public partnerships; this is an area that has yet to be fully explored.
- Community Driven Development. This is a well established demand-driven mechanism whereby Community Development Committees (CDC) establish village level priorities for small public investments and provide 30 percent of the financing (in-kind or in cash) with ALRMP providing 70 percent. CDD includes innovative methods for community level procurement. The mechanism seems ideally suited for small scale NR investments to manage resources that are specifically owned by the community. For CDD investments that have positive externalities (including carbon capture or knock-on benefits for other communities), ALRMP might consider increasing the subsidy level to, say, 90 percent.
- Support to Local Development (SLD) is a new fund mechanism. This window can potentially be used for common resource issues that extend beyond the ownership and control of one particular community. This might include NR investments around such common resources as shared communal grazing and indigenous vegetation resources, watershed management, common forestry resources and selective interventions to both protect the resource and avoid NR-related conflict. Note that micro investments in common resource management (for resources that are shared between communities) are not likely to be effective under CDD as communities have no incentive to prioritize these investments over ones that are directly beneficial to the community itself.
- Contingency Funds (CF) are disbursed in tranches to districts and are intended for rapid interventions to mitigate the effects of drought. They are primarily disbursed to line ministries through the district structures. The fund is receiving substantial WB and European Commission (EC) support and may attract UK Department for International Development (DFID) support. CFs could be used for emergency interventions to mitigate the negative environmental/NR impacts of drought, related to “negative coping strategies” such as increased charcoal burning, foraging and over-grazing.

It is important to clarify the difference between SLD and CDD. SLD’s objective is to enhance the policy environment and augment sector services. The component in the last 5 years has been involved as a stakeholder in the formulation of several draft policies that involve the ASALs. They include:

1. National Policy for the Sustainable Development of Arid and Semi Arid Lands of Kenya
2. National Land Policy
3. National Disaster Policy
4. Policy framework for Nomadic Education in Kenya
5. National Policy on Land Reclamation
6. National Policy on Peace Building and Conflict Management
7. National Food Security and Nutrition Policy

8. National Livestock Policy
9. National Irrigation and Drainage Policy

SLD has also been involved in the provision of social infrastructure at the district level.

CDD on the other hand is focussed on implementing community driven initiatives. It has established processes that allow communities to articulate their priorities and implement their priority projects. Whereas SLD is focussed at the district, regional, and national levels, the CDD is focussed at the community level<sup>8</sup>.

All these funding mechanisms could be used (and in some cases are already being used) for NR-related investments; although to date DM has been the primary window for NR related disbursement. There is some GOK internal discussion about whether particular investments from the DM window are DM or NRM, as the overlap is quite substantial. In reality, all the windows are directly or indirectly related to climate change adaptation, community resilience and natural resource management. For DANIDA to focus on one window would be a limitation.

While CDD is relatively well-defined and is purely demand driven, DANIDA's decision-making would be easier if the SLD, DM and CF funding rules were better defined. The areas of focus, levels of aggregation, and allocation rules and criteria are not clear. For example, it says nothing about which interventions can and should be funded and from which funding source. Note that funds are tracked by component and by sector. However, it would be useful for DANIDA and other donors if the project categories were also more clearly defined. This is a possible area where DANIDA may provide technical assistance.

Climate change adaptation and natural resource management require flexible funding mechanisms that are capable of addressing resourcing needs at different levels of organisation and in different types of organisation. Many of the pressing issues in the ASALs relate to the management of scarce common resources – including a range of resource areas, such as water, watershed, indigenous vegetation, and wildlife – that fall at an intermediate level, between the district and specific communities. The intermediate level investments typically entail a broad institutional mix, including private public partnerships – GOK and international NGOs, for example. They may benefit members of more than one community and require the collaboration and compliance of more than one community. However, there are no public structures below the district level for project execution in the NR/Climate Change nexus. NGOs and CBOs sometimes fill the gap. Note, however, that the geographic coverage of CBOs and NGOs is highly variable in the ASALs. There appears to be no budget allocation or proposal to support the formation of CBOs, cooperative groups, or agro-enterprises, and this is an area requiring further examination. Group structures already exist for water management (water user associations), livestock marketing, and wildlife husbandry and eco-

---

<sup>8</sup> For additional information see Arid Lands Management Project Phase Two (Cr. 3795-KE). Implementation Review Mission, World Bank Implementation Review Mission, 2-13 February 2009.

tourism, but for other NR related investments it may be necessary to invest in the set-up of the relevant structures.

### **3.4 Monitoring and Evaluation**

Phase II of the ALRMP has seen a major increase in the focus on monitoring and evaluation (M&E), with the establishment of an M&E Unit and development of an indicator framework. The intent is to improve project management and measure results.

One major problem is the implementation of the M&E system “after the fact”. Since the system of data capture was only implemented in the last two years, there is a considerable data backlog of project information and the M&E system is therefore reliant on recollection, as most of the projects have already been closed. This has resulted in incomplete or no data being entered into the system. Moreover, using recollection methods to build up the information base is unreliable and may introduce inaccuracies into the data. For Phase III, DANIDA and the WB should push for a very comprehensive M&E design input during the preparation stage so that new and enhanced tools are in place at the start of the phase.

There are also problems with staffing and the lack of technical capacity at the district level to handle M&E. The PCU is overwhelmed by the M&E needs due to the few (only 2) technical staff available to monitor the progress of all micro-projects implemented across 28 districts. They currently rely heavily on ICT staff to provide them with M&E information. An integrated management and information system (IMIS) for monitoring and evaluation information has been developed and is currently being implemented by the ALRMP project. The database application developed for the ALRMP M&E is not sufficiently flexible to meet the data requirements of users and to capture full details of the ALRMP project portfolio.

There is a current ongoing consultancy for the “reconstruction of baseline information for the arid lands resource management project and execution of the ALRMP II impact evaluation.” This consultancy has been assigned to the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), which is tasked with “reconstructing” indicators at the baseline before the start of ALRMP II and evaluating their progress to date. This is a demanding consultancy as it relies heavily on Kenya National Bureau of statistics (KNBS) and early warning data from ALRMP. It will be difficult to reconstruct the baseline indicators for the communities from the KNBS datasets. Note that the ALRMP projects tend to be small in geographic scope and it is doubtful that KNBS and ALRMP early warning data are sufficiently disaggregated to capture localised impacts.

In addition, the early warning system does not capture NRM indicators adequately. The detailed SWOT is captured in Annex 4: SWOT Analysis for Monitoring and Evaluation.

### 3.5 Coordination Structures

Within the ALRMP there is no clear distinction between DM and NRM interventions. Internally an agreement was reached to classify water related interventions as NRM and livestock interventions as DM.

Due to lack of decentralised structures for decision making within the government, the ALRMP established structure at the district level is the District Coordination Unit (DCU). The DCU is headed by the Drought Management Officer (DMO) and supported by a Community Development Officer (CDO) and District Accountant. The DCU includes the DSG, which is a technical subcommittee of the District Development Committee (DDC). The DSG also has direct influence on the targeting of Constituency Development Funds (CDF), while ALRMP has complemented the CDF funds, which are mainly focused on social infrastructure<sup>9</sup>.

Note that the DSG structure is unique at the district level, as it includes civil society representation. In some districts, Garissa, for example, it has proved a means for introducing pluralism in the decision-making structures. Clearly, this is only a stop-gap measure in the absence of a formal constitutional model for decentralisation. However, the national level Kenya Food Security Meeting (KFSM) linkage to the local DSG structure, while informal, has achieved notable successes, including a major increase in the transparency of emergency food aid allocation in the ASALs and, until recently, development of harmonised assessment and allocation mechanisms. The ALRMP has been at the forefront of support to the KFSM –DSG structure, and has been the de facto secretariat of the former since 1999. ALRMP has provided a range of training and support to the DSG and sub-groups, and has considerable leverage over the structures.

At the community level there are Community Developments Committees (CDC) that set community priorities and develop and implement the community action plans (CAPs). There are concerns as to how autonomous these committees are, and whether there has been political interference in the identification of community priorities.

The required investments for NRM include:

1. Capacity building of the environmental committees including traditional environment committees, community development committees and district steering groups in NRM management.
2. Harmonisation of legal mandates of the environmental committees to streamline decision making.
3. Training of existing technical personnel and recruitment of additional NRM officers for the districts.
4. Institutionalization of the DSGs

The SWOT analysis is attached in Annex 5: SWOT analysis for Structures and Institutions.

---

<sup>9</sup> Arid Lands Resource Management Project Phase Two: Additional financing for the drought emergency, ESSD Operations for Eastern Africa, July 10, 2006

## 4 Investment Analysis by Component

### 4.1 Drought Management Component

The current drought management programme has spent substantial project resources and staff-hours on drought contingency and response activities and there is a widespread perception among ALRMP staff that long-term investment in NR management will serve an important preventative function, reducing underlying vulnerability to drought.

#### 4.1.1 Early Warning System

The drought early warning system was developed in conjunction with key stakeholders – including the UN, several international NGOs, and FEWS NET – and was designed to provide early warning of drought and other humanitarian situations to allow the GOK and its partners to provide mitigation and relief to affected communities. The system is comprised of assessments, consultations, and a database that stores data on the collected indicators. It is coordinated at the national level and implemented at the district. At the district level and through the DSG and the DMO, key indicators are monitored on a monthly basis. These range from rainfall distribution to livestock mortality to human health indicators. Monthly early warning reports are prepared by the DMO and used at the district level for monitoring and preparedness and sent to the national level to be included in monthly early warning reviews of the ASAL areas.

This early warning system has been continuously revised. Two key revisions of interest have been the incorporation of diverse livelihood systems in semi arid districts and the upgrading of questionnaires to cover food security indicators and other issues specific to semi-arid areas. We recommend that the system should be expanded to capture natural resource management indicators on NRM, such as those related to conflict and environmentally harmful coping strategies. The SWOT analysis carried out is captured in Annex 3: SWOT Analysis for Early Warning.

The required investments for NRM in early warning include:

1. Upgrading of the data collection instruments and questionnaires to incorporate NRM indicators;
2. Research on current and appropriate short-term (coping) and long-term (adaptation) strategies;
3. Modification of the software to allow for storage and analysis of natural resource indicators;
4. Training of the field monitors, data analysts and district environmental officers on NRM early warning;
5. Design of quantitative, evidence-based and transparent methods for NRM early warning;
6. Development of appropriate quality control for natural resource management early warning; and
7. Production of manuals on natural resources early warning.

#### 4.1.2 Training

Training on NRM has been provided to DSG members in twenty six districts, and as a result of the training, all the ALRMP districts have developed strategic NRM plans. In addition 644 communities

have been trained. There will be a need to train additional communities and for refresher training at the district level for ALRMP III.

### **4.1.3 Conflict Management**

Conflict in the ASALs is driven by historical differences between the communities, limited natural resources, and easy access to small arms. To be able to carry out successful implementation of NRM activities, there must be conflict resolution mechanisms in place at the community level. The NRM component is attempting to coordinate approaches to resolving natural resource conflicts, as there is no current government structure for doing this. During ALRMP I it was observed that there are continuous conflicts over natural resources, resulting in shifting of ethnic boundaries and a constant need for renegotiation over control of the resources<sup>10</sup>.

The need for conflict resolution has become extremely necessary, especially following the 2007 post election violence that brought to the fore conflicts which were largely due to inequitable distribution of natural resources. A Conflict Officer has been hired by ALRMP and is focusing on capacity building, by establishing and empowering District Peace Committees (DPCs). Currently, there are 24 functional District Peace Committees in arid and semi arid areas of Kenya. These are in Wajir, Mandera, Ijara, Garissa, Tana River, Mwingi, Moyale, Samburu, Isiolo, Marsabit, Turkana, West Pokot, Laikipia, Marakwet, Baringo, Trans Mara, Narok, Kitui, Makueni, Kilifi, Kwale, Lamu, Kajiado, and Tharaka.

### **4.1.4 Micro Project Investments**

During ALRMP II, 165 investments in NRM were implemented in 2007/2008 in agro-forestry, pasture development, land rehabilitation, soil and water conservation, beekeeping, aloe production, and agribusiness value addition. There is large potential for expanding the NR micro project base in the ALRMP.

Micro Project Investments are identified at the district level from the district strategic plans and at the community level from community action plans. The projects are then implemented by the different components based on the communities they affect. Some are implemented through the NRM component, others through the CDD and SLC components.

The Kimetrica team was informed of a large number of micro projects in the NR sector that may have beneficial effects in long-term vulnerability reduction. These include:

- Wastewater recycling schemes to use wastewater for small-scale irrigation of home gardens
- Tree seedling propagation, , possibly including sale
- Re-forestation schemes where requested by communities
- Establishment of 'green-belts' around settlements to prevent degradation due to livestock and collection of fuel wood
- Soil erosion control structures - Live fencing around boreholes, earth dams and water pans
- Tree planting and live fencing around schools and dispensaries

---

<sup>10</sup> Arid Lands Resource Management Project Phase Two Project Appraisal Document Africa Regional Office, May 23, 2003

- Rehabilitation of water pans and earth dams
- Roof catchment water harvesting
- Maintenance of rock catchments
- Gully prevention
- Water harvesting and storage structures (shallow wells)
- Tapping and protection of springs
- Small-scale irrigation (provision of hand pumps)
- Small-scale agricultural projects (localized forestry, tree/bush crops, re-seeding, and tree planting)
- Rehabilitation of denuded sites – promotion of reseeded; filling up gullies
- Agricultural advisory services
- Education and health advisory services
- Income generating activities (small-scale: apiculture, tanning of hides, quarrying, milk processing, and collection of herbs)
- Commercialization of dryland products (aloe, sisal, hides and skins, gum Arabica, gum resins -- e.g., Frankincense and myrrh, neem, silkworm production, wood carving, beading)
- Small-scale fishing (alternative sources of food for pastoralists)
- Protection of natural resource base (planting, tree nurseries)
- Fish farming (to feed on mosquito larvae)
- Organic farming (spray made from concoction of herbs; promotion of farm manure)

#### **4.1.5 The KACCAL Project**

The Kenya Adaptation to Climate Change in Arid and Semi Arid Lands (KACCAL) is in the design phase and will be executed under the ALRMP framework. The project will focus on climate information products, policy and advocacy, climate risk management at the district and local levels, and community driven initiatives for climate resilience. The latter two components will be implemented in four ASAL districts, with similar activities implemented in a fifth district with funding from an UNDP Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) grant. All three components are contributing directly to the integration of climate change adaptation into development processes in the ASALs, through the ALRMP.

As the project focuses on adaptation to climate change, there are several areas of investment in the KACCAL project that could be considered by DANIDA. Of particular relevance for DANIDA is the community driven initiatives for climate resilience, which directly target the communities. It focuses on building capacity of communities to develop and implement climate resilient action plans. It is also focussed on micro projects and empowering communities to use natural resources with conservation and sustainability in mind. In addition, the project places an emphasis on making environmental information readily available to communities in a comprehensible and appropriate format.

## **4.2 Community Driven Development**

The focus of this component has been the empowerment of communities to articulate and implement their development priorities. Since its inception, 644 communities have participated and implemented 2,379 micro projects. The ALRMP has contributed Ksh 609,878,897, while the communities themselves have raised Kshs 280,680,205 in counterpart funds. CDD projects are comprised of social infrastructure projects, safety nets (targeting the marginalised), and income

generating activities. It is possible that the mechanism could be used to support community driven small scale NR initiatives in the future.

The Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) and Participatory Integrated Community Development (PICD) approach has been used to help community groups to identify and formulate projects that meet their key objectives. ALRMP provides training to the communities and staff members on PICD, community procurement, financial management, gender and development Guidelines have been put in place to ensure that investments are selected based on their cost effectiveness and sustainability.

The CDD component report for 2007/2008 emphasized that drought and post election violence have been major factors limiting implementation of projects. The economic impact of the violence has reduced community contributions, while also raising the cost of commodities and, therefore, affecting the cost of planned and approved micro-projects.

Some progress has been made with regard to gender mainstreaming; however, more efforts are needed to effectively achieve a favourable balance between genders in pastoralist communities<sup>11</sup>. There may be a need to encourage the inclusion of the youth in CDC's to ensure that their priorities are articulated.

---

<sup>11</sup> Community driven development component report for financial year 2007 - 2008

## 5 Summary of Recommendations on Future Directions

### 5.1 The Focus of Possible DANIDA Support

This report has highlighted several key areas where DANIDA financing would support existing ALRMP activities and fit within DANIDA's areas of strategic interest. These include:

- Consolidating and strengthening the M&E, and including NR inventory baselines in the system
- Broadening the scope of the EW system to include NR variables including negative NR coping strategies and NR conflict indicators
- Increasing the micro project funding for NR related projects through the current ALRMP funding mechanisms
- Expanding ALRMP support to NR-based conflict management in the ASAL areas
- Supporting the development of NR management capacity at district and sub-district levels
- Strengthening of the NRM component in policy documents and the evaluation and redesign of the NRM component.

While capacity building in NR is handled under the NRM component, we recommend that to provide the wide-ranging support to livelihoods, including enhanced climate change adaption capacities at district and community levels, DANIDA support should make use of all the current ALRMP funding windows. The only exception is the Drought Contingency Fund, which does not have an NR or climate change focus. Earmarking of funds for a particular disbursement mechanism or component would place limitations on the range of activities that can be supported and DANIDA's areas of focus clearly cut across the current components.

The SWOT analysis found that policy documents all lack clear NRM components. This is an area where DANIDA could provide policy guidance by indicating which types of investment fall specifically under NRM rather than under other components. In addition, there is a need to provide guidance on how NRM complements other non-ALRMP funds such as the Constituency Development Fund

### 5.2 Phase-out Strategy

The ALRMP II project appraisal document proposed the development of a phase-out strategy to prepare the technical, financial and institutional aspects of the project, to continue work in the arid lands. The phase-out strategy has not yet been developed; however, the current project phase closes in 2010. It is essential that in the design of any new support to NRM under ALRMP III a phase-out strategy is also included to ensure that all activities under current funding are sustainable for the benefit of the ASALs.

Given the major recent institutional changes and the fact that the Ministry has yet to be staffed, it is premature to speak of the institutionalisation of ALRMP. The most likely (and desirable) scenario is that ALRMP continues as a project with a third phase approved

### 5.3 Coordination between DANIDA and World Bank in the ALRMP

The WB funding mechanism is generally considered to be effective in disbursing and managing funds. The ALRMP is one of the few initiatives providing targeted poverty interventions to Kenyans living in marginalised ASAL areas. The need for a mechanism such as this to compensate historically disadvantaged parts of the country is as urgent as ever. ALRMP provides a controlled mechanism for highly localised fund disbursement. Relations between the Bank and the project team are excellent. Linking DANIDA support to the WB delivery mechanism through a SWAP-like arrangement therefore makes sense, and will contribute to reducing the transactions costs for the Project Management Unit.

It should be noted that in addition to providing supervision, the WB connection also means that the project has access to the vast knowledge resources of the Bank, including its own expertise and contacts with research. This connection partly explains why the project has been at the forefront of innovation in many areas of drought management including community-based early warning, CDD, and drought contingency planning.

The Ministry of Finance has requested additional funding for a Phase III. The key question is whether a new WB credit will be approved by the WB for an ALRMP Phase III. If the WB credit is not forthcoming, and given the current budgeted levels of support for the Ministry, there may be a need for a general bridging credit. In this scenario, the proposed funding could either be disbursed to cover costs for just over one year (at current scale) or the ALRMP project would have to be scaled down (perhaps focusing only on the original 11 ASALs) to less than one quarter of its current scale. Given the high political profile of ALRMP in the ASALs and the general perception that it is a high impact project, a rapid scaling down will be extremely difficult. What is more likely is that the GOK and other donors would step up. For this reason, we suggest that as a contingency plan, in case of a discontinuity of WB funding for phase III, DANIDA should consider allocating the grant as a 14-16 months bridging finance. At the start of Phase II there were considerable delays in project activities because of funding bottlenecks. It is also possible that part of the DANIDA grant will be available before the Phase III IDA credit and could be used either as a bridge or on a reimbursable basis.

### 5.4 Possible Technical Assistance for ALRMP

There is a general reluctance among the ALRMP staff relating to technical assistance, at least in the conventional form of expatriate advisors, reflecting the view that the technical skills relating to drought and natural resource management in Kenya are available in Kenya or could be easily acquired by the key decision-makers at national and district levels.

However, there is a need to explore how far GOK procedures and practices enable timely hiring of appropriate technical services in specialised areas. There are certainly areas requiring external Technical Assistance (TA) or capacity support and the main gap is in M&E. Technical Assistance in the following areas is recommended.

- a) **Design of a monitoring and evaluation framework.** This TA should be used to assist ALRMP to build a practical monitoring and evaluation framework for natural resources. The framework should capture all the objectives for NRM for future phases of the ALRMP. The

TA will assist with the design of the results matrix including objectives, outputs, outcomes and appropriate tools and indicators to measure the performance of the project.

- b) **Development of appropriate monitoring and evaluation methodology.** Currently the baseline data that is used for impact assessment carries a huge number of indicators that are collected a bigger level of strata (location level) that is not suitable for impact evaluation at community level. The statistics collected at this larger level cannot be used to estimate impact at the community level. The TA would assist in the design of appropriate methodologies to assist in impact evaluation at the micro project level, and see how best this can be reported at a national scale.
- c) **Following a) and b) development of training and software methods and tools** to support the roll out of an enhanced M&E system.

## **Annex 1: Note on Conflict Management**

Conflict management has received more attention from the GOK in the past few years as conflict has become more widespread and its roots go directly to access and control over resources. We interviewed a GOK Conflict Officer, Godfrey Leemiso, working in ALRMP. He provides the following information:

The District Peace Committees (DPC) is a hybrid model that brings together synergies between traditional and formal mechanisms for conflict prevention, resolution and management. DPCs bring together stakeholders who have similar interests, and work on peace and security issues in their districts. They consist of community representatives, DSICs, CSOs, Local Authorities, women, youth, disabled persons, and the private sector -- drawn from all the administrative units of the district -- mandated to determine parameters for tasks in the district. Community representatives are drawn from all district locations to ensure that each location (administrative level 5) is represented.

The roles of the District Peace Committees are:

1. Co-ordinate, harmonize and facilitate peace building activities
2. Promote peace education, a culture of peace and non-violence
3. Administer and account for peace building funds
4. Networking with other peace forums to enhance cross border co-existence
5. Document and keep record of the peace processes and intervention
6. Oversee implementation of peace agreements and declarations
7. Promote mainstreaming of conflict sensitive approaches to development in the district
8. Support initiatives for the eradication of illicit small arms in Kenya and community policing
9. Resource mobilization
10. Develop mechanisms for resolving disputes amongst committee members
11. Promote public awareness
12. Monitor and evaluate peace building programs
13. Perform all other functions necessary for the realization of the objectives of the National Policy on Peace building and Conflict Management.

Currently, there are 24 functional District Peace Committees in arid and semi arid areas of Kenya. These committees are in the following districts: Wajir, Mandera, Ijara, Garissa, Tana River, Mwingi, Moyale, Samburu, Isiolo, Marsabit, Turkana, West Pokot, Laikipia, Marakwet, Baringo, Trans Mara, Narok, Kitui, Makueni, Kilifi, Kwale, Lamu, Kajiado and Tharaka.

The Arid Lands Resource Management Project (ALRMP II) in collaboration with the National Steering Committee on Peace Building and Conflict Management (NSC) is mandated to spearhead capacity building of DPCs within the project district. During the current financial year (2008/09,) ALRMP targeted 14 districts for capacity building. Other than capacity building, ALRMP has also facilitated DPCs to undertake conflict prevention and resolution including rapid response through the provision of logistical support. Mr. Leemiso said that they also facilitated exchange visits to enable DPC

members to share experiences while at the same time learn best practices. Some DPC offices have also been equipped.

#### Challenges.

- DPCs do not have a constant source of funds. They are, according to Mr. Leesimo, limited in what they can do when it comes to conflict prevention. As a result, most of them tend to be reactive, as opposed to proactive.
- Lack of legal framework – DPCs are not recognized by the law and they only operate courtesy of goodwill.
- Lack of capacity to respond to conflict – most DPCs do not have offices, vehicles etc. It therefore becomes very difficult for them to address the same.

#### Way forward.

While other stakeholders are pushing for the creation of the legal framework, Mr. Leesimo expressed his wish to request that we consider making provision of about 500,000/= per year for the DPCs on a pilot basis. The ALRMP is currently supporting a few of them but the support is not enough given emerging conflict issues.

## Annex 2: Quantitative Analysis of Funding Gaps

In this analysis we extrapolate the funding gap for 2009 – 2015 based on a sample of District-level NR Strategic Plans. From an analysis of the full cost of implementation of the district plans in five districts, we can extrapolate the resource gap for all the 26 ALRMP districts for the next six years to be an estimated Ksh. 48.38 billion (approximately USD 612 million). Current ALRMP funding -- and alternative funding, such as the Constituency Development Fund -- covers only a small fraction of this total.

	Activities	Estimated Investment <sup>12</sup> in KHz for 10 years(2005-2015)	Possible Resource Gap (2009-2015)
Garissa	Pasture resource management(regulate grazing, alternative livelihoods)	230,000,000	
	Non-wood forest products resource management(honey harvesting, germ plasm, resin,	115,000,000	
	Livestock resource management(disease control/surveillance, markets, improvement of road networks)	2,270,000,000	
	Water resource management(desilting, development of water supply systems)	320,000,000	
	Land resource management	15,000,000	
	Food crop resource management(prosopsis research,	330,000,000	
	Minerals resource management(exploration, marketing, EIA)	120,000,000	
	Wildlife resource management(ecotourism, community training, policy development)	290,000,000	
	Wind and solar energy resource management	5,500,000	
	Coordination of development initiatives(enhance role of DSG's, develop M&E system, develop a program of implementation of ASAL activities)	65,200,000	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,760,700,000</b>	
Ijara	Water resource management	860,000,000	
	Land resource management	105,000,000	
	Livestock resource management(Tsetse fly control, disease surveillance, marketing, annual vaccination campaigns)	500,000,000	
	Pasture resource management matrix(reseeding, bulking sites, firebreaks)	70,000,000	
	Forests resource management	55,000,000	
	Wildlife resource management(employment of community scouts, preservation of wildlife corridors,	300,000,000	
	Sand and stones resource management(clay brick-making, environmental audits)	10,000,000	
	Solar and wind energy(solar energy, carbon fixing)	50,000,000	
	Aquatic and marine resource management(fish farming, conservation)	16,000,000	
	Minerals management	50,500,000	
	Coordination of development initiatives(enhance role of DSG's, enhance M&E)	5,000,000	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,016,500,000</b>	

<sup>12</sup> The estimated investment is based on district need, not sources of funding.

	Activities	Estimated Investment in Kshs for 10 years(2005-2015)	Possible Resource Gap (2009-2015)
Baringo	Livestock resource management	979,000,000	
	Water resource management	1,284,000,000	
	Land and soil resource management	1,282,000,000	
	Pasture resource management	100,000,000	
	Forests resource management	30,000,000	
	Wildlife and tourism resource management	50,000,000	
	Fish resource management	30,000,000	
	Minerals resource management	67,000,000	
	Solar and wind energy resource management	15,000,000	
	Coordination of development initiatives	65,200,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,902,200,000</b>	<b>2,483,218,182</b>	
Kajiado	Minerals resource management	140,000,000	
	Livestock resource management	310,000,000	
	Wildlife resource management	155,000,000	
	Forest resource management	270,000,000	
	Pasture resource management(restocking, grubbing invasive species, pasture reseeding)	130,000,000	
	Solar and wind energy resource	10,000,000	
	Water resource management	280,000,000	
	Land and Soils Management	200,000,000	
	Food crops management	320,000,000	
	Coordination of development initiatives in the district	65,200,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,880,200,000</b>	<b>1,196,490,909</b>	
Isiolo	Livestock resource management	1,191,000,000	
	Water resource management(soil conservation, water act)	1,060,000,000	
	Pasture resource management	186,000,000	
	Wildlife resource management	160,000,000	
	Fish resource management	28,000,000	
	Honey bee resource management	25,000,000	
	Mineral resource management	67,000,000	
	Food crops resource management	240,000,000	
	Solar and wind resource management	25,000,000	
	Land and soils resource management	15,000,000	
	Coordination of development initiatives	65,200,000	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,062,200,000</b>	

### Annex 3: SWOT Analysis for Early Warning

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	OPPORTUNITIES/ AREAS OF INVESTMENT	THREATS	Priority Rank
Systems for early warning are in place.	EW has strong focus on livestock and water indicators.	Enhancement of the EW tools to capture NRM indicators on conflict and other NRM issues.	Increased load on the Early warning	1
		Modification of EW software databases to capture NRM indicators.	Technical expertise required to change software	3
		Building of community based EW information system that should feed into the District and National EW. Community EW should capture conflict and environmentally harmful coping strategies.	CDCs already overstretched with CDD tasks.	2

### Annex 4: SWOT Analysis for Monitoring and Evaluation

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	OPPORTUNITIES FOR INVESTMENT	RISKS	Priority Rank
Currently a checklist exists used during EIA Compliance to NEMA requirements.	No baseline NRM data available hence reliance on CBS and EW data	Baseline survey on NRM	No resources have been allocated to baseline surveys.	6
		Natural resources inventory	Vast geographical areas to be covered to build a comprehensive inventory.	7
M&E framework developed highlighting the key performance indicators	No solid M&E structure Currently under-resourced with only 2 M&E personnel who have to rely on regional ICT officers for information.	Strengthening of the M&E operational structure with personnel and resources	Lack of sufficient monitoring and evaluation personnel.	4
		Training of all officers at national and district level on the environmental monitoring framework		5
	Current M&E tools have a bias towards drought indicators, minimal NRM indicators are available.	Technical assistance on development of an appropriate M&E framework, monitoring system and tools.	Low literacy levels at community level to use standard tools	1
	Operationalizing M&E framework into the software is difficult	Technical assistance on the implementation of the M&E results framework and standardization of language in the MIS	Conflict with CPMU monitoring framework.	2
	Lack of standard data collection tools	Consultancy for the development of a NR monitoring system and tools to ensure proper capture of outcome indicators.		3
Lack of formal participation in M&E below district level	Community based evaluation mechanisms to complement formal evaluation and risk assessment	Low literacy levels at community level	3	

## Annex 5: SWOT analysis for Structures and Institutions

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	OPPORTUNITIES/ AREAS OF INVESTMENT	THREATS	Priority rank
NRM now a stand-alone component. 26 District strategic plans in place.	Separation of NRM and DM is still difficult.	Strengthening of the NRM component in the policy documents. Re-evaluation and redesign of the NRM component.	Separation may lead to poorly coordinated interventions between the two components.	1
NRM can depend on effective DM structures. Which include at the national level well established KFSM (key sectoral ministries and partners) and KFSSG. At the district level the DCU situated and provincial administration level and headed by the Drought monitoring officer (supported by the community development officer to manage CDD). CDCs at the community level.	Interpretation of NRM not clear to DEC and other structures implementing DM.	Strengthening of the traditional environmental committees.	No legal mandates for committees to operate under	4
		Capacity building of the District Environmental committees	Possible conflict with NEMA over roles	5
	Weak NRM coordination due to multiple environmental institutions at national, district and community level with different legal mandates.	Harmonization of legal mandates	Policy development costly process	6
		Development of Natural Resource contingency planning processes similar to those for drought.	Unlike drought there are no methodologies and processes to determine what constitutes a NRM emergency.	
	Weak Technical Capacity of various line ministries, limited staff numbers	Training of existing technical capacity and recruitment of additional natural resource management officers at district level.	Lack of financial resources at government level.	7
	Demoralised METs due to prohibition of top ups.	Restructuring of terms for the mobile extension teams, to empower and motivate the teams. METs are highly trained and key In successful implementation of NRM plans.	Current government policy is against top ups	3
Project closure before institutionalisation of structures. May cause the collapse of all mechanisms already in place	Institutionalization of DSG and DPC (District Peace committees). Empowerment of DSG to handle all community development resources.	No policy/legal mandates for institutionalising the drought management system. No phase out strategy in place to ensure the systems is sustainable.	2	

## Annex 6: SWOT Analysis for Natural Resource Management

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	OPPORTUNITIES FOR INVESTMENT	THREATS	Priority Rank
26 District NRM plans have been developed and 644 communities trained on NRM planning	Limited understanding of how financially viable and lucrative NRM Investments are.	Strengthening business skills at community and household level on creating business plans, management and marketing.	Lack of basic literacy among communities	1
	Limited use of available data and information in making NRM plans and investments	Training of district coordination structures on use of data in planning	No natural resource inventories available at district level.	2
		Building a Natural Resource information system in each district that provides full information on the natural resources within the district.	Lack of computer facilities and literacy.	3
Communication strategy in place.	Lack of adequate documentation and dissemination procedures for best practices and lessons learned.	Strengthening of the communication system.	Difficulties disseminating information to communities.	4
		Establishment of a communication system that allows triangulation of information-within communities. Value addition of Field monitor level communication proposed through an SMS based system	GSM network coverage limited in ASALS	5
		Updating, processing and digitizing NRM knowledge base for NRM planning and investments. Dissemination of this information in appropriate formats	Lack of computer facilities and literacy	6
		ALRMP radio broadcasts in community radios such as in Wajir or national radio on NRM topics.	Low usage of radios in ASALS.	7
Setting up of District peace committees in progress. 2 day trainings held in every district.	Extensive conflicts in all districts over natural resources. Conflicts on NR largely ignored by other government agencies.	Capacity building at national and district level on conflict management. 2 day programme needs to be expanded to at least 4 days.	Lack of adequate resources for training.	8
		Capacity building at community level for environmental screening and social impact analysis of projects.	Environmental impact assessment checklist already in use.	9
		National Policy on Peace building and Conflict Management	Policy enactment can take years.	10

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	OPPORTUNITIES FOR INVESTMENT	THREATS	Priority Rank
Successful CDD initiatives	Limited resources available for 30% community contribution	Review of CDD to allow increase of ALRMP contribution for NR projects to at least 90%.	Lack of effective government structures for decentralisation. Expansion of CDD to cover approx. 3.5 million people in semi arid areas would add less value than expanding DM. <sup>13</sup>	11
	Lack of technical skills in agronomy, livestock health, irrigation, marketing, value addition at community level	Secondment of trained personnel in these areas to the DEC and DSG.	Lack of sufficient technical personnel in the districts. Difficult nature of subject matters of livestock etc.	12
Current scientific information cannot be understood by communities. Information arrives late and in a complex form. Communities not able to interpret information to their microclimate.	Complexity in translating and repackaging the climatic information. Sufficient research and resources will be required to achieve this.	Research on appropriate adaptation mechanisms for communities affected by long term drought	Expansive ASAL areas	13
		Repackaging of scientific information to feedback to the communities in appropriate formats.	High illiteracy rates	14
		Packaging of natural resource information to feedback to communities in the appropriate format	High illiteracy rates	15
		Integration of natural resource information into ASAL plans.	High illiteracy rates	16
Abundant number of activities	Limited Public/Private Investment	Research into best practice on public/private partnership	Lack of GOK policies guiding private public investments	17
		Training of communities on business management skills	High illiteracy rates	18
		Livestock product processing – Hides and Skins, Meat	Sustainability	17
		Provision of improved breeds,	Sustainability	17
		Apiculture(Bee keeping)	Sustainability	17
		Agricultural production- Aloe Vera, Neem, Gum Arabica	Sustainability	18

<sup>13</sup> Arid Lands Resource Management Project Phase Two Project Appraisal Document Africa Regional Office, May 23, 2003

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	OPPORTUNITIES FOR INVESTMENT	THREATS	Priority Rank
Some disaster/risk reduction projects currently being undertaken.	Currently haphazardly undertaken, need a more coordinated approach under a program DM projects focus on infrastructure and not on livelihoods	Development of a disaster/risk reduction strategy	Lack of legal mandate to support the strategy. National disaster policy not yet enacted.	19
		Long term NRM projects to minimize drought effects	Sustainability	20
Water and Irrigation development activities have been undertaken under all components of ALRMP. Under NRM 8 investments totalling USD 87,000 were done.	Operation and maintenance fees not properly valued for the projects. Hence continuous need for external financing	Training in cost benefit evaluations for water projects	Need for highly specialised technical personnel.	21
		Capacity building in sustainable water management	Sustainability	22
	High wastage of water during wet seasons leading to no water during dry seasons.	Construction of water storage systems to reduce vulnerability during droughts.	Sustainability	23

## **Annex 7: Documents Reviewed for the Assignment**

*Concept Note: Natural Resource Management Programme, Kenya 2010 – 2015, DANIDA, January 2009*

*District strategic plans for 5 districts, Baringo, Ijara, Kajiado, Isiolo and Garissa, ALRMP, 2004.*

*Interim Strategic plan 2008-2012, Ministry of State for Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands, Government of Kenya, December 2008*

*Arid Lands Resource Management Project Phase Two – additional financing for the drought emergency, World Bank, ESSD Operations for Eastern Africa, July 10, 2006*

*Arid Lands Resource Management Project Phase Two Project Appraisal Document, World Bank, Africa Regional Office, May 23, 2003*

*Arid Lands Resource Management Project Phase Two, Implementation Review Mission, World Bank, February 2-13, 2009*

*Arid Lands Management Project Phase Two (Cr. 3795-KE). Implementation Review Mission, World Bank Implementation Review mission, February 2-13, 2009.*

*Community Procurement Manual and Community Accounting and Financial Reporting Manual, ALRMP.*

*Brief Monitoring and Evaluation Unit Status Report, ALRMP, February 2009*

*CDD Progress report 2007-2008, ALRMP, 2009*

*CDD 2009 Supervision mission Report, ALRMP, September 2003-December 2008*

*Summary of the Communications Strategy: Showing: Goals, outcomes, outputs and key activities, ALRMP, February 3, 2009*

*Drought Management Component; Summary of Activities Undertaken from 2003/2004 TO 2007/2008, ALRMP, 2009*

*Arid lands Resource Management project II-Financial status as at Dec 2008, ALRMP, December 2008*

*Kenya Adaptation to Climate Change in Arid and Semi Arid Areas (KACCAL). Project Appraisal Document, February 7, 2009.*

*Progress on implementation of support to local development component: A brief for the World Bank supervision mission, ALRMP, February 2, 2009.*

*Progress on Implementation of Natural Resource Management Component, ALRMP, February 2009.*

*Arid Lands Resource Management Project Financial Status as at 31st December 2008, Funding and disbursement status of the project. ALRMP, 31<sup>st</sup> December 2008.*