



Kisumu, Kenya

Local progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2013-2014)

Name of focal point: Christopher Rusana
Organization: Kisumu City Council
Title/Position: City Manager
E-mail address: rusanachris@yahoo.com
Telephone: 0722602053

Reporting period: 2013-2014
Last updated on: 19 March 2014
Print date: 19 March 2014
Reporting language: English

A Local HFA Monitor update published by PreventionWeb
<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/reports/>

Priority for Action 1

Ensure that disaster reduction is a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation

Core Indicator 1.1

National policy and legal framework for disaster risk reduction exists with decentralized responsibilities and capacities at all levels.

How well are local organizations (including local government) equipped with capacities (knowledge, experience, official mandate) for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Description of Progress & Achievements:

They have the mandate and medium level expertise with limited skilled staff on DRR and climate adaptation

To what extent do partnerships exist between communities, private sector and local authorities to reduce risk?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Description of Progress & Achievements:

A lot of informal engagement occurs between the LA, private sector and the communities for instance drainage clearance to reduce flooding is often done in partnership , formal coordination of stakeholders is however still a challenge.

Core Indicator 1.2

Dedicated and adequate resources are available to implement disaster risk reduction plans and activities at all administrative levels.

How far does the local government have access to adequate financial resources to carry out risk reduction activities?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Local revenue streams and government disbursement for service delivery normally indirectly address DRR issues e.g implementation of fire compliance standards

To what degree does the local government allocate sufficient financial resources to carry out DRR activities, including effective disaster response and recovery?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Direct allocation is minimal however Some regular activities such as building control , solid waste management, drainage clearance contribute to DRR and re budgeted for regularly

Core Indicator 1.3

Community participation and decentralization are ensured through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels.

How much does the local government support vulnerable local communities (particularly women, elderly, infirmed, children) to actively participate in risk reduction decision-making, policy making, planning and implementation processes?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Little efforts have been made in supporting vulnerable communities through stakeholder forums on DRR

To what extent does the local government provide training in risk reduction for local officials and community leaders?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Not so regular special programmes though Local authority regularly monitors and approves buildings for compliance with building codes

How regularly does the local government conduct awareness-building or education programs on DRR and disaster preparedness for local communities?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Programs include cultural diversity issues	No
Programs are sensitive to gender perspectives	No

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Constant monitoring by school administration though not directly related to DRR, interventions made reduces risks

Core Indicator 1.4

A national multi-sectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning.

To what extent does the local government participate in the national DRR planning?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Desktop review of national policies have provided the framework for the DRR plans at LA level

Priority for Action 2

Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

Core Indicator 2.1

National and local risk assessments based on hazard data and vulnerability information are available and include risk.

To what degree does the local government conducted thorough disaster risk assessments for key vulnerable development sectors in your local authority?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Description of Progress & Achievements:

The local government has tried in terms of approval and monitoring building plans, annual renewal of fire safety compliance licenses

To what extent are these risk assessments regularly updated, e.g. annually or on a bi-annual basis?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Very little from the local government

How well are disaster risk assessments incorporated into all relevant local development planning on a consistent basis?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

The policies are available and sufficient but implementation is a big challenge

To what extent have local schools, hospitals and health facilities received special attention for "all hazard" risk assessments in your local authority?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Schools	Yes
Hospitals/ health facilities	Yes

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Hospitals have tried to put safety measures but schools have not

How safe are all main schools, hospitals and health facilities from disasters so that they have the ability to remain operational during emergencies?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Schools	Yes
Hospitals/ health facilities	Yes

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Hospitals have tried to put safety measures but schools have not

Core Indicator 2.2

Systems are in place to monitor, archive and disseminate data on key hazards and vulnerabilities.

-- No questions related to local context --

Core Indicator 2.3

Early warning systems are in place for all major hazards, with outreach to communities.

To what extent are early warning centres established, adequately staffed (or on-call personnel) and well resourced (power back ups, equipment redundancy etc) at all times?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Apart from meteorological department, there are no early warning centers on other issues.

How much do warning systems allow for adequate community participation?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

The community is given enough time in terms of early warning though there is no known communication strategy hence some people are caught unawares.

Core Indicator 2.4

National and local risk assessments take account of regional/trans-boundary risks, with a view to regional cooperation on risk reduction.

How well are local government risk assessments linked to, and supportive of, risk assessments from neighbouring local authorities and state or provincial government risk management plans?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Kisumu DRR will be part of the City development strategy and some services regularly provided by the LA to citizen are stered towards DRR and included in our development plans.

Priority for Action 3

Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels

Core Indicator 3.1

Relevant information on disasters is available and accessible at all levels, to all stakeholders (through networks, development of information sharing systems, etc).

How regularly does the local government communicate to the community, information on local hazard trends and risk reduction measures (e.g. using a Risk Communications Plan) including early warnings of likely hazard impact?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

There has been some sensitization especially in flood prone areas.

Core Indicator 3.2

School curricula, education material and relevant trainings include disaster risk reduction and recovery concepts and practices.

To what degree do local schools and colleges include courses, education or training in disaster risk reduction (including climate related risks) as part of the education curriculum?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Minimal

Core Indicator 3.3

Research methods and tools for multi-risk assessments and cost benefit analysis are

developed and strengthened.

-- No questions related to local context --

Core Indicator 3.4

Countrywide public awareness strategy exists to stimulate a culture of disaster resilience, with outreach to urban and rural communities.

-- No questions related to local context --

Priority for Action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Core Indicator 4.1

Disaster risk reduction is an integral objective of environment related policies and plans, including for land use, natural resource management and adaptation to climate change.

How well integrated are local government DRR policies, strategies and implementation plans with existing environmental development and natural resource management plans?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Minimal

How far do land use policies and planning regulations for housing and development infrastructure take current and projected disaster risk (including climate related risks) into account?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Housing	Yes
Communication	Yes
Transportation	Yes
Energy	Yes

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Most public institutions have preventive equipment like fire extinguishers, however there is no focus other risks

How well are risk-sensitive land use regulations and building codes, health and safety codes enforced across all development zones and building types?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Environmental Impact Assessment is done to mitigate risks that may arise from the project before approval is given

How strong are existing regulations (e.g. land use plans, building codes etc) to support disaster risk reduction in your local authority?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Most schools, hospitals and health facilities are designed to be safe from risks and are regularly assessed from hazards

To what degree does the local government support the restoration, protection and sustainable management of ecosystems services?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Forests	Yes
Coastal zones	Yes
Wetlands	No

Water resources Yes

River basins No

Fisheries Yes

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Forest conservation is observed and fish industry is regulated, conservation policies are highly implemented

How much do civil society organizations and citizens participate in the restoration, protection and sustainable management of ecosystems services?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Description of Progress & Achievements:

The regulations are strong but implementation is a big challenge

How much does the private sector participate in the implementation of environmental and ecosystems management plans in your local authority?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Not much is done and many people are ignorant

Core Indicator 4.2

Social development policies and plans are being implemented to reduce the vulnerability of populations most at risk.

What is the scope of financial services (e.g. saving and credit

schemes, macro and micro-insurance) available to vulnerable and marginalised households for pre- disaster times?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

There are several resources of finance from NGOs however LA support is normally minimal

To what extent are micro finance, cash aid, soft loans, lone guarantees etc available to affected households after disasters to restart livelihoods?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

No direct economic incentives

Core Indicator 4.3

Economic and productive sectorial policies and plans have been implemented to reduce the vulnerability of economic activities.

How well established are economic incentives for investing in disaster risk reduction for households and businesses (e.g. reduced insurance premiums for households, tax holidays for businesses)?

Level of Progress achieved: 1

Description of Progress & Achievements:

There is minimum support provided

To what extent do local business associations, such as chambers of

commerce and similar, support efforts of small enterprises for business continuity during and after disasters?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Disaster risk assessment has been carried out in various sectors e.g fire compliance standards, building codes

Core Indicator 4.4

Planning and management of human settlements incorporate disaster risk reduction elements, including enforcement of building codes.

How adequately are critical public facilities and infrastructure located in high risk areas assessed for all hazard risks and safety?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

The physical planning is in place to approve the construction of buildings and associated facilities as per the building codes

How adequate are the measures that are being undertaken to protect critical public facilities and infrastructure from damage during disasters?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

This applies to projects that undergo EIA

Core Indicator 4.5

Disaster risk reduction measures are integrated into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes.

How well are disaster risk reduction measures integrated into post-disaster recovery and rehabilitation activities (i.e. build back better, livelihoods rehabilitation)?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Not enough, victims are often left on their own to survive after the initial support to overcome the immediate challenge that results from disaster occurrences

Core Indicator 4.6

Procedures are in place to assess the disaster risk impacts of major development projects, especially infrastructure.

To what degree do local government or other levels of government have special programs in place to regularly assess schools, hospitals and health facilities for maintenance, compliance with building codes, general safety, weather-related risks etc.?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Schools	Yes
Hospitals/ health facilities	Yes

Description of Progress & Achievements:

National policies exist, but implementation is minimal

Priority for Action 5

Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

Core Indicator 5.1

Strong policy, technical and institutional capacities and mechanisms for disaster risk management, with a disaster risk reduction perspective are in place.

-- No questions related to local context --

Core Indicator 5.2

Disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans are in place at all administrative levels, and regular training drills and rehearsals are held to test and develop disaster response programmes.

How regularly are training drills and rehearsal carried out with the participation of relevant government, non-governmental, local leaders and volunteers?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Available through NGO's such as Red cross/ private hospital, the sources are however scattered and controlled by different actors

How available are key resources for effective response, such as emergency supplies, emergency shelters, identified evacuation routes and contingency plans at all times?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Stockpiles of relief supplies	Yes
Emergency shelters	Yes
Safe evacuation routes identified	Yes
Contingency plan or community disaster preparedness plan for all major hazards	Yes

Description of Progress & Achievements:

The Red cross has always led in this however LA rarely participate in this

To what extent does the local government have an emergency operations centre (EOC) and/or an emergency communication system?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Some emergency lines are operational while some are not

How aware are citizens of evacuation plans or drills for evacuations when necessary?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

To some extent there is sensitization

To what degree does the Contingency Plan (or similar plan) include an outline strategy for post disaster recovery and reconstruction, including needs assessments and livelihoods rehabilitation?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Though not yet adopted, the contingency plan covers all the aspects mentioned

How far are regular disaster preparedness drills undertaken in schools, hospitals and health facilities?

Level of Progress achieved: 2

Schools	Yes
Hospitals/ health facilities	Yes

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Very minimal

Core Indicator 5.3

Financial reserves and contingency mechanisms are in place to support effective response and recovery when required.

To what degree do local institutions have access to financial reserves to support effective disaster response and early recovery?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Description of Progress & Achievements:

There is too much bureaucracy in local financing

How much access does the local government have to resources and expertise to assist victims of psycho-social (psychological,

emotional) impacts of disasters?

Level of Progress achieved: 3

Description of Progress & Achievements:

Services are available with Red cross and social services department, however this is not well coordinated and some victims suffer silently.

Core Indicator 5.4

Procedures are in place to exchange relevant information during hazard events and disasters, and to undertake post-event reviews.

-- No questions related to local context --