



Kenya

National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2013-2015) - Interim

Name of focal point:	Mr Vincent Matioli
Organization:	MINISTRY OF DEVOLUTION AND PLANNING STATE DEPARTMENT OF DEVOLUTION DIRECTORATE OF SPECIAL PROGRAMMES
Title/Position:	under secretary
E-mail address:	matioliv66@yahoo.com
Telephone:	+2540722841229

Reporting period:	2013-2015
Report Status:	Interim
Last updated on:	16 February 2015
Print date:	16 February 2015
Reporting language:	English

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

Outcomes

Strategic Outcome For Goal 1

Outcomes Statement

Kenya has a draft National Disaster Risk management Policy which intergrates disdaster risk management in planning and budgeting. County Governments are also being sensitised on the need to come up with County Disaster Risk Management Policies and also plan for disaster risk reduction funds. Meanwhile the National Government has devolved funds for disaster management to all Counties.

Strategic Outcome For Goal 2

Outcomes Statement

efforts are underway to strengthen county disaster risk management committees. There are disaster management Committees in Counties. We are building on the existing Committees

Strategic Outcome For Goal 3

Outcomes Statement

the National Government has undertaken risk vunerability and hazard assesment to identify and map out potential risks in the Counties. The outcome will be used to plan and or put in place risk reduction measures.

Strategic goals

Strategic Goal Area 1

The more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction.

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

Twelve disaster vulnerable Counties have been mapped out using available information from the available hazard maps. Training modules have been prepared to built capacities of these counties on issues of disaster risk reduction and to help them put in place Early Warning Systems for disaster management

Strategic Goal Area 2

The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards.

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

We intend to work with County Governments to reach out to communities to built their disaster risk reduction capacity hence make them resilience to hazards.

Strategic Goal Area 3

The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities.

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

we continue to hold relief food stocks and non food items in strategic reserves as apreparedness mechanism for assisting communities affected by disasters.

Priority for Action 1

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

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is disaster risk taken into account in public investment and planning decisions? Yes

National development plan	Yes
Sector strategies and plans	Yes
Climate change policy and strategy	Yes
Poverty reduction strategy papers	Yes
CCA/ UNDAF (Common Country Assessment/ UN Development Assistance Framework)	Yes
Civil defence policy, strategy and contingency planning	No

Have legislative and/or regulatory provisions been made for managing disaster risk?
Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Country has a National Disaster management Policy though still in draft form. Through an Executive order, a National Disaster management Unit has been formed within the National Police Service to take charge on all issues of disaster management in the country.

The 2010 constitution of Kenya, recognizes disaster risk management as a development agenda and creates 2 levels of governance i.e National Government and County Government.

Schedule 4 of the 2010 Constitution of Kenya, Sec 1. on the roles of National Government-No 24. Gives the role of disaster management to the National Government and Sec 2.on the roles of County Governments- No. 12 gives the role disaster management and fire fighting to County Governments.

Kenya created 47 County Governments through the 2010 Constitution.

A part from the National platform on disaster risk reduction which has been in existence since 2006, 5 County Governments have created their county platforms on disaster risk reduction including; Turkana County, Tana- River County, Garissa County, Baringo County and Nairobi County.

Kenya has created disaster risk reduction champions through capacity building Kenya Women Parliamentarians (KEWOPA) to help move forward legislative agenda on disaster risk reduction and disaster risk management bill.

There is a Climate Change Secretariat and National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy in place.

There is National Drought Management Policy in place to end drought emergencies.

There is National Environmental Management Agency (NEMA) policy and bill in place.

Nairobi County has legislated disaster management and fire fighting policy.

Kisii County has also legislated disaster management policy.

There are other Acts of Parliament supporting disaster risk management activities in the Country.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

A shift in mindset from response to risk management is yet to be fully realized even within the political cycles. This has resulted into low prioritization of risk reductions matters when it comes to allocation of national budgets. This should again be resolved once the expected

policy comes into place to guide allocation of funds to risk reduction

Lack a unified and comprehensive disaster management policy has affected coordination on disaster management both within government and among other stakeholders. However, with the expected approval of the DRM Policy, an umbrella coordination mechanism will be

put in place which will harmonize all the existing ad hoc policies on DRM.

DRM governance has not fully been devolved to the local communities in Kenya save for ad hoc efforts mostly by the Non-Governmental Organizations. However, the new

constitution and the introduction of the counties system of governance provides an opportunity to accelerate mainstreaming of DRR at the local level.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

What is the ratio of the budget allocation to risk reduction versus disaster relief and reconstruction?

	Risk reduction / prevention (%)	Relief and reconstruction (%)
National budget		
Decentralised / sub-national budget		
USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g transport, agriculture, infrastructure)		

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Disaster Risk Reduction Ministry Sector Ministries such as devolution and Planning, Interior and Coordination of National Government, Agriculture and Fisheries development, Environment water and Natural Resources have key componets of their budgets dedicated for disaster risk management. Copunty Governments are currently setting aside budgets for disaster risk reduction.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

key challenges are that issues of disaster risk reduction are scattered in different national organizations and without a Policy framework coordination remains a problem

Core indicator 3

Community Participation and decentralisation is ensured through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do local governments have legal responsibility and regular / systematic budget allocations for DRR? Yes

Legislation (Is there a specific legislation for local governments with a mandate for DRR?)	Yes
Regular budget allocations for DRR to local government	Yes
Estimated % of local budget allocation assigned to DRR	5

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Kenya Constitution, 2010 has devolved disaster management to County Governments. This ensures that they budget for disaster risk reduction activities

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

County Governments have been in existence for only 1 year. Most of them are still putting up structures for disaster management

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are civil society organizations, national finance and planning institutions, key economic and development sector organizations represented in the national platform? Yes

civil society members (specify absolute number)	7
national finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)	1
sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)	7
private sector (specify absolute number)	7
science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)	3
women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)	2
other (please specify)	youth organizations ¹

Where is the coordinating lead institution for disaster risk reduction located?

In the Prime Minister's/President's Office	Yes
In a central planning and/or coordinating unit	No
In a civil protection department	No
In an environmental planning ministry	No
In the Ministry of Finance	No
Other (Please specify)	

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

we experience challenge of funding in holding regular meetings for National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

lack of appropriate budgetary provision for the National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. There is need for International Disaster Risk reduction Organizations such as UNISDR to support the National Platform

Priority for Action 2

Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

Some progress, but without systematic policy and/ or institutional commitment.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national multi-hazard risk assessment with a common methodology available to inform planning and development decisions? Yes

Multi-hazard risk assessment	No
% of schools and hospitals assessed	15
schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)	85
Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments	No
Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments	Yes
Risk assessment held by a central repository (lead institution)	Yes
Common format for risk assessment	No
Risk assessment format customised by user	No
Is future/probable risk assessed?	No

Please list the sectors that have already used disaster risk assessment as a precondition for sectoral development planning and programming.

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The country has done hazard and vulnerability analysis with funds from UNDP, and consulted the expertise of Kenyatta University, one of the institutions of higher learning and research in Kenya to carry out hazard mapping and documentation. Through the assistance of UN Regional Office for disaster reduction, Country has developed a National disaster loss database to help collect, capture and manage database information on hazards in the country.

Kenya has developed Kenya Initial Rapid Assessment (KIRA) tool, a multi-sector, multi-agency tool whose purpose is to provide a fast overview of a humanitarian situation in order to support evidence based decision making in early stages of a disaster.

The Kenya Meteorological Services have devolved their early warning services to the County levels so as to strengthen risk assessment and early warning systems in the Counties where disaster strikes the most.

Through the support from IGAD, a regional economic community, the member states developed hazard maps.

All Major disasters are monitored by the existing lead agencies. National Disaster Operation

Center monitors all forms of disaster such as accidents, fires, conflicts earthquakes, volcanic

eruptions at village level. The information is relayed through the provincial administration

from the village elders, to the local chiefs who in turn send the daily report to Divisional

officers, the District Commissioners to Provincial commissioners for collating and onward

reporting to the National Disaster Operation center.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The existence of early warning systems for major hazards lack a coordinated approach and are issued sometimes with little consultations due to lack of legal coordination framework.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are disaster losses and hazards systematically reported, monitored and analyzed?
No

Disaster loss databases exist and are regularly updated

No

Reports generated and used in planning by finance, planning and sectoral line ministries (from the disaster databases/ information systems)

Yes

Hazards are consistently monitored across localities and territorial boundaries

No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Specific investments have been made in poverty eradication, drought risk reduction and livelihoods improvement in close to 28 arid and semi-arid districts through the Ministry of Northern Kenya and the National Drought Management Authority (formally the Arid lands). A fully funded program to manage/ reduce floods impacts in Western Kenya - Western Kenya Floods mitigation community driven project – has been running for close to 3 years with a 3 billion budgetary allocation for construction of dykes, floods early warning hydrometeorological system, community resilience enhancement, flood shelters, demonstration housing, improvement of community radio stations for information dissemination and alerts warning.

There are additional funding mechanisms at the community level to which DRM initiatives are beginning to tap in. Examples include the Constituency Development Fund – CDF, the Local Authority Transfer Fund – LATF, the Youth Enterprise Development Fund, the Women Development Fund. These funds are now available to support local / Community risk reduction/ poverty alleviation/ environment

conservation initiatives.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

DRR is a cross cutting issue in development planning in Kenya. So it is not easy to plan for it as a stand-alone sector and so attach budgets to it. Instead, budgets are allocated to relevant mainstream sectors like Agriculture, Water, Health, etc. In the same way it is not easy to seek funding for it as a standalone sector. The frequency and severity of the disasters being experienced in Kenya attract most of the funds available towards response, leaving little or none for risk reduction .

Lack of adequate funding to devolve DRM structures to the local still remain a challenge and to address root causes. Priority for response and poverty eradication has continued to supersede Risk reduction.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 2

Some progress, but without systematic policy and/ or institutional commitment.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do risk prone communities receive timely and understandable warnings of impending hazard events? No

Early warnings acted on effectively	No
Local level preparedness	Yes
Communication systems and protocols used and applied	Yes
Active involvement of media in early warning dissemination	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

County, Sub-County and Locational Disaster Management Committees are in place in most parts of the Country. Most of them have received some form of training courtesy of NGOs and government initiatives. Following the Post-Election Violence in 2008, Peace Committees have been instituted in most communities preserve peace and prevent conflict. Through the provincial Administration that has networks across the whole country, the government is able to create awareness and early warning in case of epidemic outbreaks, or pending disasters. The liberalization of media in local dialects ensures that early warning and awareness creation on disasters spreads to virtually all the communities.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The financial implications of instituting and maintain elaborate DRR structures at the community level are beyond the government ability to manage. However, this challenge has been countered by maintaining same structures/ taking advantage of existing ones especially the District Steering Groups to also double as Disaster Committees. With devolution rolling out, the challenge is to ensure that these temporary structures at the community level become permanent and well-functioning.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Does your country participate in regional or sub-regional actions to reduce disaster risk? No

Establishing and maintaining regional hazard monitoring	No
Regional or sub-regional risk assessment	No
Regional or sub-regional early warning	No
Establishing and implementing protocols for transboundary information sharing	No
Establishing and resourcing regional and sub-regional strategies and frameworks	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Through the National Platform focal points/ Desk Officers have been trained and designated to various line ministries. These are now trainers of trainers and are playing a crucial role in mainstreaming DRR to communities through training of the local level disaster committees. The National Platform has every year coordinated the marking of the International Day for Disaster Reduction and is in the process of establishing a National Disaster Loss Data Base with support from Partners.

The platform has played a central role in drafting the DRM policy and has made the necessary reviews to it including aligning it to the new constitution especially in areas of devolution and bill of rights. This policy is now pending approval.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Lack of a secretariat (staff, office with office equipment) to facilitate the work of the National Platform in convening coordination meetings and follow up of resolutions thereof. - Slow process of approving the draft DM policy. This is the policy that provides for the formation of the National Platform and also for the County Platforms. This means that the platform as it is, is not legitimate. It means there are no guidelines yet within the relevant Ministry for allocation of funds and other resources to run the activities of the Platform at the national level and at the counties. - High frequency of disasters has attracted focus to response leaving little time for risk reduction initiatives. This is compounded by the understaffing problem at the Ministry

of State for Special Programs who double as the NP Secretariat staff. - Limited funding if any. There are no guidelines based on which funds can be directed towards the activities of the NP. It is not surprising that some of the interviewed agencies are willing to support the NP activities but lack the means through which to channel such funds.

Priority for Action 3

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

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national disaster information system publicly available? No

Information is proactively disseminated	No
Established mechanisms for access / dissemination (internet, public information broadcasts - radio, TV,)	Yes
Information is provided with proactive guidance to manage disaster risk	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Kenya has integrated disaster risk reduction in the education system and institutions of higher learning, with review of the Kenya education curriculum by Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development recognizing the importance of risk reduction to spur sectoral development, the review is currently underway.

Some schools in flood prone areas have intergrated flood management in their regular English lessons for example Kano in Kisumu County and Budalangi in Busia County , these flood prone areas are in the Western part of Kenya.

Institutions of higher learning and research like Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenyatta University, Nairobi University, Moi University have

reviewed their curricula and are offering courses on disaster risk management, disaster and diplomacy, disaster management and climate change, policy and environment among other disaster management specializations.

Through the Kenya Women Parliamentarians (KEWOPA) as champions of disaster risk reduction in the country, they use their knowledge on disaster risk management in their public meetings and forums to raise awareness on hazards in their constituencies.

The national Government through the Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government is creating awareness to hazards through its structure of Nyumba Kumi (Ten House) Concept, Asst.Chiefs, Chiefs, Asst.County Commissioners, Deputy County Commissioners and County Commissioners.

The National Government in collaboration with UN Regional office for Disaster Reduction , UNDP and media houses in the country organizes TV and Radio talk shows to raise awareness on hazards and disasters in the Country. The use of FM stations broadcasting in local dialects have gained a lot of popularity.

The role of Council of elders from different communities in Kenya has helped immensely in conservation of cultures and application of indigenous knowledge in disaster risk management.

With support from UNICEF and UNISDR, the Kenya Institute of Education has made some progress in mainstreaming DRR into primary schools curriculum. A Schools manual to guide infrastructure development at schools to ensure safety has been developed. Also developed are: a Teachers Resource Manual to support teachers in delivery of DRR contents in schools; Pupils Resource books for class one, two and three. All these have been published and ready to be used. Pupils' resource books for higher classes are in the process of production.

Informally, development and humanitarian NGOs continue to play a central role in providing DRR training to both government and community groups and representatives.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The curriculum development process for lower level education will need to move to the next level by providing in service training for teachers to be able to use the material produced and to put in place a monitoring system to ensure that schools are now 'DRR compliant' based on the manuals developed.

More resources will be needed to produce additional resources material both for teachers and pupils.

There is no unified and certified curriculum based on which DRR education is provided especially at the informal level.

Application of extra curriculum activities occasions like Sports, soccer, drama festivals, Music festivals, athletic meetings has helped Kenya raise awareness on disasters and hazards in the country.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? No

primary school curriculum	Yes
secondary school curriculum	No
university curriculum	Yes
professional DRR education programmes	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

A Schools' manual to guide infrastructure development at schools to ensure safety has been developed. Also developed are: a Teachers Resource Manual to support teachers in delivery of DRR contents in schools; Pupils Resource books for class one, two and three. All these have been published and ready to be used. Pupils' resource books for higher classes are in the process of production. Informally, development and humanitarian NGOs continue to play a central role in providing DRR training to both government and community groups and representatives.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The curriculum development process for lower level education will need to move to the next level by providing in service training for teachers to be able to use the material produced and to put in place a monitoring system to ensure that schools are now 'DRR compliant' based on the manuals developed. More resources will be needed to produce additional resources material both for teachers and pupils.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national scientific applied-research agenda/budget? No

Research programmes and projects	Yes
Research outputs, products or studies are applied / used by public and private institutions	No
Studies on the economic costs and benefits of DRR	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Research activities are promoted particularly at graduate schools on various disaster issues.

However, the outputs, products or studies may not yet be fully applied by the public or private sector in resolving the disaster problems that affect the country due to other structural or financial challenges.

There exists National/ International Research Institutions who have been undertaking disaster risk related studies in Kenya. Examples include the International Livestock Research Institute on promotion of livestock activities, the Kenya Agriculture

Research Institute on promotion of agricultural productivity and food security and ICIPE on insect physiology. Other similar institutions include the Kenya Medical Research Institute - KEMRI, Center for Disease Control – CDC and the Regional Center for Resource Mapping and Development among others.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The Key challenge in Kenya remains the strategic direction and focus on disaster related research and the funding that goes with this. This should hopefully be resolved with the expected enactment of the Disaster Management Policy.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do public education campaigns for risk-prone communities and local authorities include disaster risk? Yes

Public education campaigns for enhanced awareness of risk.	Yes
Training of local government	No
Disaster management (preparedness and emergency response)	Yes
Preventative risk management (risk and vulnerability)	No
Guidance for risk reduction	No
Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Government officers from key ministries have been targeted by key humanitarian agencies for training with the aim to mainstream DRR within their respective sectors. Disaster preparedness and emergency response however remains domain of the humanitarian agencies with Red Cross leading the way. However, other government organs like the National Disaster Operation Center (NDOC), the Crisis Response Unit, the police and the Armed Forces have taken part in responding to emergencies as and when they occur. NDOC in government is charged with the responsibility of coordinating emergency response operations. Attempts at creating awareness on preventive risk reduction have been conducted. However, due to limited resources and a strong institutional basis, such initiatives do not get to a level where they can be put to practice or implemented. Information on DRR practices at the community level is mostly available with the NGOs and the Humanitarian Agencies that work with them.

Public awareness campaigns in Kenya have largely been spearheaded by the humanitarian agencies, the Ministry of State for Special Programmes and to some extent the provincial administration and the media

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The unavailability of a comprehensive policy on DRM and the relevant institutions remains a major hindrance to promoting a systematic awareness campaign on DRR. However, the ongoing NGOs and Humanitarian Sector work on awareness creation, the current robust media Provincial Administration network will continue to enlighten Kenyans on their roles in DRR Please use additional space if required.

Priority for Action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Core indicator 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.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a mechanism in place to protect and restore regulatory ecosystem services? (associated with wet lands, mangroves, forests etc) No

Protected areas legislation	Yes
Payment for ecosystem services (PES)	No
Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)	No
Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)	Yes
Climate change adaptation projects and programmes	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Kenya has developed vision 2030, which is being implemented through a series of successive Five year medium term plans.

The first one being the 1st medium plan 2008-2012, currently we are on 2nd medium plan 2013-2018.

County integrated development plans which incorporated disaster risk reduction in all

the 47 County development plans are linked to the vision 2030 and the five (5) year sector specific medium plans have been prepared to cater for local implementation strategies.

Kenya vision 2030 is based on three pillars namely;-

- 1) Economic pillar,
- 2) Social pillar,
- 3) The political pillar.

The three pillars are anchored on foundations which include;

- i. Infrastructure
- ii. Information Communication and technology (ICT).
- iii. Science Technology and Innovation(STI)
- iv. Land reforms.
- v. Human resources development
- vi. Security, peace building and conflict management.
- vii. There is a vibrant public private partnership through social corporate responsibility in disaster risk management

For the reporting purposes it is the 2nd pillar that is good news for disaster risk management practitioners in Kenya.

The Social Pillar- "Investing in the people of Kenya", the social pillar aims at building a just cohesive society that enjoys equitable social development in a clean and secure environment and entails areas such as;

- Health
- Education and training
- Youth
- Gender
- Vulnerable groups
- Housing
- Environment
- Water and sanitation.

Therefore the Government has established mechanisms for increasing the resilience resiliency of the poor and most vulnerable of Kenyan society.

- viii. There is a vibrant public private partnership through social corporate responsibility in disaster risk management

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The main challenge for the country remains the enforcement or implementation of the available strategies and policies to curb environment degradation. This is partly due to lack of enough resources for the required human resources, equipment and facilities. But also due to corruption in which regulations are overlooked to abet degradation/ pollution/ unplanned settlements. However, the promulgation of the new constitution and the on-going

strengthening of key institutions like the judiciary should help curb corruption and other vile practices.

Core indicator 2

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do social safety nets exist to increase the resilience of risk prone households and communities? No

Crop and property insurance	No
Temporary employment guarantee schemes	No
Conditional and unconditional cash transfers	Yes
Micro finance (savings, loans, etc.)	Yes
Micro insurance	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The government has in place various institutions and schemes to protect the welfare of vulnerable populations in the country. First is the Ministry of youth and gender which coordinates development affairs of women, girls and youth. A Youth Enterprise Development Fund is in place to provide small loans or grants to youth to engage in micro-businesses. The same applies to women who have the Women Development Fund to provide grants/ loans to women to engage in micro-businesses. There is also a provision for unemployed youth to provide labor to government development projects (locally known as 'Kazi Kwa Vijana' initiative) so as to earn them a wage. Other safety net schemes include

the retirements' benefits authority which ensures that all those employed have some savings to rely on during their sun-set years. A pilot initiative to provide cash/ food transfer subsidies to the poor elderly citizens of the country is on trial in a few urban and rural areas

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Funding challenges are quite common among the government initiated safety-nets schemes.

Corruption and mismanagement cases have been reported in some of the schemes. Cash transfers are still limited to disaster response initiatives while insurance of climate related agricultural or livestock risks has not really taken root. The retirement benefits scheme is only applicable to those who worked and saved with it.

The government's vision 2030 will hopefully improve the economic well-being of most Kenyans by reducing poverty levels and generating economic opportunities to more

Kenyans. The strengthening of the judiciary and other such institutions should solve the problem of corruption and resources mismanagement.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the costs and benefits of DRR incorporated into the planning of public investment? No

National and sectoral public investment systems incorporating DRR.

No

Please provide specific examples: e.g. public infrastructure, transport and communication, economic and productive assets

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

As part of the Vision 2030, the Kenya Economic Stimulus Program (abbreviated as ESP) was initiated by the Government of Kenya to boost economic growth and lead the Kenyan economy out of a recession situation brought about by economic slowdown. The Kenyan ESP was introduced in the 2009/2010 Budget Speech in parliament. Its aim was to jumpstart the Kenyan economy towards long term growth and development, after the 2007/2008 postelection violence that affected the Kenyan economy, prolonged drought, a rally in oil and food prices and the effects of the 2008/09 global economic crisis. The total budget allocated amounted to 22 Billion Kenya Shillings (260 million US\$), with the money going towards the construction of schools, horticultural markets, jua kali sheds (cottage industry) and public health centers in all the 210 constituencies. The Key objectives of the ESP have been to boost the country's economic recovery; Invest in long term solutions to the challenges of food security, Expand economic opportunities in rural areas for employment creation; Promote regional development for equity and social stability; Improve infrastructure and the quality education and healthcare; Invest in the conservation of the environment; Expand the access to, and build the ICT capacity in order to expand economic opportunities and accelerate economic growth.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The implementation of Kenya's Vision 2030 is faced by myriad of challenges such as inadequate and limited resource allocation especially in carrying out development activities; political interference; uncertain political environment; constant inflation compounded with the weak currency; global recession, hence limited donor funding which is also greatly linked to donor dependency; corruption especially in the misappropriation of funds as seen in the free Primary Education Programme; inadequate and ineffective involvement by the citizens of Kenya; unsustainability of programmes; insufficient disaggregated data; poor linkage of policy, planning and budgeting at the grass root levels; natural and man-made disasters such as famine, drought, post-election violence of 2007 and economic crisis leading to reprioritization. Coordination and sharing of activities and responsibilities among those charged with the implementation of flagship projects and Middle Term Plans, proper training

needs, and adequate and sufficient allocation of finances in the budget are some of the solutions that need to be factored to ensure successful implementation of Kenya's Vision 2030 by the Delivery Secretariat and the Ministry of State for Planning, National Development and Vision 2030. Further, since Vision 2030 is charged with industrializing the nation and making it a middle-income economy, there should be enhanced networking and collaboration with other development partners, capacity building of the communities to enhance project sustainability and ownership, employment of a bottom-up approach where programmes and projects begin at the community level; promotion of understanding of development agenda at all levels, promotion of transparency and accountability through enhanced corporate governance, public-private partnerships; and effectiveness in the implementation and monitoring of devolved funds so as to maximize benefits.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there investment to reduce the risk of vulnerable urban settlements? Yes

Investment in drainage infrastructure in flood prone areas	Yes
Slope stabilisation in landslide prone areas	Yes
Training of masons on safe construction technology	No
Provision of safe land and housing for low income households and communities	No
Risk sensitive regulation in land zoning and private real estate development	Yes
Regulated provision of land titling	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator

(not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Land use planning has been an integral part of most urban developments in the country. Zoning tool is applied to categorize and regulate developments in most urban centers in Kenya. This is closely connected to land titling for earmarked developments Building codes are in place although strict enforcement may not have been achieved. In the recent past the government has embarked on Slums Upgrading Programs with the notable ones in Nairobi's Kibera slums and in Kisumu. Certain fragile ecosystems and environments have in the recent past been identified and set aside for rehabilitation or protection, a case in mind being the Mau Water Shade, Aberdares Forest and the Mt. Kenya Forest.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Corruption and poor enforcement of the building codes and conservation laws still remains a big challenge. Competing land uses and population pressure coupled with rapid rural urban migration have also contributed to challenge the intention to improve land use planning and management.

Core indicator 5

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do post-disaster programmes explicitly incorporate and budget for DRR for resilient recovery? No

% of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR

DRR capacities of local authorities for response and recovery strengthened	Yes
--	-----

Risk assessment undertaken in pre- and post-disaster recovery and reconstruction planning	Yes
---	-----

Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery	Yes
---	-----

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Livelihood programs support to vulnerable communities by UNDP in which communities are supported to raise fund for community projects like fish farms. Kenya Red Cross along Tana River and other areas have supported communities through restocking programs, construction of sand dams, establishment of agricultural farms. Other actors including government have supported restocking programs after major droughts, long term water projects among other initiatives

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

The main challenge remains the Relief mindset in which little thought if any is given to long term risk reduction or recovery. Most recovery projects initiated at the community level are not sustainable due to lack of financial and adequate human resource capacity to sustain them. Funding gaps to scale up recovery projects still remains a challenge too.

Core indicator 6

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the impacts of disaster risk that are created by major development projects assessed? Yes

Are cost/benefits of disaster risk taken into account in the design and operation of major development projects? Yes

Impacts of disaster risk taken account in Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)

Yes

By national and sub-national authorities and institutions

No

By international development actors

Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Environmental Management and Coordination Act (1999) clearly makes EIA mandatory for all projects specified in the Act. In the NEAP (GoK, 1994), the Government proposes to “integrate environmental conservation in economic development to provide sustainable development for posterity. This includes integration of environmental considerations in development planning at all levels; promotion of environmentally sound use of both renewable and non-renewable resources in the process of national development; establishment of an institutional framework for coordinating, monitoring, and enforcing environmental regulations and standards; and finally providing human and financial resources to support an environment and development coordinating agency and an EIA institution.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Level of ignorance among the public in Kenya on EIA and so the lack of effective public participation. - Most developers undertake the EIA process mainly to be compliant with the regulations in place, which is responsible in part to the corruption witnessed in the sector. Most proponents have EIA Licenses yet they are not aware

of the contents of the EIA project/study report which resulted into the EIA license. They sign reports compiled by lead experts without reading since all they are interested in is the EIA License or they do not have the capacity to comprehend its contents due to the professional environmental language used in the EIA report. · Lack of effective consultation of the public. · The technical nature of the EIA reports which inhibit effective public scrutiny.

Priority for Action 5

Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

Core indicator 1

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are there national programmes or policies for disaster preparedness, contingency planning and response? Yes

DRR incorporated in these programmes and policies

Yes

The institutional mechanisms exist for the rapid mobilisation of resources in a disaster, utilising civil society and the private sector; in addition to public sector support.

No

Are there national programmes or policies to make schools and health facilities safe in emergencies? Yes

Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety

No

Training and mock drills in school and hospitals for emergency preparedness

Yes

Are future disaster risks anticipated through scenario development and aligned preparedness planning? Yes

Potential risk scenarios are developed taking into account climate change projections

No

Preparedness plans are regularly updated

Yes

based on future risk scenarios

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Contingency planning for major hazards is not yet fully institutionalized in Kenya. Sub-national structures still lack the technical capacity to develop or implement contingency

plans. However, there is proposed the establishment of a National Drought and Disaster Contingency Fund that will provide immediate funds to respond to disasters once it comes into effect.

The government maintains grain reserves through the ministry of Agriculture for relief needs during disasters. A few specialized agencies like the Kenya Red Cross usually develop some form of contingency planning for certain hazards.

A number of government run referral hospitals and other medical facilities exist at various levels and are to some extent able to handle emergencies involving mass casualties.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Prioritizing contingency funds in the midst many other pressing/ competing needs still remains a challenge. Funding sub-national contingency/ disaster preparedness structures, leave alone contingency plans still remains a challenge

Core indicator 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.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the contingency plans, procedures and resources in place to deal with a major disaster? Yes

Plans and programmes are developed with gender sensitivities	No
Risk management/contingency plans for continued basic service delivery	Yes
Operations and communications centre	Yes
Search and rescue teams	Yes
Stockpiles of relief supplies	Yes
Shelters	No
Secure medical facilities	No
Dedicated provision for disabled and elderly in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities	No
Businesses are a proactive partner in planning and delivery of response	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The government maintains grain reserves through the ministry of Agriculture for relief needs during disasters. A few specialized agencies like the Kenya Red Cross usually develop some form of contingency planning for certain hazards. A number of government run referral hospitals and other medical facilities exist at various levels and are to some extent able to handle emergencies involving mass casualties. Contingency planning for major hazards is not yet fully institutionalized in Kenya. Sub-national structures still lack the technical capacity to develop or implement contingency plans. However, there is proposed the establishment of a National Drought and Disaster Contingency Fund that will provide immediate funds to respond to disasters once it comes into effect.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular,

highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Prioritizing contingency funds amidst many other pressing/ competing needs still remains a challenge. Funding sub-national contingency/ disaster preparedness structures, leave alone contingency plans still remains a challenge.

Core indicator 3

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

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are financial arrangements in place to deal with major disaster? Yes

National contingency and calamity funds	Yes
The reduction of future risk is considered in the use of calamity funds	No
Insurance and reinsurance facilities	No
Catastrophe bonds and other capital market mechanisms	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Specific disaster fund so far no-existent. The national consolidated fund usually provides any required funds for disaster response. Due to the limited nature of the resources, risk reduction during emergencies is not usually prioritized. The insurance industry has been in existence for long, but has been for commercial purposes. Insurance of crop and livestock risks is only beginning to take root.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Competing needs for funding still remains a major impediment towards achieving a contingency fund for emergency response.

Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Has an agreed method and procedure been adopted to assess damage, loss and needs when disasters occur? Yes

Damage and loss assessment methodologies and capacities available

Yes

Post-disaster need assessment methodologies

Yes

Post-disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on gender aspects

No

Identified and trained human resources

No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Damage and loss and post disaster needs assessment methodologies exist.

However, these are not uniform across the board and are institution/ agency based.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

There is need for uniform, synchronized disaster loss and post disaster needs assessment methodologies. These need to be anchored within national institutions and not individual agencies as is the case at the moment. This will be sorted out once the disaster risk management legislation will be in place.

Drivers of Progress

a) Multi-hazard integrated approach to disaster risk reduction and development

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Do studies/ reports/ atlases on multi-hazard analyses exist in the country/ for the sub region?: Yes

If yes, are these being applied to development planning/ informing policy?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

The government through the relevant ministry has commissioned a nation-wide hazard and risk mapping exercise that is currently underway. At the individual level, institutions and agencies have commissioned their own studies to address this need. Results of such studies and maps may not yet have been fully utilized to inform comprehensive policy formulation or development planning but may have been applied at sector specific planning. There is need for more unified systematic efforts to assess comprehensively, the risk of disaster in Kenya. The results of such assessments need to find their way into policy formulation and development planning board rooms.

b) Gender perspectives on risk reduction and recovery adopted and institutionalized

Levels of Reliance

Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders.

Is gender disaggregated data available and being applied to decision-making for risk reduction and recovery activities?: Yes

Do gender concerns inform policy and programme conceptualisation and

implementation in a meaningful and appropriate way?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

Gender disparity issues have been deliberated upon in Kenya for quite some time within and outside government with plans and strategies rolled out to address it. Ministries and government departments have been established within government and social economic programs set up to address the gender disparity question. NGOs and the private sector have equally been active on gender issues, especially those that contribute to vulnerability to disasters in the area of HIV and in addressing inappropriate cultural orientations that put women and girls at risk. The new constitution now provides better opportunities for women and girls in natural resource ownership and management which could promote further sustainability of such resources. More efforts and dedication are needed to actualize the intentions of the new constitution in this regard.

c) Capacities for risk reduction and recovery identified and strengthened

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Do responsible designated agencies, institutions and offices at the local level have capacities for the enforcement of risk reduction regulations?: Yes

Are local institutions, village committees, communities, volunteers or urban resident welfare associations properly trained for response?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

Key national institutions for disaster risk management are in place and a few more are in the pipeline. With the promulgation of the new constitution which has emphasis on devolution, it is expected that these national institutions will in the next few years devolve as a matter of priority to the county and sub-county levels. Human resource development in the area of disaster risk reduction has picked up with some key universities taking a lead role. Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology in western Kenya now provides fully fledged certificate, diploma, graduate and post graduate courses in disaster risk management. Other universities are following suit. The Kenya Institute of Education has initiated measures to mainstream disaster risk

management skills and knowledge into the education curriculum. This process will need to be supported further to realize its goal of entrenching disaster risk reduction into the education system.

d) Human security and social equity approaches integrated into disaster risk reduction and recovery activities

Levels of Reliance

Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders.

Do programmes take account of socio-environmental risks to the most vulnerable and marginalised groups?: Yes

Are appropriate social protection measures / safety nets that safeguard against their specific socioeconomic and political vulnerabilities being adequately implemented?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

The social safety nets introduced by government to protect the less privileged members of society are still at the pilot level, only covering a small section of those that are vulnerable to disasters. These efforts need to be systematized, institutionalized and scaled up to cover more vulnerable Kenyans. More elaborate structures of assessing and identifying vulnerable groups need to be put in place. More sustainable and longer term strategies for supporting the vulnerable groups also need to be determined rather than just providing handouts to them.

e) Engagement and partnerships with non-governmental actors; civil society, private sector, amongst others, have been fostered at all levels

Levels of Reliance

Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders.

Are there identified means and sources to convey local and community experience or traditional knowledge in disaster risk reduction?: Yes

If so, are they being integrated within local, sub-national and national disaster risk reduction plans and activities in a meaningful way?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

Non state actors, the civil society groups and to an extent the private sector have played a crucial role in moving the DRR agenda forward in Kenya. They have been at the fore front in advocating for policy on DRR and building capacities of existing institutions in DRR. They have been strong in responding to disasters and in awareness creation. They have played a crucial role in addressing the root causes of vulnerability including food security, poverty eradication, risk transfer among other interventions. These agencies have worked closely with government through existing coordination networks like the National Platform for DRR, the Inter Agency Working Group on DRR, the Kenya Humanitarian Forum, the Food Security Working Group, Kenyans for Kenya Initiative among many other networks. The National Platform for DRR needs to be strengthened and provided with greater space to deliberate on and advise the executive on risk reduction strategies. There is need for harmonization/ synchronization of the coordination mechanisms so that there exist a central authority in coordination of all disaster risk management matters.

Contextual Drivers of Progress

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

More efforts are needed towards mainstreaming DRR into development sectors not just at the National level but now also at the county level where most administrative responsibilities have been transferred to. A disaster risk reduction manual for schools has been developed. A further step would be to build the technical capacities of managers of these schools to implement the provisions of the manual. An inventory of all the schools that are DRR compliant needs to be developed to encourage more schools to meet the required standards

Future Outlook

Future Outlook Area 1

The more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction.

Overall Challenges

The country has developed a strategy Disaster Risk Reduction Medium Term Plan II for implementing Vision 2030. The strategy mainstreams DRR issues in all programmes and projects for Vision 2030

Future Outlook Statement

to domesticate DRR in all planned programmes and projects

Future Outlook Area 2

The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards.

Overall Challenges

there is problem resulting from low capacity to undertake the envisioned programmes and projects throughout the country, lack of adequate funding and lack of laws and policies that mainstream DRR

Future Outlook Statement

we have also come up with a programme aimed at empowering communities in order

to built their resilience

Future Outlook Area 3

The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities.

Overall Challenges

currently the Disaster management Unit under the national Police Service has been mandated to undertake disaster management activities before appropriate policies are enacted

Future Outlook Statement

ensure the Policies are passed in parliament and an Act enforcing the same is in place

Stakeholders

Organizations, departments, and institutions that have contributed to the report

Organization	Organization type	Focal Point
Ministry of Devolution and Planning, Directorate of Special Programmes, Other Sector Ministries and stakeholders	Governments	Focal Point