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I. Introduction

Kenya is one of the world’s most water-scarce nations, falling well below the United Nations benchmark for water scarcity.\(^1\) Furthermore, water availability is anticipated to decrease in the wake of climate change, with direct impacts on livelihoods. The 2009 drought, for example, is estimated to have risked the lives of nearly 10 million Kenyans (Nzau 2013). Eighty percent of Kenya is made up of arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs), where drought is particularly pervasive.

Marsabit County has a poverty rate of 83.2%, placing it 44\(^{th}\) out of Kenya’s 47 counties, and it is comprised primarily of pastoralist populations. While traditionally pastoralist institutions were actually among the most resilient social-ecological systems in East Africa (Mwangi and Ostrom 2009), a combination of increased drought due to climate change, changes in land tenure that restrict traditional mobility, and exclusion from government services has increasingly threatened nomadic pastoralism and brought into question its continued viability. A resilience-based analysis strongly supports a hybrid strategy, which neither rejects pastoralism nor ignores its increasing vulnerability (Robinson and Berkes 2010).

Increasingly, traditional humanitarian aid has been criticized for failing to encourage (and perhaps even subverting) the development of long-term capacities to withstand drought. In order to bring humanitarian disaster relief into better coordination with long-term development goals, there has been a paradigm shift in favor of enhancing resilience as opposed to merely providing disaster relief. In order to promote long-term resilience and reduce dependency on disaster relief, it is important that efforts be targeted at enhanced governance capacities as opposed to meeting immediate needs.

What is resilience?

USAID adopts the following definition of resilience:

“The ability of countries, communities, and households to anticipate, adapt to, and/or recover from the effects of potentially hazardous occurrences (natural disasters, economic instability, conflict) in a manner that protects livelihoods, accelerates and sustains recovery, and supports economic and social development.”

While other definitions abound in both the scholarly literature and practitioner guides, they all have in common some reference to ability or capacity to withstand shocks. Whereas references to resilience originally referred to a property of an ecological system, in recent decades there has been much discussion of “community resilience” (Norris et al 2007) and a focus on the human and institutional aspects of social-ecological systems.

The clear relationship between resilience and ‘ability’ or ‘capacity’ and the recent focus on ‘community’ bring the literature on drought resilience directly into dialogue with long-standing debates in the development field about the roles of governance, participation and inclusion, and empowerment. There is an increasing consensus among both scholars and practitioners that the work of building resilience is in fact the work of empowering individuals and communities to be able to meet their needs in situations of high risk and vulnerability.

What is governance?

For the purpose of this governance audit, I adopt the conceptualization of governance as “a process of devising rules for a variety of operational or day-to-day situations... undertaken by governments... as well

as organizations of all types and at all scales” (Mwangi and Ostrom 2009). This definition is particularly appropriate here because it allows for analysis at any organizational level, from the household to the national government, which as we will see in the following section, is essential to effective resilience-building. The notion of governance as a system for devising rules for day-to-day situations also helps to clarify its relationship to capacity-building initiatives (which can enhance individuals’ and groups’ decision-making power), on the one hand, and drought preparedness and response (actions in response to a recurrent, problematic situation), on the other.

**Why a focus on gender?**

In the pastoralist communities where BOMA works, a focus on resilience logically implies a focus on women, as they are particularly vulnerable to drought and other disasters. Traditional gender roles mean that women are often tasked with household water collection and childcare. A further implication of the traditional division of labor is that pastoralist men are highly mobile together with their livestock, while women often remain in semi-settled communities, where they are less resilient to drought.

Despite being most affected, women also tend to be less influential in household decision-making that might affect resilience. There is substantial support for the notion that both negative impacts of drought and access to elements of adaptive capacity are socially differentiated across genders (Cutter 1995, Denton 2002, Enarson 2002).

Boma’s Governance Project seeks to enhance governance processes in Marsabit County, paying particular attention to drought resilience among pastoralist women. This Governance Audit seeks to evaluate existing capacities across multiple levels in order to provide an informed set of recommendations on project design.

**II. Conceptual Framework**

In this governance audit, we emphasize a multi-level and multi-sectoral approach to resilience-building, examining both individual capacities as well as governance at the community and county level. Both academic literature (Robinson and Berkes 2011) and practitioner guides (Frankenberger et al. 2012) on resilience highlight the critical importance of **multi-level, networked participation** in building the capacity to adapt to environmental change.

DFID’s Approach Paper on Disaster Resilience explicitly identifies five types (Political, Social/Human, Technological/Physical, Financial/Economic and Environmental/Natural) as well as four levels (Global/regional, National, Municipal/Local and Community/Household) of resilience-building activities. Both USAID and TANGO International in their concept papers on resilience adopt the adaptation of that ‘assets pentagon’ approach shown in Figure 1.

The governance audit also adopts a variation on this conceptual framework, adapted to the particular context and set of objectives facing BOMA’s governance project. Because BOMA is particularly concerned with being able to adequately measure the impact of its intervention, I propose the following matrix (Table 1) in which I have begun to identify particular indicators that can be used to assess each type of resilience at each level identified in the conceptual framework below.
In contrast to the framework presented above in Figure 1, I have removed natural/environmental resilience as a category, since our intervention cannot directly influence these factors. I have also combined financial and technological/physical resilience into one category that represents available tangible/material resources. In light of the newly devolved system of government in Kenya, as well as BOMA’s own geographical focus, I also replaced the national level with the county (which is intended to include national government structures operating at the county level).

### Table 1: Measurable Impacts of Resilience-Enhancing Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual/Household Level</th>
<th>Community Level</th>
<th>County/Government Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial/Physical</strong></td>
<td>Household Income &amp; Physical Assets</td>
<td>Community-level assets and natural resources</td>
<td>Government and other funds available to communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Material Resources)</strong></td>
<td>Income Diversification</td>
<td>Social Cohesion</td>
<td>Coordination across agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>Inequality across groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human</strong></td>
<td>Self-Efficacy Awareness of opportunities</td>
<td>Collective Efficacy Awareness of potential community actions</td>
<td>Political Efficacy Citizen awareness of political rights &amp; responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills/Education</td>
<td>Skilled Members</td>
<td>Institutional Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political</strong></td>
<td>Women’s decision-making power within the household</td>
<td>Women’s decision-making influence in the community</td>
<td>Community decision-making influence in the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observable Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Individual Private Action</td>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>Public Action (engagement with government)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, I have added the category of observable final outcomes. If the different categories of resilience-building activities are successful, they should result in enhanced abilities of people to meet their own needs in anticipation of and during a time of crisis, at each of the three levels. If people actually use these enhanced abilities, they should be observable as:

- Individual action to create private goods for the benefit of the household
- Collective action to create public goods for the benefit of the community
Political action, in which the government provides public goods in response to community demands

For example, if a woman in a REAP savings group uses her newly generated income to buy non-perishable food items that can be used in time of emergency, this could be considered an example of observable individual action. If women in a REAP savings group work together to combine their savings to construct a borehole for benefit of the community, this could be considered an example of observable collective action. If those women work together instead to lobby the government to use CDF funds to build a school nearer to the village, this could be considered an observable example of political action. This should serve as a guide for measuring the impact of BOMA’s governance work. Each cell in the matrix above should be represented by at least one indicator on the baseline and endline surveys. In my final report, I will outline specific measurement strategies for each of these forms of resilience, as well as describing a general research strategy for rigorous assessment of impact.

III. Methodology of the Governance Audit

At BOMA’s request, the consultant conducted a governance audit making use of a literature review, interviews with key informants and focus groups with current and potential future BOMA beneficiaries. The purpose of the governance audit was to ultimately provide a set of recommendations that would inform the design of BOMA’s governance program.

The literature review included internal BOMA documents, practitioner guides from other civil society groups and international agencies, government documents, and related academic work in the natural and social sciences. Research and documentation were reviewed in order to assess the state of knowledge regarding governance, drought resilience, pastoralism and gender issues in the region, as well as to recognize successes and failures of prior governance interventions.

Open-ended interviews were conducted at the county level with representatives from the Marsabit County Government as well as NGOs working on governance-related programs in the region. These organizations included Concern Worldwide Kenya, CIFA, PACIDA, PISP and the Catholic Dioceses. Organizations were selected for inclusion based on BOMA staff’s knowledge of related work and on information from BOMA’s prior Assessment Report, but were also affected by the availability and willingness of interviewees. (In particular, attempts were made to interview staff of the NDMA but were unsuccessful.) The content of these interviews involved the structure of the newly devolved system of government, as well as the status of existing interventions in the region related to governance and disaster resilience.

In addition, field visits were made to four BOMA locations. Based on preliminary information obtained during interviews with county-level organizations, field visit locations were selected to include those which had received various existing governance programs. Locations visited included Ngurunit and Ilaut (both of which have received the CC process), Loiyangalani (which has received CMDRR) and Kargi (which lacks any currently operational community-level governance programs).

These field visits resulted in additional village-level interviews with local leaders, such as area chiefs, youth representatives and community committee members, as well as one member of the county assembly and BOMA’s own mentors in the region. These interviews focused on the structures of local governance and community leadership and organizations, as well as perceptions of existing governance interventions.

2 The CC and CMDRR process are described briefly in section IV of this document and will be described in greater detail in the forthcoming governance audit.
In addition to interviews, the field visits involved five focus group discussions in each location. One focus group in each location was composed of BOMA Locational Committee members, and the discussion involved an assessment of existing community capacities and relevant actors, as well as the relationship between the community and local government. The remaining four focus group discussions in each location were conducted with local women and were related to the women’s decision-making power at three levels: in the household, the community and the government. These four focus groups included two each in two distinct sites: the locational center and a more rural part of that same location. In each site, one focus group was composed of current REAP beneficiaries and another was composed of women who have not received the REAP program, but who are being considered for future inclusion in REAP. Assuming REAP has been effectively targeted at the poorest and most vulnerable women in each location, these two focus groups should be roughly comparable in theory except for whether or not they have received REAP.

Site selection and group composition were decided by BOMA staff in accordance with both logistical constraints and organizational objectives. Focus group discussions were facilitated by BOMA field officers and conducted in the appropriate local language for each site. With the permission of the participants, discussions were recorded and later transcribed and translated into English for use by the researcher. For a full list of sources consulted for the purpose of the governance audit, see Appendix I.

This methodology suffers from several limitations. The selection of interviewees and focus group participants was constrained by logistical considerations and is not necessarily representative of the broader groups they are meant to represent. In general, the sample size is relatively small, so opinions expressed by our interviewees may not represent the views of the broader community. In addition, both interviews and focus groups are likely subject to particular forms of survey bias. Interviewees represent organizations with their own reputations, interests and objectives, and they may have incentives to represent their own programs in an unrealistically positive light. Because focus groups were clearly conducted by representatives of the NGO, there is some risk that participants feel compelled to “tell us what we want to hear” in the hopes of increasing their chances for receiving future assistance. Attempts were made to mitigate this risk by guaranteeing the confidentiality of the discussions and by explaining clearly the purpose and future use of the information being gathered. (In the case of the focus groups, the researcher does not believe that there is cause for concern that the bias would be distinct across the different groups, meaning that comparative analysis is still viable.) The use of translation introduces another potential source of bias. Since there is often not one-to-one correspondence of words across languages, translation is somewhat subjective and depends on the interpretation of the translator him- or herself.

Thus the consultant recommends that the findings of the governance audit be presented to key stakeholders for validation and that the feedback provided by those stakeholders be incorporated into the governance audit before finalizing a public version. Ideally, these stakeholders would include both county-level leaders and key informants, as well as some representatives of potential beneficiaries at the grassroots level.

IV. The Governance Audit

In the rest of this report, I will provide an overview of what we know about each of the three levels described above, with respect to: existing capacities in each of the resilience categories described above, opportunities for enhancing those capacities, and potential threats to such efforts.

The basic questions I seek to answer in the following sections are:
• To what extent do individuals have sufficient resources and abilities to prepare for and respond to drought on their own?
• To what extent do communities have the ability to come together to collectively solve problems that cannot be solved individually?
• To what extent do individuals and communities have the ability to request required goods and services from their government and to what extent does the government have the capacity and willingness to respond to these requests?
• What opportunities exist to strengthen capacities at each level? What is known about the likelihood of success of different kinds of interventions?

Then I offer preliminary recommendations for BOMA’s Governance Project, based on the information provided in each section.

A. Individual/Household Capacities

As described briefly in the introduction, individual capacities to manage drought are low, particularly among pastoralist women. There is significant dependency on disaster relief aid, particularly in times of severe drought. In terms of financial resources, Marsabit is among the poorest counties in Kenya, with a poverty rate of 83.2%. BOMA’s target population is especially hard-pressed with an average per capita monthly household income among BOMA beneficiaries (prior to receiving assistance from BOMA) of 760KES (but as low as 403KES in one community), compared with the national income per capita of 3,247KES/month. In addition, much household income is dependent on livestock and is thus particularly vulnerable to fluctuations in time of drought. Increased income generation and diversification would contribute to enhancing resilience at this level.

Access to physical infrastructure is similarly deficient with only 7.5% of households in Marsabit having access to electricity and only 35.4% with access to improved sanitation (compared with 87.8% nationally). In terms of human capital, Marsabit ranks 44th out of 47 counties on literacy and 42nd on school attainment. Among BOMA beneficiaries, the majority are illiterate. More data are needed to assess social capital at the individual level (ie how much do individual women report that they can count on their neighbors or family members for assistance in times of crisis), but it seems likely that social resources are relatively high in comparison with tangible assets due to the existence of traditional social structures.

Awareness and self-efficacy are two additional measures of social/human resilience, which may directly affect capacity to prepare for and respond to drought. They represent, respectively, knowledge of opportunities for action that are available to individuals and belief in their own abilities to successfully implement those actions. Both can hinder effective individual-level resilience activities, even if the necessary tangible resources are in fact available.

Focus group discussions indicated that for both REAP and future REAP women knowledge of the new constitution and the rights and responsibilities conferred to citizens is limited. While the women surveyed cited the constitution as bringing positive change in areas such as “gender equality” and “peace,” very few details were known about what specific provisions the constitution provides to accomplish these goals. When particulars were given, they were often based upon misinformation. Several focus groups cited female genital mutilation, which is not actually referenced anywhere in the constitution. Awareness of specific governance structures and political opportunities available to women was very low across all focus groups. Awareness of individual actions for drought resilience was higher, with women citing actions such as stockpiling, savings boxes, small businesses, and selling livestock. These ideas were fairly common across all focus groups.
With respect to efficacy, women in the 16 focus groups were also asked individual survey questions about their perceptions of their own abilities with respect to political participation and household and community matters. Such survey questions are problematic for various reasons and cannot be used to directly compare individuals or to obtain an objective measure of total efficacy. However, given that we do not expect survey bias to be different across the groups we surveyed, these measures can be used to reliably compare efficacy across groups.

Our findings indicate that for questions about efficacy at the individual/household level (“I can solve most problems by myself if I try hard enough” and “I am capable of preparing my own family for drought.”), REAP women did report higher efficacy on average than non-REAP women, but these differences were not statistically significant. For questions about village-level action however (“I am well-qualified to participate in decision-making in the village” and “I could do as good a job in leadership position in this village as most other people”), there were some significant differences.

REAP women reported higher efficacy on both questions about efficacy in village-level decisions, and so did women in more remote locations. Both differences were statistically significant. In more remote manyattas, efficacy was already high (perhaps due to the greater ease of coordination within smaller communities). However, in more centralized locations, joining REAP appears to be associated on average with an increase of almost 1.5 points on the 5-point Likert scale.

Within-household decision-making power for women in this context is low. Pastoralist societies in Kenya are typically patrilineal cultures, which often adhere to traditional gender roles. While we lack hard data at the county level, we do know that across BOMA beneficiaries, at least 30% of women report having no power over household decisions such as purchasing food, children’s medical bills and school fees, and this figure is as high as 90% in some communities. In focus group discussions, women indicated that they have little influence within the household, with their husband making many decisions without consulting them. There were also several references to domestic violence. These findings seem to hold for both REAP and non-REAP women. In REAP focus groups, however, women did indicate that having direct ownership over certain assets has allowed them a greater degree of autonomy than they previously experienced.

**Opportunities**

Preliminary data suggests that BOMA’s existing REAP program is quite successful at enhancing capacities at this level. Participants report significant increases in household meat and rice consumption,
school-related expenditures and enrolment, and livestock assets. A randomized controlled trial (RCT) is currently underway in order to establish causality, but initial analysis is very promising.

Effects of the REAP program on social capital and women’s decision-making power within the household will also be tested in the ongoing RCT, but we have no hard data at this point to demonstrate the existence of these impacts. Income generation by women may directly improve their power over household expenditures, but it may also be necessary to directly address perceptions and attitudes toward women by men in each community to truly affect intra-household power dynamics.

Preliminary evidence also suggests that REAP activities are likely to improve self-efficacy and feelings of empowerment among beneficiaries, as individuals may develop a sense of psychological empowerment through involvement in community organizations and activities (Zimmerman 1990).

Awareness of low-cost and effective drought preparedness/response strategies is not directly included in REAP programming as far as I know, but it would be relatively easy to incorporate informational seminars to this effect into existing programming.

Preliminary Recommendations: Building Individual Capacities

- BOMA’s existing REAP work is already quite successful in terms of enhancing material resources at the individual/household level, so a comprehensive governance project should include this and consider ways to link this work more directly to resilience-building at other levels and sectors.
- The project should include awareness-raising about specific strategies for disaster risk mitigation at the household level.
- It may be useful to work directly with men to raise awareness about women’s issues and to improve women’s intra-household decision-making power.
- Any project that is devised should pay heed to respecting individual autonomy (i.e., not imposing specific decisions) so as not to inhibit self-efficacy and thereby crowd-out endogenous motivation for individual action.

B. Community Capacities

Capacities will of course vary greatly across communities as well as across individuals. However, the county-level data described in the previous section imply that capacity in terms of tangible resources (financing, infrastructure, education) is likely to be relatively low at the community level. In terms of social and human capital, we ask what is a given community’s capacity for collective action. In other words, is a given group capable of working together to create endogenous solutions to shared problems without external assistance?

Capacity for collective action has been studied extensively in the literature on common-pool resource management, where it is thought to depend on whether the community fits the following definition: a set of people with shared beliefs and preferences, a more-or-less stable set of members, who engage in repeated, direct interactions with each other across a variety of contexts, and who are mutually vulnerable with respect to the problem in question (Singleton and Taylor 1992). Heterogeneity is therefore a threat to capacity for collective action. In the Kenyan context, this is particularly relevant to both the gender issues discussed above (as men and women may not be mutually vulnerable and also may have distinct preferences) and to ethnic diversity.

---

In countries across the world, high levels of ethnic diversity have been linked to low levels of public goods provision, in sectors such as education, infrastructure, health, water and sanitation (Alesina, Baqir and Easterly 1999; Khwaja 2002; Banerjee et al 2005). In Western Kenya, ethnic diversity is correlated with lower funding of primary schools and community water wells, which is at least partly explained by a weaker ability to sanction non-contributors (Miguel and Gugerty 2005). A series of field experiments in neighboring Uganda demonstrate that co-ethnics are more likely to cooperate in public goods games, indicating a primary mechanism – greater possibility of collective action – through which ethnic diversity and public goods provision may be related (Habyarimana et al 2007). Such difficulties of coordination are likely to be exacerbated in conditions of scarcity, such as during a drought, and indeed there have been instances of violent ethnic conflict in some parts of Marsabit County.

Another reason to pay close attention to both gender and diversity is that marginalized groups are likely to be either directly excluded or simply over-powered in community decision-making processes. Thus political capacities for particular groups at the community level will depend on their relative position within the community, and women are particularly likely to be under-represented.

Academic literature on building community resilience recommends that “communities must reduce risk and resource inequities, engage local people in mitigation, create organizational linkages, boost and protect social supports, and plan for not having a plan, which requires flexibility, decision-making skills, and trusted sources of information that function in the face of unknowns” (Norris et al 2007).

**Opportunities**

BOMA savings groups and similar interventions can help to produce community-level financial resources that can then be used for drought preparedness activities. These groups may also contribute to the development of trust and social cohesion, thereby enhancing capacity for collective action, though we do not yet have hard data to support this. Similarly, enhancing women’s economic resources may have spillover effects on other areas of their lives and on perceptions and treatment of them by their male counterparts (and therefore their access to decision-making spaces within the community). However, this remains to be tested and even if we assume it to be true, it could likely be complemented with efforts at direct dialogue. Notably, BOMA’s External Assessment concluded that “there is a lack of social and cultural support for the role of women as entrepreneurs; women are subject to stereotypes and there are few visible role models for them at any level. Gender barriers need to be addressed at all levels, from the legal system to the domestic system… Finally, they would benefit from… a collective “voice” for the needs and concerns of women entrepreneurs in the county.”

Several NGOs have been working in Marsabit County on enhancing community-level capacities for collective action. Interviews with NGO representatives indicate that there are two predominant models for doing so: Community Conversations (CC) and Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction (CMDRR). CMDRR is explicitly focused on drought management, whereas CC is used by the implementing NGO across all of its programs. Representatives we spoke with asserted that CC must be institutionalized in a village before they will consider doing any direct service provision there.

Both processes engage the community in identifying ways in which they can meet their needs through a combination of collective action and political action. Both result in the creation of community plans, which can include a Disaster Risk Reduction Plan (in the case of CMDRR) or a general Development Plan (in the case of CC), in addition to a Contingency Plan (effectively the “plan for not having a plan” mentioned above). In both cases, the plan addresses not only what needs to be done, but also what resources are available for the community to accomplish tasks independently, what actions will require external support and in those cases where they can obtain that support.
Both draw from widespread participatory development toolkits, such as Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA). However, the CC methodology is more intensive in nature and intended to be a continuing process that communities engage with indefinitely, as opposed to a one-time intervention. It is also possible within the CC process to adopt CMDRR as a methodology, so the approaches are not mutually exclusive. The CC process begins with 6 weeks of community entry before potentially adding on the CMDRR methodology to produce a Disaster Risk Reduction Plan.

The CC methodology is spearheaded by Concern but implemented through local partners including CIFA, PISP and HODI. CMDRR is championed by CORDAID, and adopted by NDMA, JICA, PACIDA, CIFA and the Catholic Dioceses. WorldVision uses something similar to CC, and the Catholic Dioceses has also adopted a third approach which mimics many of the strategies of CC and CMDRR, and which appears to have been quite successful but has been implemented in a limited number of villages.

Notably, county-level interviewees reported that sometimes they arrive in a village to find that other organizations have arrived before to create “community plans” which were then never used. Concern takes care to work with groups that have already been created (assessing whether the community agrees with its membership) rather than creating new ones each time. There is definitely need for greater coordination across NGOs and for some sort of county-level repository for plans that have already been created, to help avoid duplication of efforts.

With respect to mitigating ethnic conflict, some interviewees expressed skepticism as to the success of past peace initiatives. However, other interviewees felt that they had been quite successful. Some evidence indicates that merely engaging with another group on a regular basis can increase interethnic trust (Kasara 2013), so interventions like CMDRR and especially CC (as well as BOMA’s savings groups) have the potential to mitigate this problem if they engage diverse groups in cooperative processes. The CC process also directly engages with questions of inequality through activities such as a privilege walk.

With respect to gender issues, both CC and CMDRR both are aimed at the community as a whole, with efforts made to ensure representation of women, but not necessarily to bolster the quality or effectiveness of their participation. In interviews, representatives from CONCERN expressed the view that in their experience, women’s participation has been successfully engaged through the process without any explicit focus on gender. However, in BOMA’s focus groups with existing and future REAP beneficiaries, we found that in some cases women were unaware of existing community processes. In addition, some village-level interviewees observed that while women attend public meetings in great numbers, they also tend to speak less often. Given BOMA’s singular focus on the most marginalized groups within a community, this seems to be an area where there is room for improvement.

Preliminary Recommendations: Building Community Capacities

- BOMA Savings Groups can perhaps be harnessed to provide financing and material resources for community-level risk reduction activities.
- Community-level governance work must directly address inequalities in the community and meaningfully engage all stakeholder groups in decision-making.
- It must boost and protect existing social supports, as well as enhancing trust and social cohesion.
- It should “plan for not having a plan,” enhance decision-making skills and ensure the existence of reliable information sources.
- It should seek to improve relations across ethnic groups to avoid scarcity-induced conflict and to promote collective action.
• It should seek to engage women and minority ethnic groups within the community, not only by including them, but also by taking steps to ensure that their inclusion is meaningful, and that their voices are actually heard and incorporated into decision-making processes.
• Given the preponderance of existing community plans, BOMA should seek to avoid duplicating existing efforts and creating fatigue among beneficiaries.
• BOMA should also avoid ‘crowding out’ endogenous motivation and organization by imposing newly created structures on top of existing, legitimate social structures and leadership.

C. County Capacities
Kenya’s new constitution devolves power to county governments, granting them de jure authority over a substantial range of sectors including agriculture, health, education, trade, public works and services, disaster management, environment and natural resources (Constitution of Kenya 2010). The constitution also explicitly calls for public participation in governance and the inclusion of marginalized groups (defined explicitly to include pastoralist populations). This represents a timely opportunity for Boma’s potential governance work, as the newly formed county governments are still developing plans for institutionalizing public participation and therefore may be open to influence by civil society actors as to how best to implement this piece of their mandate.

Background on Devolution
Attempts to decentralize Kenya’s government have been made since independence. All of Kenya’s first three presidents used their power to overturn or minimize efforts at devolution (Kramon and Posner 2011; Branch 2011). Three key factors hindered successful devolution efforts in the past: a lack of political will, weak institutional capacity of local government entities and a lack of community awareness about citizen roles in accountability and participation (Omolo 2010).

While devolution and participation are now formally enshrined in the country’s constitution, there are already concerns that the current administration is giving “Love-Hate Signals on Devolution,” with accusations that administrative representatives push the interests of the National Government, thus conflicting with the popularly elected County Governors and that Kenyatta has diverted funds that should have been transferred to county governments.4 One explicit goal of the new constitution was the restructuring of the Provincial Administration (Hassan 2013), which had been used in the past to consolidate presidential power through suppression, electoral fraud and even the promotion of violent conflict (Branch, Cheeseman & Gardner 2011, Throup & Hornsby 1998, Widner 1992). However, current evidence suggests that the newly formed National Administration is “almost identical to the PA in terms of structure, functions and personnel” (Hassan 2013).

In several other African countries, genuine decentralization of power has been thwarted despite formal constitutional provisions (Ibid.). Thus a lack of political will at the national level is a potential threat to the effectiveness of devolution, but funds have been disbursed and so the County Government does have substantial autonomy with respect to local service delivery. However, our interviews with County officials did reveal that there may be a lack of coordination between national and county government agencies, at least at this early stage. Weak institutional capacity is also a potential threat, as a long history of centralization compromised the development of local governments (Omolo 2010). Certainly at this stage, with the county governments only about six months old, we find ourselves in a transitional period in which many county government positions not yet filled. Significantly, the village administrators and

village councils that should be tasked with supporting grassroots-level participation do not yet exist, but are expected to be appointed within the coming months. Finally, a lack of community awareness is also likely to continue to be a factor, with some indication of this evident in prior BOMA focus group discussions.

**Background on Citizen Participation**

Public participation is prominently featured throughout the new constitution. It is also institutionalized through at least two national-level laws. But like devolution, citizen participation has been attempted previously in Kenya, with mixed results. For example, in the late 90s, Kenya’s international donors began to request reforms to address poor local government performance. It was this external pressure that ultimately led to the creation of Kenya’s participatory budgeting program, the Local Authority Service Delivery Action Plan (LASDAP), which required that local citizens be directly involved in proposing and prioritizing budgetary expenditures at the ward level (Sheely 2012).

Though citizens formally offered proposals and voted to rank them in order of priority, technocrats and politicians still had the power to overturn some of these decisions (Ibid) and the LASDAP process was also characterized by low levels of participation (Lubaale, Agevi & Ngari 2007). Some other limitations of the LASDAP process that the government should seek to avoid in future efforts to engage citizen participation included: (1) facilitators sometimes invited only their supporters to participate, (2) there was poor prioritization as political incentives supported allocating similar amounts across projects, (3) disjoint between elected and appointed officials resulting in poor coordination on planning (Muriu 2012).

**County-Level Actors and Coordination Efforts**

Apart from the County Government itself, other organizations working at the county level on disaster risk reduction include the National Drought Management Authority (NDMA) and NGOs such as those mentioned above in the Community Capacities section. As described above, there are two predominant models for enhancing community governance: Community Conversations (CC) and Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction (CMDRR). While I discussed the differences in methodology between them above, it is important to note here the potential linkages of each with county-level structures.

NDMA has formally adopted CMDRR as its method for engaging communities in disaster risk reduction. We are still hoping to schedule an interview with NDMA, but based on interviews with other actors at the county level, it seems that NDMA is currently waiting for funding and is not especially active at the moment.

CC is spearheaded by Concern and they are making concerted efforts to coordinate with the county government. They have met with representatives of the County Assembly and have provided assistance in the drafting of a bill which would, if passed, institutionalize the CC community plans as an official mechanism for providing citizen participation into the formal planning process. The County Executive branch, however, was unaware of such plans at the time when we spoke with them, though Concern did indicate that they plan to liaise with the other County Government structures as well. One major opportunity in this regard is that one of Concern’s partners in the implementation of CC will soon be joining the County Government himself, and will likely provide a valuable ally to Concern in their goal of creating direct linkages between CC and the government planning processes. Our village-level interviews also confirmed that discussions between Concern and the County Assembly are likely to lead to the adoption of a legal framework incorporating CC into county-level processes.

One interviewee suggested that NGOs have a role to play in strengthening County Government in the eyes of Kenyan citizens by working through its structures, thus lending credibility and confidence. Thus, while recognizing the threats to devolution discussed, we also must acknowledge that our own decision to
work through the County Government itself may itself play a role in mitigating those threats, by recognizing and reinforcing the autonomy of the devolved government structures.

**Material Resources**

While we do not have a copy of the county budget, interviews with members of the County Executive suggest that the funds devolved to Marsabit County amount to around 3.8billion KES with about 50% of that allocated for development. The County has prioritized the Livestock, Roads and Water sectors, with about 200million allocated to the county-level Department of Water (though some of this may actually need to be allocated to healthcare staff).

In contrast, NDMA is apparently without funding at the moment (though this remains to be confirmed). Preliminary interviews did suggest, however, that NDMA is uniquely well-situated to manage information with respect to disaster risk recovery and may be a source of information technology resources. In particular, NDMA is well-suited to play a coordinating role across the many NGOs working in this area, and to formally document and aggregate the community plans and make them more readily accessible at the county level.

Apart from the County Government’s own operating budget, there exist several devolved funds that pre-date the new constitution but that are still theoretically available to community requests, most notably the Constituency Development Fund, which is administered by the MP from each constituency.

**Preliminary Recommendations: Building County Capacities**

- Efforts should be made to create direct linkages between community-level governance structures and formal government administration. This can be done most easily through NDMA or the County Government structures, or both.
- Potential partnership with Concern seems especially promising, since they are the farthest along in terms of creating these linkages.
- There is a need for a centralized repository of community-level plans, easily accessible to the government, the general public and civil society actors who can hold the government accountable for responding to them.
- There is a need for increased citizen awareness of their rights and responsibilities under the new constitution, and the duties of the county towards its citizens.
- There is a need for increased citizen awareness as to the existence of funds for local development and the methods through which they can lobby the government for necessary local services and infrastructure.
- To the extent possible, the government should be encouraged to avoid the pitfalls of past efforts at engaging meaningful citizen participation.
- Citizen participation should be: as inclusive as possible, facilitate meaningful dialogue (not just informational meetings), have a clear system for prioritization of requests, and have clear authority to be included in the planning process.
D. Key Findings and Related Recommendations

In the table below, I summarize the key findings discussed in the preceding sections and organize them according to the related recommendations for design of the Governance Program which logically follow from each set of findings. I also identify which part of the Governance Audit methodology provides the source for each set of findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings of the Governance Audit</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Governance Program Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Enhanced resilience corresponds to governance/decision-making capacities across multiple levels.  
  • Resilience comes in many forms, including physical, human, social and political capacities. | Literature Review (DfiD) | The BOMA Governance Program includes activities across three levels: individual/household, community and county/government.  
  The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan measures various types of capacities, according to the DfiD guidelines. |
| • There is a need to create direct linkages between community-level governance structures and formal government administration.  
  • There is a need for greater coordination across organizations working on governance issues in Marsabit County.  
  • Pains must be taken to avoid duplication of efforts, in particular the creation of multiple, conflicting community plans and committees.  
  • Two methodologies predominate in governance work: CMDRR and CC  
  • CC is more comprehensive and can incorporate CMDRR  
  • CC is coordinated by Concern, which has expressed a willingness to partner with BOMA, including the possibility of financial support for new REAP programming where requested by community plans.  
  • Concern is in the process of persuading county government to adopt CC as its formal method of citizen engagement. | Literature Review  
  County-level Interviews  
  Community-level Interviews | Creation of a centralized repository of existing community plans.  
  Coordination with CC committees in BOMA’s community-level governance work.  
  Direct collaboration with Concern, likely in the form of implementing CC where it does not yet exist; and working with existing CC committees to offer new governance programming. |
| • Even where comprehensive governance programming has taken place, BOMA’s target group (low-income women) is not always aware of such opportunities.  
  • While women are included in public barazas, they speak significantly less than men and often feel they are not heard.  
  • Both REAP and non-REAP women report unequal influence in household and | Focus Group Discussions  
  Community-level interviews | Since there is demonstrated need to enhance women’s capacities in particular, BOMA’s governance activities should provide a complement to REAP’s successful financial empowerment strategy with political empowerment programming for |
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community decision-making, but also suggest that REAP has improved things.

- REAP is well respected among its target group, and in the community at large.
- BOMA’s skill-set, resources and brand name make it well-suited to target women.

| Lack of awareness regarding the constitution, new government structures and opportunities | County-level interviews |
| Little awareness of female leadership; few known role models | Focus Group Discussions |
| Low level of education | The BOMA Governance Program provides a series of training modules for individual participants. |
| Expressed desire for educational programming and training on drought resilience. | Training Module I will educate communities about the new constitution, the rights it confers to them and the government resources that are available. |

- Women in general report resistance from men to their decision-making powers.
- REAP women report lack of understanding on the part of men in the community about economic decisions.
- REAP women report willingness/interest of men to be involved with BOMA.
- REAP women report the need for a more favorable business climate.

| Given the preponderance of existing community plans, BOMA should seek to avoid duplicating existing efforts and recognize the legitimacy of existing community governance structures. | County-level Interviews |
| Male community leaders (including members of community committees) will be invited to participate in Training Module II. | Community-level Interviews |

| Target women have very low levels of formal education and very little experience with political engagement. | Literature Review (internal BOMA documents) |
| Women explicitly express desire for educational programs and for literacy training in particular. | Focus Group Discussions |

| Training Module III provides training for women to help them more effectively engage with government structures. | Where possible, women should be linked to any existing literacy programs in the region. |

- Existing community committees will be involved in the creation of content (and perhaps the implementation) of Training Module I, and will be described as part of the formal governance structures presented the training. |
• Target women have very low levels of formal education and very little experience with political engagement.
• BOMA Savings Groups can be harnessed to provide financing and material resources for community-level risk reduction activities.
• Little awareness of female leadership; few known role models.
• Women explicitly express interest in educational field trips to meet other women’s groups.

| Literature Review (internal BOMA documents) | “Training Module IV: Practicum” provides some practical experience to complement skills from the previous modules. Women will identify a list of priorities, match them to available resources, and finally, engage in an active process of collective action. |
| Focus Group Discussions | Field trips will be planned to allow representatives of each group of women to visit female political leaders and successful women’s groups in other parts of the County. |

V. Proposal: BOMA’s Governance Program
BOMA’s Governance Program will take place at three levels. The first component will target individual/household level capacities by providing training modules that build on BOMA’s existing skills and resources. The second component, geared toward improving community capacities, involves integration of the aforementioned training modules with existing community-level governance structures, in particular the CC committees. Finally, a third component will facilitate county-level coordination by developing a transparent, web-based repository for existing and future community plans.

Household-Level: Women’s Leadership Training
The first component will involve a series of training modules, geared toward enhancing the ability of low-income women to participate in household and community decision-making and to engage in political action. This component of the governance project is the direct counterpart to the REAP program, with the notion that the financial empowerment that REAP offers will complement and strengthen the political empowerment of similar groups of women and vice versa. Though low-income women are the target beneficiaries of this project, the training modules will also involve men. This is in recognition of the fact that women’s abilities to engage in decision-making depend in large part on the acceptance and cooperation of men.

The proposed training program includes several modules: (1) Governance Education, (2) Men’s Workshop, (3) Skill-building and (4) Practicum.

“Module 1: Governance Education” will be open to the public but with specific efforts made to engage REAP and future REAP women and their husbands and male family members. Its goal will be to raise awareness about the new constitution and the rights and responsibilities it confers to ordinary citizens as well as to women in particular. This module will also inform participants about existing and new formal government structures as well as community-level governance bodies (including the committees established by CC/CMDDR processes). Finally it will educate attendees and about resources and funds that they have a right to petition and through which channels they can do so. This module should also include awareness-raising about specific strategies for disaster risk mitigation at the household level.

“Module 2: Men’s Workshop” will engage the men who were invited to attend Module 1, as well as male community leaders. Training for men includes both consciousness-raising with respect to REAP activities and also general gender sensitivity training (while remaining sensitive to local cultural norms). The goal of this training module is to secure buy-in from men in the community so that they can be more
supportive of both women’s economic and political activities. Workshops will stress the benefits to the household and to the community as a whole of women’s activities.

Whereas Modules 1 addresses a lack of awareness of opportunities, and Module 2 seeks to address unfavorable cultural views of women’s participation, Modules 3 and 4 recognize another potential limitation to women participating in government, which is that they may lack the skills to do so effectively because they have had few similar experiences in the past. “Module 3: Skill Building” offers leadership and communication training for women to leave them better prepared to engage with the existing and forthcoming governance structures. It also leads women through a needs identification and prioritization exercise in order to clarify what they most hope to gain through political participation and then helps them to identify resources (individual, community and government resources) which they can target to help them achieve their goals. In the following Module, “Practicum,” the facilitator will help the women to tackle one specific goal as a group, culminating in the elaboration of a proposal to be submitted through the appropriate governance structure. The participants will also be encouraged to pass on what they have learned to other women in the community.

As a corollary to Module 4, select women (and perhaps some men as well) will be chosen from each community to go on field visits to see successful examples of women’s participation in governance. These might include meetings to speak with female leaders in County Government, as well as visits to observe successful examples of collective action by women in other areas.

Table 3: Overview of Training Modules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Module</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Source of Content</th>
<th>Notes on Logistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance Education</td>
<td>• Overview of new constitution</td>
<td>• Governance Audit</td>
<td><em>Participant Selection:</em> Open to public, word-of-mouth through core women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Citizen Rights &amp; Responsibilities</td>
<td>• Government Popular Education Documents</td>
<td>Direct invitations to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Women’s Rights</td>
<td>• Discussions with Local Leaders for context-specific information</td>
<td>• REAP women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overview of governance structures at community &amp; county level</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Future REAP women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Channels for requesting assistance (local channels as well as national</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Husbands and male family members of core women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>devolved funds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Duration:</em> ~1-2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Workshop</td>
<td>• Explanation of REAP Activities and benefits/purpose</td>
<td>• Existing REAP training and documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Explanation of Governance Program Activities and benefits/purpose</td>
<td>• Governance Audit &amp; Present Proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Brief skill-building component</td>
<td>• Standard Gender Modules from NGO partners (still to be identified)</td>
<td><em>Participant Selection:</em> The men who attended module 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gender Awareness training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community leaders: elders, chiefs, village administrators (if they exist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Duration:</em> ~2-3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill-building</td>
<td>• Leadership &amp; Communications Training</td>
<td>• Standard Leadership modules from NGO partners (still to be identified)</td>
<td><em>Participant Selection:</em> The women who attended module 1 (REAP and future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community-Level: Integration with existing community structures

At the community-level, BOMA must integrate all of its work with existing community governance structures. BOMA should take advantage of the proposed partnership with Concern to offer new REAP programs through existing (or newly formed) CC committees. Concern representatives have suggested that there may be financing available for such an intervention, where it aligns with priorities identified in community plans. This would serve two purposes. It would help to strengthen the credibility and legitimacy of new governance structures by linking them directly to tangible outcomes. It would also help generate broader community ownership of the REAP program, because it would now be offered directly in response to demands made by a recognized community leadership organization. (This, in addition to the training workshops for men in the community, could help to mitigate resistance faced by women business owners from other community members who lack an understanding of the goals of the REAP program.) Of course, this would occur independently of the training modules described above, which are intended to occur in places where REAP groups already exist (at least during the pilot intervention).

With respect to the governance program itself, the “Governance Education” module will include information about both county government structures and existing (or newly formed) community-level committees established by CC/CMDRR processes. Prior to creation of this training module in each location, a mini “Governance Audit” should be conducted with existing leaders to ensure that the content includes all relevant formal and traditional governance structures that exist in a given area. Participants will be encouraged to focus their political action through these local channels, thereby enhancing the legitimacy of these new structures. Committee members and local leaders will also be invited to be involved in the program, both by providing input to the content of the Governance Education training module and by attending the Men’s Seminar.

In places where CC already has been implemented, we can integrate our trainings with the existing committee, as described above. In places where CC does not yet exist, we have the option of training our staff in the CC process, creating a committee through that process and then integrating it into our women-specific work as described above.

The second option has the advantage of providing our staff with timely training on what is likely to become a standard procedure in Marsabit County. Many of the skills required to be a successful CC facilitator are in fact transferable to other field officer activities, so this approach would generally
strengthen BOMA’s human resources. It also would confer legitimacy to BOMA’s governance program and in particular would make coordination with the community committees easier to implement (since BOMA would already be recognized as a point of contact for them).

The disadvantages of this approach include a substantial increase in the time required to implement the governance program and an even greater departure from BOMA’s core program activities. In addition, if Concern successfully persuades the County Government to adopt CC as standard practice, then this facilitation should eventually be the responsibility of the village administrator, not that of an NGO. However, it is unclear when (if at all) this shift in responsibilities will take place.

**County-Level: Aggregation of Plans and Coordination with Relevant Agencies**

A major contribution that BOMA could make at the County level would be to help aggregate the community plans and make them easily accessible to government officials, civil society actors and NGOs. While Concern is already liaising with the County Government to integrate community plans into the formal county planning process, there is at the present moment no fully transparent method of accessing those plans.

BOMA should establish a repository of community plans, to be both comprehensive (including all communities in Marsabit) and updated regularly. This information should then be made available to the public through an open-access, user-friendly, searchable web platform. This can be done both for Community Development Plans (for use by the county government) and for Community Disaster Risk Reduction Plans (for use by NDMA). In addition to facilitating the use of citizen priorities in government planning processes, this website would also enhance transparency by allowing civil society actors to monitor whether or not government agencies are in fact taking citizen-generated plans into account. Finally, this online repository would help reduce duplication of efforts by NGOs, who would now be aware of pre-existing community plans before they enter a new location to conduct work.

This aspect of the governance program will require close coordination with the various NGOs that have facilitated the generation of community plans throughout Marsabit County, in order to obtain digital copies of those plans that already exist and to establish a system for directly uploading any new plans that are generated in the future.

It would also require direct field visits to locations throughout Marsabit County in order to identify Transparency Advocates. These individuals would have some access to communications technology so that they could send updates to the website manager about changes to community plans or actions taken to carry them out. (Budget permitting, BOMA could provide an IT device to facilitate this process.) These individuals would have to be selected in a transparent manner and made known to the rest of the community during the training process, so that those without access to technology could pass on any concerns or observations to the designated community liason. Ideally, BOMA would equip this person in each location with the appropriate technology and train them to track the performance of local government in delivering promised goods and services.

The two purposes of this county-level work are availability of information about the community plans themselves and what they contain, and the availability of information about response and follow-up to those plans. BOMA may wish to consider disaggregating those two purposes so that the repository of community plans can be mainly operated and used by the relevant government entity, whereas the monitoring of those plans may perhaps be managed by an external watchdog group.
VI. Research Questions and Implications

The pilot intervention above and monitoring and evaluation plan described below will allow us to answer the following research questions:

1. Does the proposed intervention increase outcomes related to enhanced governance and drought resilience?
2. If so, under what circumstances? What factors impede or enhance the results?
3. What is the relationship between REAP activities and Governance Program activities?
   - Do REAP women benefit differentially from Governance Program activities, indicating a need to expand REAP in conjunction with any future Governance Activities?
   - Do REAP-related outcomes change as a result of interaction with the Governance Program?
4. Are men and non-REAP women more supportive of REAP activities after participating in the Governance Program? Are men and non-REAP women more supportive of REAP when it is administered subsequent to formal community planning processes?
5. Can a targeted intervention toward women improve things across the community?
6. Are government agencies willing to engage in a transparency program that may expose corruption?

Answering these questions will provide various insights to help BOMA plan its future programming. If the pilot is successful (Question 1), it will justify an expansion of activities. If the pilot is unsuccessful, the data will be used to pinpoint its specific weaknesses for the purpose of a re-design. If the pilot is differentially unsuccessful across groups (Question 2), the data will be used to identify ways to personalize the intervention to meet the needs of different groups.

Questions (3) regarding the interaction between REAP and the Governance Program will, first, provide further insights into the nature of REAP impacts beyond the direct financial benefits. It will also inform the design of future programming, giving us some insight into whether REAP expansion (both across and within locations) should occur prior to scaling up the Governance Program. Questions (4) regarding the receptivity of other community members to REAP can similarly teach us new things about the REAP program itself, and help us to better understand its impacts and reputation beyond its direct target group.

Since there is evidence to support direct targeting of women in financial assistance programs such as REAP (suggesting that women spend money on more socially beneficial investments), it may also be true that enhancing women’s political power will change the category of goods that are sought after through collective channels. Question 5 seeks to contribute to this research and provide further support for BOMA’s theory of change.

Question 6 addresses the county-level governance work and warily seeks to ascertain the success of a transparency program that requires participation by the very agency to be monitored.

VII. Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

A. Selection Process

Selection of Pilot Communities

According to BOMA staff, there are resources and willingness to implement a pilot governance intervention in four locations in Marsabit County. These locations should be selected from among those where REAP has already been implemented. Beyond this, the initial population of locations will depend on the form of collaboration with Concern that is selected. If we are to work with existing committees, then we can choose the pilot locations only from among those that already have a CC committee. If,
however, we plan to become CC implementers ourselves, then we must choose the pilot locations only from among those that do not yet have a CC committee.

Once the initial set of possibilities is established, the pilot locations should be selected to represent the diversity of that set. They should be selected in a stratified manner to account for ethnic diversity, income/infrastructure level and prior government involvement. This strategy ensures that the pilot communities represent sufficiently the diversity of the locations where BOMA works. As a result, if the pilot is successful, we can be more confident that it will also be successful across a wider range of BOMA’s beneficiary communities.

Once the pilot locations are selected, an additional four control locations should be selected from the same initial pool. They should be identified using matching procedures to identify one location that is roughly comparable to each of the pilot locations, along the same key variables that were used to stratify the initial selection. The pilot will not be conducted in these control locations, but the baseline and endline measures will be collected there in order to provide a reasonable counterfactual to the pilot intervention.

Selection of Participants
The selection of participants for each training module is described briefly in Table 3 above. While Module I is open to the public, only those invited to the more selective training modules will be approached for purposes of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.

In each pilot location, REAP women and likely future REAP participants will be invited to attend the trainings. Wherever possible, we will administer the baseline survey to all those invited to participate, even if they do not choose to attend the workshops. (The names of attendees should also be recorded at the beginning of each meeting.) Male family members of those women will also be surveyed, as well as the local leaders identified for inclusion in the program. (This latter group may include the area chief, elders and village administrator if he/she has been selected at time of implementation.) In addition, a small, random selection of non-participant community members should also be surveyed, as a way to assess spillover effects to other portions of the population.

B. Data Collection Process

Baseline and Endline Surveys should be conducted in both treatment and control locations with the participants described above, as well as their closest counterparts in the control communities. The baseline and endline data will be collected at both the community and individual level.

Community-level data will be collected from community leaders and from BOMA governance field officers assigned to a given area. A baseline audit should be filled out by the within-community facilitator regarding the state of political participation, involvement of government representatives in the community, state of infrastructure and instances of collective action and/or public good creation within the community.

Individual-level data will be collected through surveys with all female REAP and non-REAP participants of Modules III & IV, the male participants of Module II and select community leaders, as well as a random sampling of other community members.

The baseline survey should be conducted before any other activities related to the Governance Program begin. An ‘endline’ survey should be conducted at the end of pilot programming and will assess the intermediate effects of the training modules. Ideally, another endline survey should be conducted 6
months to a year after the end of programming, as the final outcomes of the Governance Program are unlikely to manifest themselves immediately.

A smaller number of in-depth interviews should also be conducted both before and after implementation of the pilot in each of the target communities. These will provide qualitative data to supplement or explain any of the quantitative findings, and will involve richer descriptions of some of the more nuanced indicators identified in the section below. In-depth interviews should also be conducted with leaders in each region (to get a broader perspective on the success or failure of the pilot) and with county-level actors regarding the county-level governance activities.

With respect to the county-level programming (aggregation of community plans and creation of a web-based transparency platform), in addition to the in-depth interviews referenced above, the data required to assess its effectiveness is that which is being collected in the process of the programming itself: google analytics data on use of the website itself, changes to community plans or to actual related infrastructure within communities. This information should be compared with government budget documents to assess the fit between community requests and government service provision. It should also be supplemented with information from community-level Transparency Advocates, who will be tasked with keeping track of specific requests or observations made by people within their community.

C. Measurement Indicators

The specific measures included in the surveys should correspond directly to the “Measurable Impacts of Resilience-Enhancing Activities” presented in Table 1 on page 4 of the present document. In Table 4 below, I have outlined these indicators and identified the methodology that can be used to collect each. These represent control characteristics, intermediate and final outcomes.

Final outcomes in this context are very difficult to assess, particularly over the short run. Thus we include various intermediate outcomes, which may not be the ultimate goal of the program, but which provide some evidence to back our theory for how those ultimate goals will be reached. For example, we may not be able to observe an instance of collective action by the women we train during the pilot period. However, we can observe increases in the capacity and willingness for collective action among those women, as a direct result of the training.

We also collect measures of resilience categories that we have no power to directly affect. For example, the household income or educational level of a participant is unlikely to change as a result of participating in a series of training modules alone. However, we collect this information for two purposes: First, to control for potential interaction effects related to those measures (for example, those with a higher initial level of education may be more likely to retain information from the training program) and second, to monitor any spillover effects that may result from participation (for example, a woman is inspired by her participation in the program to save up her money and pursue formal schooling).

In Table 4, I outline each of the sets of indicators that should be collected in the baseline and endline data collection, the methodological strategy that should be employed to measure them, and the purpose of each. (By “purpose,” I mean the following: Is this merely a control variable or something that we hope to improve through this program? If it is something we hope to improve, is it one of the final outcomes we are working toward, or is it an intermediate outcome that is theoretically linked to a final outcome?)

Below the table, I provide a brief explanation for each category of measures.
### Table 4: Specific Indicators and Methods of Measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measurement Type</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial/Physical Capacities</strong>&lt;br&gt;Household Income</td>
<td>Individual Survey</td>
<td>Control / Spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Assets</td>
<td>Individual Survey</td>
<td>Control / Spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversification of Income Source</td>
<td>Individual Survey</td>
<td>Control / Spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Level Assets</td>
<td>Community Survey</td>
<td>Control / Spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Gov’t Funds</td>
<td>Community Survey &amp; Official Docs</td>
<td>Intermediate Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social/Human Capacities</strong>&lt;br&gt;Educational Level</td>
<td>Individual Survey</td>
<td>Control / Spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Inequalities</td>
<td>Community Survey &amp; Interviews</td>
<td>Control / Spillover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy&lt;br&gt;Collective Efficacy&lt;br&gt;Political Efficacy</td>
<td>Individual Survey&lt;br&gt;Belief Elicitation Games</td>
<td>Intermediate Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness and Knowledge</td>
<td>Individual Survey</td>
<td>Intermediate Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>Individual Survey</td>
<td>Intermediate Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cohesion</td>
<td>Key Informant Interviews&lt;br&gt;Collective Action Games&lt;br&gt;Direct Observation by Staff</td>
<td>Intermediate Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Institutional Capacities</td>
<td>Interviews and Official Documents&lt;br&gt;Transparency Website Traffic</td>
<td>Intermediate Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Across Agencies</td>
<td>Interviews and Official Documents&lt;br&gt;Transparency Website Traffic</td>
<td>Intermediate Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Capacities</strong>&lt;br&gt;Women’s decision-making power in the household</td>
<td>Survey Question&lt;br&gt;In-depth Interviews</td>
<td>Final Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s decision-making influence in the community&lt;br&gt;Community decision-making influence in the government</td>
<td>Surveys and Interviews&lt;br&gt;Official Documents&lt;br&gt;Participant Observation</td>
<td>Final Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community decision-making influence in the government</td>
<td>Surveys and Interviews&lt;br&gt;Official Documents&lt;br&gt;Participant Observation</td>
<td>Final Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observable Outcomes</strong>&lt;br&gt;Individual Private Action&lt;br&gt;Collective Action by Communities&lt;br&gt;Public Action (individual or collective engagement with the government)</td>
<td>Individual Surveys&lt;br&gt;In-depth Interviews&lt;br&gt;Direct Observation</td>
<td>Final Outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial/Physical Capacities**<br>These are the material resources that BOMA already works to enhance for pastoralist women through its REAP programming. *Increased household income, physical assets and diversification of income sources* are all measures of enhanced resilience at the individual level and BOMA already collects information on all of these.
At the community and government level, we can assess through surveys, interviews and official documents whether or not new assets have been acquired and whether access/knowledge of government funds has increased. For example, we can ask local government authorities and community leaders about the frequency of citizen requests for government assistance, about the responsiveness of the government, about actual infrastructure or service delivery generated by the government in response to these requests, and we can examine formal documents to assess the amount of government funding or personnel that has been allocated to a particular community or region.

Social/Human Capacities

Educational Level is simply a control variable that will allow us to assess whether the training program appropriately targets people of all educational backgrounds. Similarly, stark community inequalities will affect how well groups are able to work together, so we must control for this in our analysis. Education can be assessed through individual survey questions, as BOMA already does. Community Inequalities can be assessed through the community-level surveys and interviews to assess the range of incomes and resource-levels, as well as to document any salient conflicts that have arisen as a result.

Efficacy is a person’s belief in his/her own abilities and is a necessary prerequisite to individual or collective action. There are standard survey questions with a long history in academia intended to assess self-efficacy, collective efficacy and political efficacy (which mean, respectively, a person’s beliefs about their abilities to solve problems on their own, together with their community, and through political action). This is a relatively easy measure to collect and provides a proxy for psychological empowerment.

Survey bias is definitely a concern for these measures, particularly when it is known that an NGO (and likely future service provider) is the agency collecting the data. Respondents may feel compelled to over- or under-report efficacy if they think one or the other is likely to make them more eligible for resources in the future. Hopefully, reassuring participants that survey questions are for anonymous research purposes only can mitigate this problem. In addition, any inflation or deflation that occurs should hopefully not affect comparative data, across groups or time periods. Unless we have reason to believe that different groups have incentives to bias the question in a different direction, we can still place some faith in the comparison of baseline and endline data.

However, if time and funding allows, an additional method for measuring efficacy involves the use of belief elicitation devices often employed in behavioral economics and psychology research. These comprise games in which respondents are asked to essentially bet on their performance on a series of tasks. The notion is that when real incentives are involved, people are less likely to mis-represent their beliefs about their own abilities. The difficulty with this method is that it can be very difficult to explain in a field setting, and it can be even more difficult to design discrete tasks that accurately represent the real-life skills (particularly political capacities) that we would wish to test for.

Awareness and Knowledge: This set of survey questions will measure how much participants have learned from attending the training modules. These survey questions should essentially quiz respondents about the topics covered in the workshops, such as identifying potential actions and activities related to drought management, knowledge of political rights & responsibilities, awareness of government structures, etc.

Social capital and social cohesion are related but distinct concepts for which there is also a long-standing tradition of measurement in the social sciences. Social capital can be thought of us an individual’s access to social resources (how many friends/family members does a person have, how many organizations do they belong to, can they count on their neighbors to help them in time of crisis). BOMA’s existing survey
collects some related measures on trust, but these can be expanded for the purpose of the Governance Program.

Social cohesion refers to a group’s ability to work together to solve problems and to avoid conflict. It is roughly analogous to collective action and can be measured both through survey questions and through standard collective action games used in both lab and field settings by behavioral economists and political scientists. These typically represent variations on the prisoner’s dilemma game. Comparing performance on these games across treatment and control groups and before and after the intervention will help to establish any impact on group cohesion. This data can be supplemented with in-depth interviews with participants regarding their experience working together throughout the duration of the Governance Program.

*County Institutional Capacities and Coordination Across Agencies* are things we hope to affect through the creation of a repository of community plans and the associated transparency mechanisms. Through in-depth interviews with representatives from County Government and other relevant county-level organizations identified in the Governance Audit, we can get some sense for whether there has been any improvement in these areas subsequent to implementation of the website. We can also monitor use of the website itself through software such as google analytics.

*Political Capacities and Observable Outcomes*

The final two sections represent our final outcomes and are very closely related. Political Capacities refer to the extent to which governance has been improved, i.e. the extent to which individual’s decision-making power has been expanded at each of our three levels of analysis. Observable Outcomes refers to ways in which people have actually utilized their increased decision-making power to engage in positive change for themselves. The former represents simply having the ability to influence outcomes, the latter involves actually doing so, and is therefore tangible and observable in a way that the former is not. While the latter is in theory more directly observable, it may also require more time to appear. Thus we divide these two sections in order to maximize our ability to observe change.

The political capacities that the Governance Program may enhance include women’s decision-making power within the household and the community (through the training workshops and practicum), and the community’s decision-making power within the government (through the public training module and the transparency mechanism). These can each be assessed through a mix of survey questions (for example, the household decision-making data that BOMA’s M&E team is already collecting) and in-depth interviews about participant experiences. In the case of the community and government level indicators, BOMA project staff within each community can also engage in a process of participant observation – taking detailed notes on the practicum itself and at public barazas and government meetings.

Observable final outcomes include those described in the introduction on page 4 of this document. They include individual action to create private goods for the benefit of the household, collective action to create public goods for the benefit of the community, and political action, in which the government provides public goods in response to community demands. Our surveys should ask respondents for examples of each of these, but our BOMA field officers in each site will be instrumental in recording any examples of each of these, particularly any generated directly through Module 4 of the training program.
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Focus Groups

Location: Loiyangalani
1. BOMA Locational Committee Members
2. Loiyangalani Center REAP Beneficiaries
3. Loiyangalani Center Potential Future REAP Beneficiaries
4. (Manyatta) REAP Beneficiaries
5. (Manyatta) Potential Future REAP Beneficiaries

Location: Kargi
6. BOMA Locational Committee Members
7. Kargi Center REAP Beneficiaries
8. Galoro Potential Future REAP Beneficiaries
9. Matarbah REAP Beneficiaries
10. Matarbah Potential Future REAP Beneficiaries

Location: Ngurunit
11. BOMA Locational Committee Members
12. Ngurunit Center REAP Beneficiaries
13. Ngurunit Center Potential Future REAP Beneficiaries
14. Lependera REAP Beneficiaries
15. Lependera Potential Future REAP Beneficiaries

Location: Ilaut
16. BOMA Locational Committee Members
17. Ilaut Center REAP Beneficiaries
18. Ilaut Center Potential Future REAP Beneficiaries
19. Farakoren REAP Beneficiaries
20. Farakoren Potential Future REAP Beneficiaries

Interviews (Village-Level)

Location 1 [names omitted to protect anonymity]
- Assistant Chief
- Youth Representative
- Assistant Chief
- CMDC Member
- BOMA Mentor
- VSF staff person
- VSF staff person

Location 2 [names omitted to protect anonymity]
- Chief
- County Assembly Representative
- CMDRR participant and REAP member
- CMDC Secretary
- BOMA Mentor

Location 3 [names omitted to protect anonymity]
- Chief
- Youth Representative
- BOMA Mentor
• CMDC Member

**Interviews (County-Level)**

Marsabit County Government
- Golicha Sora, County Minister for Trade, Industrialization and Enterprise Development
- Isacko G. Mamo, County Minister for Water, Environment and Natural Resources

Concern Worldwide Kenya
- Wendy Erasmus, Assistant County Director Programmes
- Martin Kumbe, Area Coordinator, Marsabit County
- Hassan Olow

CIFA (Community Initiative Facilitation and Assistance)
- Ibrahim Adan, C.E.O.

PACIDA
- Patrick Katelo Isako, Executive Director

PISP (Pastoralist Integrated Support Programme)
- Umuro Godana, Executive Director (Soon to be a member of the County Government)

Catholic Dioceses / CARITAS
- Joseph Mirgithan
- Godfrey Godana
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*The Impact of a Grants-Based Micro-Enterprise Program in Pastoralist Kenya: An Impact Evaluation of The BOMA Project’s Rural Entrepreneur Access Project at Three Years.* bomaproject.org
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MacOpiyo, Dr. Laban and Francis Opiyo. 2013. *COBRA Community-Based Resilience Analysis*. Workshop for the Validation of the Findings of the CoBRA Assessment in Marsabit.


Nzau 2013 *Mainstreaming climate change resilience into development planning in Kenya*


“‘Our Community, Our Solutions” Community Conversations Training of Trainers Manual DRAFT. Concern Worldwide.
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