



ReSAHMaP Interim Report

[Re-thinking Strategy on Animal health, markets and policy in Pastoralist Areas of East Africa: *Supporting learning by Interaction to strengthen livestock policy and practice in Kenya (ReSAHMaP)*]

Elsie Kangai

August 2016

A project being implemented with funding from The Open Society Initiative for Eastern Africa (OSIEA)

1. Please provide a brief description of the project for which funding was received (not more than 1 or 2 paragraphs). This description should include:

A very brief description of the sector in which you work and the original motivation for undertaking the project.

A description of the specific project for which funding was received including the objectives as specified in the project proposal.

The amount of money allocated by OSIEA for the project.

The overall time-frames for the project.

The specific time-frames for the work that is being reported on in the progress report.

Total Amount granted (US Dollars): 79,112

The overall time-frames for the project: November 2015-November 2016

The specific time-frames for the work that is being reported on in the progress report: Feb- Aug 2016

Background of the sector

Turkana County is one of the ASAL counties in Kenya in which livestock production is their principal source of livelihood, whereby pastoralism contributes(62%), agro-pastoralism (14%), fishing (8%), Urban/peri-urban (16%).

The value of livestock resources in the county is estimated to be 5.9 billion annually (Turkana County Development Plan, 2013). Thus, the livestock sub-sector significantly contributes to the food and cash needs of the pastoralist and provide employment to 90% of the population. Although the livestock sector plays a vital role in livelihood system for both pastoral and non-pastoral communities Turkana County and neighboring catchment spreading into Karamoja pastoral community in Uganda, Ethiopia and Sudan; they are faced with different challenges which affect their livelihoods. Broadly, the three key issues that informed the need to undertake this project include:

- 1. Climate change and decline in food security affecting pastoral livelihoods*
- 2. Limited capacity for disease surveillance and management*
- 3. Opportunities for livestock commercialization*
- 4. Policy spaces for local stakeholder engagement to influence policy*

The ReSAHMaP project

The aim of this project is to enhance the capacity of pastoral communities to influence decision making with respect to animal health, markets and policy for improved livelihoods and food security in Turkana County.

Project Objectives

- 1. To build the capacity of pastoral communities on animal health, trade and policy by engaging a local capacity building field assistant*
- 2. To document existing climate-smart pastoral practices, innovations in disease surveillance and management and innovative livestock marketing and trading initiatives to facilitate learning, and to inform policy and practice.*
- 3. To establish avenues for county-level policy debates and dialogues on animal health, trade, climate smart pastoralism, food security and livelihoods.*
- 4. To review, create awareness and advocacy for supportive policies at county, national and regional levels.*

2. Please describe your progress (both for this reporting period and cumulative) towards each of the specified objectives as outlined in the previous paragraph and the grant agreement. Please do not simply list numbers of workshops etc. undertaken, but rather provide substantive comment on the utility impact of activities undertaken.

2.1 To build the capacity of pastoral communities on animal health, trade and policy by engaging a local capacity building field assistant

- **Deployment of 2 consultants to Lokichar** –this move helped to mobilize up to seven (7) Kraals, who would serve as the entry point in the community. In addition, being on the ground, they have been able to map different stakeholders at the sub-county level, participate in formal and informal forums where the thematic issues are addressed, prepare community for policy dialogues and gather opinion from stakeholders on the capacity needs. The consultants have also fast tracked documentation of case studies.
- **Profiling of kraals** –seven kraals were identified but only three of them were profiled since the rest had migrated to wetter regions. The profiling exercise formed the basis of documentation of case studies, mobilizing of listening clubs for dissemination and also a network for policy advocacy.
- **Engagement of pastoral communities on the three thematic areas to identify capacity needs and priority issues** –this forms a basis for policy dialogues and sieving out interventions to be undertaken in Phase 2 of the project.

2.2 To document existing climate-smart pastoral practices, innovations in disease surveillance and management and innovative livestock marketing and trading initiatives to facilitate learning, and to inform policy and practice.

Activities accomplished so far

- i) Actor mapping –the consultants have mapped out all relevant stakeholders and have compiled their level of involvement in the three thematic areas including status of implementation of projects and potential opportunities provided by the projects.
- ii) Meetings with key stakeholders at the sub-county and county level –established relevance of project and early buy-in
- iii) Visits to monitor marketing of livestock in 6 markets –to build data which will strengthen the evidence base for the proposed co-management of livestock markets.
- iv) Visits to innovative project sites –pasture production in Turkwell, Kerio Valley market day, Turkana South Vaccination activities at Kraals, ADRs as agro-dealers, LMA-managed markets and ‘open’ markets. The visits gathered information on the unique features of the various interventions to support policy learning and action.
- v) Focus group discussions –held with pastoral communities and government staff to establish innovations, capacity needs, priority needs and trigger engagements with responsible actors for supportive policies and their enforcement.
- vi) Key informant interviews –these interviews helped to shape the case studies, were useful in identifying influencers in the county’s policy debates for engagement in dissemination, identifying political opportunities/policy moments in the devolved government structure and also networking to anchor the project in the county-development circles.
- vii) Documentation of case studies –documentation of case studies was completed on 18th August and a write-shop held between 19th and 22nd August. The write-shop report details the preliminary findings and information gaps which could not be filled due to data scarcity (attached separately).

There has been a positive response from stakeholder, CABE partners and relevant ministries on the importance of stakeholder participation in policy processes, acknowledgement of some of the identified gaps, desire to participate in dissemination activities and also willingness of stakeholders to support CABE in garnering the needed attention of the county assembly working groups.

2.3 To establish avenues for county-level policy debates and dialogues on animal health, trade, climate smart pastoralism, food security and livelihoods.

A number of avenues for policy debates and dialogues have been identified and plans are being concretized with actual dates when the engagements will take place in the next three months. The avenues identified so far include:

- i. **County Steering Group (CSG)**, which is made up of Heads of all government departments, NGOs, Civil society and development partners in the county. CABE has been accepted to join CSG and will in the coming weeks book a slot to share on the policy issues identified and gather views on policies of interest in the county.
- ii. **Turkana County Civil Society Consortium and Uwajibikaji Forum** - CABE plans to disseminate the outputs of this project to this consortium and seek support in advocating for priority policy issues at the county level.
- iii. **Turkana County Assembly Sub-Committees on Pastoralism** –The outcome of the previous three engagements will be synthesized into three-five key issues for consideration by the county assembly. The same will also be presented during the County Policy Dialogue for consideration at the county or national level.
- iv. **Dissemination using print and electronic media** (local FM radios, newsletters, pamphlets, policy briefs etc). Radio Jambo has the widest coverage in the county and most preferred by various interest groups and thus, identified as the main channel for conducting radio programs --likely to reach middle cadre and upper cadre and fewer pastoralists in the two sub-counties. To enhance listenership and engagement of pastoralists, we have planned to organize community listening clubs in Turkana South and Turkana East.
- v. **Identifying platforms to host e-discussions** –Two platforms were contacted as potential hosts for the e-discussions. These are i) **e-forum European Commission for the Control of Foot-and-Mouth Disease (EuFMD)** for a possible webinar on Animal health service delivery –They have asked us to share our title for the webinar and the case study. ii) **FAO Pastoralist Knowledge Hub** -who support and give visibility to pastoralist-related interventions. We are yet to get response from this platform.

2.4 To review, create awareness and advocacy for supportive policies at county, national and regional levels.

- Review of policies on animal health, climate change, marketing & trade was undertaken between April and May. The gaps and opportunities identified in this exercise informed the case study design and will be part of the policy brief.
- Although general awareness of pastoral-related policies is weak in Turkana County, we have made attempts to sensitize pastoral communities on the policies and also gathered from them their perspectives on implementation of policies. Identification of policy gaps and opportunities will be carried over into the dissemination phase and culminate into key issues to present to the county government, through the County Assembly Sub-committee on pastoralism.

3. Please outline successes, challenges and setbacks encountered during the reporting period that have impacted specifically on the achievement of your set objectives. Provide a brief description of how you dealt with problems encountered or how you intend to remedy these problems.

The main successes of the project so far have been in institutionalization of CABE in the county, mapping of actors, engagement with sub-county and county level stakeholders through various forums, networking with like-minded organisations, documentation of case studies and synthesis of issues to include in the policy brief. These have been elaborated in detail in the above sections.

The main challenges which have affected timely implementation of some activities include the following:

- **Data scarcity**- there is limited secondary data on past or on-going interventions in the three thematic areas. Generally, the culture of recording data, collating, analysing and making available for public use has almost been inexistence and systems are just being put up in various government departments. Thus, the secondary data accessed is scanty and still being pursued. In addition, we are engaging volunteers for a period of two weeks as market monitors to build the evidence base for the need for informed decision-making and the proposed co-management of livestock markets for enhanced gains for pastoral communities.
- **Challenges of attribution** –there are many partners undertaking similar interventions; which makes it difficult to attribute impact to specific stakeholders. The county government has since zoned the county and established a committee which advises new partners on areas where interventions can be undertaken and on the best approaches to implementation. However, it is unclear how zonation has been useful in enhancing development and impact of projects.
- **Migration of kraals** –from June 2016, three (3) of the Kraals migrated to other parts of Turkana in search of water and pasture due to the worsening drought. This stalled the process of profiling until a time when they would settle down –the leaders advised this could be beginning of August.
- **Changes in project staffing** –two (2) of the consultants resigned from the project –one left to pursue further studies while the other one was dismissed due to under-performance.
- **Transport using motorcycle** – The consultants expressed concerns over their health and security riding for long distances in harsh climatic conditions. Secondly, fuel is very expensive in Turkana and recommended motorcycle use for short distances of not more than 15 kilometres daily. For more engaging activities, it is highly advised to hire a 4WD vehicle.

4. Describe any key lessons you have learned and how you are sharing them and the results of the project, both internally and externally. This should include a brief summary of preliminary or final findings from any internal or external evaluations that have been undertaken.

- **Handful interventions on climate change in Turkana South and East** -there are limited interventions and stakeholders for climate change adaptation and mitigation in the two sub-counties. Most huge interventions are emergency-related/relief based. There about four (4) national policies and legislations geared towards climate change adaptation in Kenya. During the dialogue meetings, we will seek to understand the status of implementation and discuss with stakeholders what needs to be done to domesticate the policies and tap into the resources provided for adaptation activities at the county level.
- **Agro-pastoralism taking shape in the south** -there is an ongoing initiative by National Irrigation Board, along River Turkwel for crop production, which we are considering to

approach in order to collaborate with them in capacity building of pastoralists for pasture production.

- **Changing role of women in pastoral systems** –women are increasingly engaged in animal health service delivery as ADRs and as agro-dealers, feed and pasture production, preservation and commercialisation, marketing of livestock products (meat, hide and skins), water management (maintaining water infrastructures) and horticultural production. The policy dialogues/advocacy activities will seek to include the voice of women in all the thematic areas.
 - **Co-management of livestock markets is still at nascent stages in the county.** The main stakeholders, that is the Livestock Marketing Association (LMA) and the County Livestock Marketing Council (CLMC) operates independently, which undermines the efforts of development partners on market governance and also slows down potential gains of collaborative ventures. The project will put efforts in providing evidence for what works, what does not work and why for such interventions to trigger dialogue and possible efforts towards realization of the gains of co-management of livestock markets.
 - **Institutionalization of disease reporters** –although not discussed in formal circles, the government systems make use of CAHWs (christened ‘disease reporters’) when implementing activities such as vaccination campaigns, disease surveillance, off-takes among others. This provides an avenue to provoke dialogue on the formalization of their engagement for better service delivery.
 - **Reluctance of policy frameworks and legislations to legalize the role of Para-vets/community animal health workers in animal health service delivery** despite the evidence that Para-vets can provide effective, cost-efficient and safe services at the community levels. The case studies will build onto the above evidence as well as explore viable disease reporting system/mechanisms which provide incentive systems for CAHWs to enhance their accountability, regulation and collaboration in animal health service delivery.
 - **Dissemination using print and electronic media** (local FM radios, newsletters, pamphlets, policy briefs etc) is **likely to reach middle cadre and upper cadre and fewer pastoralists in the two sub-counties.** Thus, we have planned to organize community listening clubs for radio dissemination, organizing sub-county dialogues at the sub-county level and possibly, the county dialogue in the South. Secondly, in future, we will explore other avenues which we have found to be preferred by pastoralists such as more public barazas, posters, exchange visits and demonstrations.
 - **Exploration of oil in Turkana South supporting institutions and infrastructural development**–some of the community gains include establishment of public institutions and infrastructure like schools, hospitals, boreholes and wells and piped water among others. Thus, there exists potential for stakeholders to advocate for establishment of livestock-related infrastructure along the three thematic areas of the project.
5. *If this is a final report, briefly describe the next phase of the project (continuation, expansion, replication or termination) and if you plan to continue with the work, any resources that you have secured to sustain it.*
- This is an interim report covering February-August 2016. The next steps in the project are to undertake dissemination through policy debates and dialogues at the sub-county and county levels, through the channels described in 2.3.
 - Since some of the gaps identified are beyond the scope of this current project, we are developing concept notes and seeking ways to leverage resources from other CABE partners like CORDAID to support some identified interventions.
 - CABE also entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with two other local NGOs to build synergies in resource mobilisation and implementation of future projects.

6. ***Please provide detailed information regarding any anticipated deviations from the project plan or changes to the time line and budget. Note that you will need to make a separate request in writing to OSIEA for approval of any amendments to the original contract in respect of budgets, time-lines and funded activities.***

Yes, we made changes to the work plan and shared with OSF/OSIEA (Francis approved) and the fiscal manager (Peter Githongo). The major change was in scheduling of activities:

- i) Review of policies on animal health, climate change, marketing & trade –revised from April to end in July 2016
- ii) Documentation of case studies –was scheduled to end in June but has since been revised to end in August 2016
- iii) Dissemination of technical papers and policy briefs using Radio - scheduled between May and August but has since been revised to August-October 2016.
- iv) E-discussions - scheduled between July and August but have since been revised to September-October 2016.
- v) Policy dialogues - scheduled for June-July but has since been revised to October – November 2016

7. Please provide a detailed financial report documenting spending over the grant period. OSIEA has a standard financial reporting format and the report should refer specifically to the line items in the budget attached to the original grant agreement. Please note in the financial report any significant deviations on particular line items and the reasons for this. (It may be that the funds will only be expended in the next reporting period). If this is a final report please note that the OSIEA will require your most recent audited statements as soon after the end of the grant period as possible.

Centre For African Bio-Entrepreneurship							
Grant Number: OR2015-24859							
Grant Period: December 1,2015- November 30, 2016							
Expenditure Statement for the period 1st February 2016 to 31st July 2016							
ITEMS	Budget		Budget				
	US \$	Ksh	US\$	Ksh	Variance	Variance	
INCOME -							
1st Tranche - From FOSI (26 Jan 16) @ 100.5		39,901	4,010,051				
		-	-				
Forex Gain / (Loss) -				0			
EFT Funds Transfer Charges		55					
Total Income		39,956	4,010,051				
					Actual	Actual	
					Expenditure	Expenditure	Variance
	Budget	Budget	Budget	Expenditure	Expenditure	Variance	Variance
	line	US \$	Ksh	US\$	Ksh	US\$	Ksh
STAFF SALARIES AND BENEFITS (based on % of time allocation)							
Program Manager (100%) (@ \$600 * 12 months)	1	7,200	723,600	4,826	485,020	2,374	238,580
Finance Officer (100%) (@ \$300 * 12 months)	2	3,600	361,800	2,426	243,820	1,174	117,980
Executive Director (50%) (@ \$400 * 12 months)	3	4,800	482,400	3,226	324,220	1,574	158,180
Sub-total-Staff salaries and benefits		15,600	1,567,800	10,478	1,053,060	1,053,060	514,740
Undertake a comparative study of policy & legal framework on livestock health							
Community mobilization (fuel) (@ \$50 * 1)	4	50	5,025	978	98,250	-928	(93,225)
Consultation with CAHWs (@\$10 * 20 pax * 5 days)	5	1,000	100,500	577	58,000	423	42,500
Accommodation-turkana @ \$65 * 2 people*10 days)	6	1,300	130,650	910	91,455	390	39,195
Flight: Nairobi - Turkana 1 pax @ \$500 * 1 person)	7	500	50,250	766	76,960	-266	(26,710)
Consultancy - technical papers on select interventions (@ \$14k * 1)	8	14,000	1,407,000	7,593	763,060	6,407	643,940
Printing policy briefs (@ \$8 * 200 copies)	9	1,600	160,800	-	-	1,600	160,800
Printing reports (@ \$5 * 400 copies)	10	2,000	201,000	-	-	2,000	201,000
Sub-total program activities - Comparative Study		20,450	2,055,225	10,823	1,087,725	9,627	967,500
Dissemination of technical papers and policy briefs							

Radio talk shows (@ \$800 * 14 episodes)	11	11,200	1,125,600	-	-	11,200	1,125,600
Subtotal-program activities (Dissemination of technical papers)		11,200	1,125,600	-	-	11,200	1,125,600
Sub county dialogues							
Hall hire (@ \$20 * 2 venues)	12	40	4,020	-	-	40	4,020
Meals and refreshments-turkana (@ \$20 * 100 pax	13	2,000	201,000	-	-	2,000	201,000
Flight 1 person (@ \$500 * 1pax)	14	500	50,250	-	-	500	50,250
Accommodation (CABE national staff) (@ \$65 * 3 days)	15	195	19,598	-	-	195	19,598
Transport reimbursement (@ \$20 * 50 pax * 2 workshops)	16	2,000	201,000	-	-	2,000	201,000
Subtotal: Turkana County dialogues		4,735	475,868	-	-	4,735	475,868
Turkana county livestock health & climate change conference							
hall hire (@ \$100 * 1 day)	17	100	10,050	-	-	100	10,050
Participant transport refund (all pax (@\$40 * 80 pax)	18	3,200	321,600	-	-	3,200	321,600
Mobilization (@ \$50 * 1 day)	19	50	5,025	-	-	50	5,025
flight-Nairobi-Lodwar (\$300*3 pax)	20	900	90,450	-	-	900	90,450
Participant Accommodation Lodwar (@ \$65 *10 pax)	21	650	65,325	-	-	650	65,325
Meals and refreshments for the conference (@ \$30 * 80 pax)	22	2,400	241,200	-	-	2,400	241,200
Subtotal: Livestock health & Climate change conference		7,300	733,650	-	-	7,300	733,650
Organizational development							
CABE strategic plan development (@ \$2000 * 1)	23	2,000	201,000	1,172	117,760	828	83,240
Financial management software for 1 laptop & 1 desktop computer(@\$1200*2)	24	2,400	241,200	-	-	2,400	241,200
Staff capacity development on leadership, communication and governance (@ \$2,100)	25	2,100	211,050	-	-	2,100	211,050
Subtotal-organizational development		6,500	653,250	1,172	117,760	5,328	535,490
Administrative & overheads (13% of total project cost)							
Administrative & overheads (13% of total project cost)	26	8,552	859,481	5,442	546,900	3,110	312,581
Subtotal - Administrative & Overheads costs		8,552	859,481	5,442	546,900	3,110	312,581
Fiscal Management							
Fiscal Manager's Fee - 7.5% of total direct project costs	27	5,575	560,316	3,333	334,958	2,242	225,357
GRANT TOTAL		5,575	560,316	3,333	334,958	2,242	225,357
Grand Total		79,912	8,031,189	31,248	3,140,403	1,096,603	4,890,786
SURPLUS / (DEFICIT)				8,708	869,648		
Forex Gain / (Loss) -					-		
Total Bank charges as at 31st July 2016				(87.7)	(8,811)		
INTERIM BALANCE				8,621	860,837		