

Annual learning report ¹

Title	Kenya 4 Resilience Consortium
SMC number	2021:401
SMC member organisation	Skandinaviska Barnmissionen (SBM)
Cooperating partner or partners	CMA, IAS, TSA & LPI
Country or countries	Kenya
Time period of the intervention	2021-2023
Time period covered in the report	2021
Total budget in SEK	5403626
Reporting year budget	1674711

¹ SMC encourages member organisations and cooperating partners to use their own templates, however SMC's template can be helpful to make sure all reporting requirements are met. For full reporting requirements, please visit [SMC Guidelines for development cooperation grants](#) (p. 20-22). For financial reporting, see SMC'S [template for financial reports](#).

1. EXAMPLES OF RESULTS

1.1 Please share examples of results achieved or signs of change/progress noted towards the intended results on an outcome-level during the reporting period. How have these examples contributed to SMC's programme goals? Kindly also make linkages between results and relevant goals within the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.²

The Kenya4Resilience Consortium (K4RC) project in its first year (2021) despite several lapses managed to achieve notable results as well as signs of progress towards desired change. This was registered at each outcome level (contributed by each consortium member individually and collectively) as defined below: -

I. Livelihoods secured and enhanced in the target communities

- ✚ 24 farmer groups (218male, 410 female) and 4 groups (13 males, 39 female) in Tana river and Samburu counties respectively have been identified. These groups will be the direct project beneficiaries and their enthusiasm to participate in the project activities is an early sign of community acceptance and ownership of the intervention.
- ✚ Through the project entry forums, county resilience workshop and County Steering Group forums, a total of 32 Key collaborators and enablers of the intervention have been mapped and since be involved in several project activities in both the target counties. These include like-minded non-governmental organizations, community based organizations, religious leaders among other local community leaders. Civil society organizations and other local community leaders are actively participating in activities promising sustained partnerships and ownership.
- ✚ Government officials both from the national and county institutions crucial to achievement of the project goals are already on board. Line government departments of agriculture, special programs, livestock, water, nutrition, social services and local administration are actively participating in project activities and since they are key boundary partners offers signs of attainment of more resilient communities. As the duty bearers they are mandated to provide majority of social amenities such as water, markets, extension services, healthcare, security among others. Officials from the ministry of agriculture have been fundamental in the training of farmer groups in the two counties.
- ✚ Strategic partnerships and synergies have been identified and created. Components not factored in the project but necessary in achieving the

² Results should relate to planned objectives in the application/plan of the intervention. Results should contribute to one or more of SMC's goals, SMC's programme goals can be found in [Guidelines for Development Cooperation Grants](#) (p. 9). Please note that examples can be either planned or unexpected; positive or negative; and can be verified through planned monitoring, evaluations, or stories of change from the target group, etc.

goal for instance, water harvesting, averting human-wildlife conflict needed to be outsourced. The project through the creation of county hubs networked with other organizations that have the missing components offering the vital missing links. Namunyak conservancy in Samburu have been instrumental in addressing the reported human-wildlife conflicts. The Samburu Project (TSP) organization having interacted with the project, shared plans of drillings boreholes while in return have the groups they work with learn from the village savings and loaning associations component.

- ✚ Crop agriculture is not popular in the project sites of the target counties. The enthusiasm by the farmer groups to learn, practice and act as model farmers to the rest of the community is a promising sign that the proposed diversification of the livelihood streams would yield desired results. Climate smart techniques such as kitchen gardens has been picked up by one of the groups in Samburu.

II. *Learning, innovation and adaptive management enhanced within communities and civil society organizations.*

- ✚ The creation of Resilience County hubs in the two counties has created a platform for community representatives, government officials and civil society organizations to share lessons, experiences and innovations. This guarantees peer learning among the local organizations and the learning path connected to the national K4R Community of Practice (CoP). The county hub has been anchored as a working group to the County Steering Group (CSG). The CSG is the highest coordinating platform in the arid and semi-arid counties. Reporting to and learning from the CSG offers a unique opportunity to share lessons & innovations and influence government plans in relation to resilient-building interventions at the highest level in the counties.
- ✚ The county resilience workshops that preceded the project launch, notably increased knowledge of resilience concepts among the local participants including civil society representatives, national & county government officials and opinion leaders. This created a demand for more engagement with K4R activities as a guarantee learning experience. This was further highlighted by the local actors engaged during outcome mapping (OM) visioning sessions. They registered interest in the methodology and implored to participate in the project to experience the outcomes as they envisioned.
- ✚ As stipulated in the project implementation structure, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) as is their mandate held their 1st siting to among other things have a deliberation on the:-Discuss on the progress of the project thus far, Project baseline findings and recommendations, Status report on the project funds utilization and Resource mobilization plans for the consortium. The meeting had representation from the 7 SMC member organizations bar 2 namely ADRA and PMU who duly registered their apologies to be absent. The present members (2F, 7M) represented CMA that serves as the secretariat of K4R and the lead in the consortium, IAS-

- K, TSA, LPI and ERIKS. The forum is key to ensure that the project aligns to plans, navigates challenges and learns from them.
- III. *The consortium generates understanding of the connection between conflict and resilience, therefore effectively support resilience interventions in the conflict-prone target counties.*
- ✚ Life and Peace Institute (LPI) organized a conflict sensitivity training for the other 3 consortium members. With the broad objective to equip the 9 (2F & 7M) representatives of the consortium members with awareness to employ conflict-sensitive interventions. The consciousness to plan activities, mobilize participants and conducting sessions with a conflict-sensitive lens, will help avoid creating new and exacerbating existing conflicts.

K4RC broadly seeks to contribute to the SMCs program goal. The early results reported in the 1st year of the project directly to these goals as follows: -

- ✚ The consortium has identified and is working with like-minded NGOs, CBOs, FBOS and local leaders to hold duty bearers to account in the execution of their primary mandate. This directly contributes to **SMC's program goal 1** where these collaborators jointly promote and/or demand food security, household income sustained, market access (human rights).
- ✚ The program goal 2; Duty-bearers respect, protect and fulfil human rights, ensuring that the democratic space is open, and guaranteeing the civil society ability to influence has been largely contributed by the governments support for the county hubs and support in project activities. The county hubs have been a platform for public discourse reaching the duty bearers. This safe space to advocate for societal issues promotes democracy and ultimately guarantee fulfilment of human rights and fundamental freedoms.
- ✚ The rejuvenation of agricultural activities has compelled the agricultural officers who had since moved back to the county headquarters to return to the project site and offer services. The early engagements of the project has built the voice and agency of the community members. The ability of the community members to demand provision of services from the duty bearers depicts their ability to claim their right thus improve their living conditions as envisioned in SMCs program goal 3.

The highlighted results examples additionally contribute to 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals:- *Goal 1, target 1.5*; By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters, *Goal 2, target 2.4*; By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters and that progressively improve land and soil quality, *Goal 5, target 5.5*; Ensure women's full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life, *Goal 13, target 13.1*; Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries

and; *Goal 16, target 16.1*; Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere.

1.2 Are there other, previously not reported, results/important outcomes from previous interventions that have been identified during this reporting period?

In the two counties, the targeted groups have previously benefited from interventions. Just to mention a few, a group in Samburu had worked with a project back in 2018. The group still has evidence of the fruit trees and vegetable gardens that they have sustained to date in the single demo farm. Another in Tana river, benefited from an economic enterprise intervention back in 2015 and were actively involved in table banking, small scale poultry and kitchen gardens.

1.3 Member organisation's comments and analysis of the above, with focus on lessons learnt:

- ✚ *There exists a wide range of local knowledge thus calling for meaningful community involvement-* From the two county resilience workshops, it is evident that there exists some level of knowledge of the disasters, local coping measures and their capacities. The project baseline study and outcome mapping visioning laid further emphasis on this fact. It is thus critical to involve these communities as project stakeholders rather than mere beneficiaries.
- ✚ *Collaboration/networking at different levels* between state and non-state actors play a crucial role when sharing knowledge and learning both at the county and local levels hence increasing both adaptive, absorptive and transformative capacities of communities in the face of disasters. The county government officials that attended the launch of the county hubs expressed their commitment to work with the non-state actors including K4R to build the resilience of the communities.
- ✚ *Consortium dynamics-* It is worth noting that consortiums members each have unique structures, strengths, areas of improvements and cultures. This uniqueness is a great opportunity to learn from each other, achieve more by exploring individual skills but also device ways to cope with challenges encountered. Mutual understanding and cooperation is key to propel any consortium to attainment of the desired goals.
- ✚ *Communities are central to resilience building-* just as it is key to meaningful involve community members due to the local knowledge they possess, for ownership and sustainability of resilience actions community members are the prerequisite component. Despite the fact that resilience building involves different actors (duty bearers, CSOs), the right holders hold the cornerstone of this endeavor.

2. CONTEXT AND SYSTEM

2.1 Please share significant changes in the context/system during the reporting period and describe how they have had effect on the intervention.³

- ✚ *COVID-19 pandemic:* The COVID-19 pandemic is a risk in meeting the objectives of the project. The government's directive to limit movement and large gatherings to curb the spread of the disease has affected conduct of several activities. Meeting target beneficiaries has in some instances been postponed for weeks as is meeting between the consortium members. The project had not budgeted for provision of PPEs and sanitizers rendering it harder for field officers to engage communities.
- ✚ *Prolonged drought:* The reporting period has seen longer dry months than anticipated. Notably, the government declared drought a national disaster. Communities in the target counties were not severely affected; No loss of human was reported but a few (less than 100 in the two counties) cattle died as majority of the livestock were moved to higher and greener grounds. The rains have proved erratic and insufficient thus agricultural plans were greatly hampered. Additionally, the onset of the short rains means springing of few grazing patches and watering holes. The scramble for these already scarce resources leads to periodic fatal conflicts.
- ✚ *Human-wildlife conflict:* Farm fields in Samburu county have over time been invaded by wild animals mainly elephants, warthogs and monkeys. Farmers have reported more than 70% loss of their crops in the worst cases. This usually results in retaliatory attacks of the game animals.
- ✚ *Elections Fever:* Kenya enters the general elections year in 2022. Early campaigns have already been witnessed in most areas with the incumbent candidates moving with speed to make up for the lost time in power. This is both an opportunity and a risk. The plus side being the sitting government tend to support community interventions by attending forums and offering the demands as witnessed in Samburu where the County government offered fortified seeds to the farmers. It is equally a risk as elections in Kenya are associated with a period of post-election chaos and uncertainty. Additionally, change of regime means that the political goodwill will be relinquished and renewed efforts to win the government of the day starts.
- ✚ *Tribal clashes:* The project sites are prone to perennial resource based conflicts. For the reporting period, parts of Samburu county witnessed armed banditry and cattle rustling that led to loss of human lives and cattle being driven away. Tana river county was notably calm during this same period.

³ E.g., in terms of human rights, civic space, legislative or normative, economic or environmental, relevant system or institutional changes, or other shocks or stresses to the context.

2.2 How have the member organisation or cooperating partner/s adapted to the above changes? Have any other significant organisational changes occurred during the reporting period?

- ✚ *COVID-19 pandemic:* The project has encouraged the project implementers and partners to get vaccinated as well as adapt a cascading approach, where key messages at the community level has been passed to project participants through their leadership structures to minimize spread of the virus. For outcome two, use of the digital space has been adopted to encourage learning among the members.
- ✚ *Prolonged drought:* The affected communities were remedied with government programmes for instance safety net, destocking as coordinated by the National Drought Management Authority. Furthermore, the project is seeking additional funding to support water harvesting and piping efforts to avail water to the target farmer groups. Additionally, synergies with other like-minded entities is an option at the moment.
- ✚ *Human-wildlife conflict:* The consortium sort partnership with organizations that operate in conservancies and have since helped to curb the conflict between humans and wildlife. Namunyak conservancy in Samburu has played a key role in averting escalated conflict as well as seeking for compensation for the farmers.
- ✚ *Elections Fever:* The updated risk management matrix captures all the possible scenarios in the election year and how best to mitigate the subsequent effect on the project.
- ✚ *Tribal clashes:* As highlighted in the risk management plan, the field staff in close communication with the security apparatus plan project activities based on the shared security updates. Additionally, periodic updates shared on the International NGO Safety Organization (INSO) would complement the bulletins shared by the county security team to best plan.

There have been no significant organisational changes during the reporting but one implementing officer transitioning from a consortium member organization. As highlighted in the risk management plan, the succession plan in place ensured a smooth transition.

2.3 In what ways has the risk management plan helped you during the reporting period? Have you followed the plan for systematic updating of the intervention's risk assessment? When were the latest updates made and who participated?

The risk management plan has come in handy in handled foreseen risks. The staff exit as highlighted above is one instance where the plan ensured that the occurrence of the identified risk did not largely hamper the project implementation.

Security concerns remain a key risk and measures highlighted in the plan have been followed accordingly with no incidences reported so far.

The latest update of the risk management plan was done by the technical implementation team during the start of the last quarter. (October).



Risk Management
Matrix-21401_2022_l

2.4 Member organisation's comments and analysis of the above, with focus on lessons learnt:

- ✚ The risk management plan is a crucial tool to better place the project in the event of occurrence of identified risks. Having seen some risks occur, the project was able to navigate smoothly by simply following the set mitigation measure. Additionally, it is prudent to frequently update the plan to capture changes in the context.

3. INTERVENTION

3.1 Describe any significant changes to the intervention that have had an effect on outcomes or time plan. How has the implementation been adapted to these changes? Do you currently see any challenges to meeting the objectives?

- ✚ *Delayed funds disbursement:* The project funds only arrived midyear meaning that the project plans had to be behind schedule by several months. A combination of fast-tracking and running concurrent activities has enabled some great deal of implementation but a great bunch of activities remain undone. This predicament means that the consortium members did not manage to totally implement the activities as stipulated in the initial plans. It is in this light that we request to implement the remaining activities in the second year.
- ✚ *Community buy in and support-* The project has enjoyed widespread community ownership and support of the K4RC project. The human rights based approach has been adopted, where both men and women, the people living with disabilities have been included in project implementation. This has ensured that all planned interventions have been adequately attended and supported.
- ✚ *County & national Government Support-* The respective county governments and national government line departments are on board. Line government departments of agriculture, special programs, livestock, water, nutrition, social services and local administration are actively participating in project activities and since they are key boundary partners offers signs of attainment of more resilient communities.
- ✚ *CSOs willingness to support K4RC project in Samburu-* The project in Samburu had some missing components and in some instances experienced challenges. The agricultural projects needed water for irrigation and The Samburu Project (TSP) offered to support by drilling of boreholes. Namunyak conservancy collaborated in Samburu to address the human-wildlife conflict frequently

witnessed. The additional support received from the other organizations has impacted the project positively and ensured it navigates the challenges encountered.

3.2 Has your system for monitoring worked according to plan? Have there been any challenges regarding coordination and collaboration with other actors (e.g. authorities or civil society organisations) in relation to the plan?

- ✚ The project's monitoring system as set out is working seamlessly. The theory of change and logical framework developed at the design stage still hold as backed by the project baseline study conducted by an external party. As envisioned in the project proposal, the project will incorporate outcome mapping methodology to track changes (outcomes). The team is in the process to finalize the design stage of the OM methodology. This will largely supplement the already existing monitoring system. The other tools namely project management plans, reporting templates and data collections tools have ensured a smooth monitoring of the project activities.
- ✚ There have been no challenges regarding coordination and collaboration with other actors. This was largely because the two consortium members implementing in the counties had previous engagements and presence in the target counties. Additional deliberate efforts were invested in the project entry through the vigorous county resilience workshops. This has greatly ensured full participation in the subsequent activities and the baseline survey.

3.3 Have rights holders been able to participate in the intervention according to the plan? Have rights holders been able to provide feedback on the implementation, as planned? In what way have implementation or intervention design been adapted based on feedback from the rights holders?

- ✚ Community members and farmer groups have fully participated in the project activities. In the project entry, they actively participated in the baseline study as well as community dialogues to select the farmer groups to be engaged. They have equally participated in the subsequent activities once called upon. Most recently, they gave very strong sentiments in the OM visioning sessions.
- ✚ Community feedback has been the centre of the project adaptive management component. Feedback collected immediately after the conduct of an activity in addition to the periodic feedback collected have given the right holders an opportunity to advise on matters pertaining to the project. Most notably, feedback received from community members in Samburu on the viability of crop agriculture in some areas and not in some. The feedback has compelled the project to implement livestock activities as opposed to crop agriculture in those specific areas.

3.4: Member organisation's comments and analysis of the above, with focus on lessons learnt

- ✚ *Community participation is vital to the success of the intervention*-The project has been deliberate in ensuring the community members actively and

meaningfully participate in the project design, implementation, monitoring and giving feedback.

- ✚ *Outcome mapping methodology is a catalyst for community ownership and participation*-The recently conducted visioning process, enlightened the community members of the fact that the project exist to serve their aspirations for a better tomorrow. The collective community vision to the progress markers of actual and desired change, the community members shared their desire to walk the journey of the project to attainment of the 'vision.'

4. BUDGET DEVIATIONS AND FINANCIAL REPORTING

Financial Report for partner org			Project number	21401-K4RC	Reporting period	31.12.2021						
Sida grant	20,904,166		Other grants	0	Total cost	20,904,166						
Approved budget for the intervention			Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Accumulated Outcome						
Budget lines	Budget Year 1	Outcome	%	Budget Year	Outcome	%	Budget Year	Outcome	%	Total budget	Total Outcome	%
DIRECT COSTS												
Capital Costs	855,000	864,043	101%							855,000	864,043	101%
SPECIFIC PROJECT COSTS												
Project outcome 1	4,538,800	849,915	19%							4,538,800	849,915	19%
Project outcome 2	3,619,600	2,159,724	60%							3,619,600	2,159,724	60%
Project outcome 3	1,496,973	1,399,430	93%							1,496,973	1,399,430	93%
OPERATING COSTS	8,338,000	4,974,151	60%							8,338,000	4,974,151	60%
SUPPORT/ ADMINISTRATION COSTS	1,715,000	1,110,056	65%							1,715,000	1,110,056	65%
INDIRECT COSTS	340,793	192,163	56%							340,793	192,163	56%
Total costs	20,904,166	11,549,484	55%	0	0		0	0		20,904,166	11,549,484	55%
Other grants (local, income from interest etc)										0	0	
Exchange gain+/loss-										0	0	
Sida grants	20,904,166	18,173,499								20,904,166	18,173,499	
	20,904,166	18,173,499										

Describe deviations between the budget and the financial outcome.			Deviation description	Describe how you have managed the deviations and if/how this will have effect on the intended results.
Budget Line	Financial outcome			
Capital costs	101%		Awaiting TSA explanation on +100% expenditure	
Project outcome 1	19%		The deviation can be attributed to late start of the project. Drought also	Most of the 2021 activities have not been fully implemented due to the late start of the project. It is

		affected most of the project activities hence the budget has been underspend.	necessary to use the balance in 2022 to allow for the continuation of activities already underway and to achieve the planned objectives.
Project outcome 2	60%	The deviation caused by late start of the project. The expenditure is attributed to the five months of project activities rather than 12 months of recommended time of implementation within a year.	It is necessary to use the balance in 2022 to allow for the continuation of activities already underway and to achieve the planned objectives.
Project outcome 3	93%	The best performance as all planned activities were conducted.	The balances will be used in the next fiscal year in achievement of project objectives .
Operating Costs	60%	The deviation is attributed to the late start of the project activities in 2021	It is necessary to use the balance in 2022 to allow for the continuation of activities already underway and to achieve the planned objectives.
Support/ Administration Costs	60%	The deviation is attributed to late start of the project.	It is necessary to use the balance in 2022 to allow for the continuation of activities already underway and to achieve the planned objectives.
Have there been any challenges with the financial reporting or the audit?			
There has been no challenge with the financial reporting this far as well as the planned project audit.			
Are future costs expected to be in line with the budget, and spending according to plan?			
All future costs are expected to be in line with the budget and spending according to the plan unless unprecedented changes in the context happens.			

5. SMC DIALOGUE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

List any ongoing dialogue questions and recommendations from SMC's assessment, meetings, or visits, to be followed up.	Please provide SMC an update.
SMC's recommendations on undertaking the power and gender analysis and the role of religion in project implementation at the inception of the project activities which was to inform the second disbursement of funds.	The project successfully undertook a baseline survey study that assessed and informed on the three items as recommended by SMC, which indeed informed the second disbursement of funds to the project.

6. OTHER

6.1 Any other comments or lessons learnt during the reporting period?

The linkage between 21401 K4RC and 21402 K4R CoP has greatly catalysed coordination and learning among the consortium members and beyond. The ability of the two projects to combine activities has enable reaching out to more partners that has released an avalanche of opportunities for learning, synergy and reduced costs. The OMOH training, the county resilience workshops and conflict sensitivity trainings are just but a few instances that the two projects have linked up with exemplary conclusions.

6.2 Is there any feedback you would like to share with SMC (regarding communication, reporting requirements, deadlines, SMC templates, etc.).

Yes.

I would like to recommend to SMC to organize for annual reporting webinars focusing on guidelines to be adhered to when undertaking annual review reporting as a means of ensuring all SMC funded member organizations are able to report with excellence and ease. Or if possible provide extra reporting guidelines, with sample examples per question to enhance members understanding of requirements that can support member organizations in writing both annual and half year reports.

6.3 List any separate documentation, media or attachments to the learning report (stories from the target group, evaluations, policies, video, etc.)

- a) Link to a sample of activity photos.
https://docs.google.com/document/d/12IAj0VdStlBNQin9oO9pKzPx5Cvvgg5_h/edit?usp=sharing&oid=109674093062186087967&rtpof=true&sd=true
- b) Final project baseline study



FINAL REPORT of
the Baseline Survey

SIGNATURES

Authorised representatives from the SMC member organisation are to sign this report, as the contractual party to the agreement in relation with SMC.

Date:

Date:

Signatory

Signatory

Name in block letters and position

Name in block letters and position

