

March 2014

# Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development (TAMD) in Kenya

Irene Karani and Nyachomba Kariuki

---

Q4 Report - Feasibility Testing Phase



## Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>2</b>
Evaluation context	2
<b>STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS/ KEY ENTRY POINTS</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>THEORY OF CHANGE ESTABLISHED</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>INDICATORS (TRACK 1 AND TRACK 2) AND METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>EMPIRICAL DATA COLLECTION (a) TRACK 1 (b) TRACK 2</b>	<b>6</b>
Baseline Data	6
Use of Score Card	7
Resilience Assessments	9
<b>CHALLENGES AND LESSONS</b>	<b>11</b>
Political buy-in	11
Attribution	11
Shifting baselines	11
Long-time scales	11
<b>CONCLUSIONS AND EMERGING LESSONS</b>	<b>13</b>
Main achievements	13
Key lessons	13
<b>ANNEXES</b>	<b>14</b>
Annex 1: Isiolo County Score Card	14
Annex 2: Track 1 Baseline report (separate report)	19
Annex 3: Track 2 Baseline Report (separate report)	19

---

## INTRODUCTION

TAMD in Kenya is being applied at national, subnational (county) and local (ward) levels. At national level the TAMD approach has chosen to focus on specific climate change/disaster risk reduction interventions planned in the National Drought Management Authority (NDMA) Strategic Plan such as strengthening climate information systems, disaster risk reduction, strengthening coordination and planning amongst others. At the county level the approach is focusing on similar interventions outlined in the County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP) that are in line with the national priorities. At the ward level adaptation interventions planned by the 5 ward committees under the County Adaptation Fund have been chosen under the feasibility study.

There were four main tasks carried out in quarter 3:

- a) Collection of Track 1 baseline information.
- b) Scoring of Track 1 Climate Risk Management (CRM) Indicator Scorecard.
- c) Development of tools for the second monitoring visit.
- d) Validation of the Isiolo County Track 1 and Track 2 processes.

The validation meeting was held on the 10th – 11th of March 2014 in Isiolo and presented the draft Isiolo County Adaptation M&E framework which is a product of the Kenya TAMD feasibility testing phase. The framework will be finalised and handed over to the County Planning unit for integration into the county CIDP Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) framework.

## Evaluation context

The purpose of the Kenya TAMD feasibility testing was to establish an adaptation M&E framework which could evaluate the success of climate change adaptation interventions at county and ward levels. Climate change adaptation interventions are being implemented in Isiolo by various stakeholders with no framework to measure their collective success. The National Climate Change Action Plan 2013 (NCCAP) integrated TAMD in its national adaptation M&E framework and proposed the implementation of an adaptation M&E framework in a pilot county. The TAMD feasibility study was therefore in line with this proposal. The evaluation context was defined by the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASAL) secretariat in the National Drought Management Authority (NDMA) in liaison with LTS Africa. NDMA is mandated to coordinate climate change adaptation at national and sub-national levels. The establishment of the County Adaptation Fund (CAF) in Isiolo County served as a good entry point for the TAMD feasibility testing. This is because the communities and county officials had already been sensitised on climate change and appropriate structures such as the county and ward adaptation committees were already in place by the time the TAMD testing began.

## STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS/ KEY ENTRY POINTS

Adaptation interventions have been institutionalised within the Isiolo County government by incorporating them in the CIDP and budgeting for them under each sector. The adaptation M&E framework which is a product of the TAMD approach will be integrated into the CIDP M&E framework for tracking CCA interventions in the various sectors. Various actors at the county and local levels have been involved with the most strategic being the NDMA County Drought Coordinator, the County Planner, the NDMA Climate Change Advisor and the NDMA Monitoring Officer at national level. These actors were chosen for their strategic roles in national and county climate change planning and M&E.

Actors from sectoral departments in the county developed the Track 1 theory of change (ToC), its indicators and assumptions whilst the ward adaptation committees developed their individual Track 2 ToCs. Both these processes were participatory with the researchers providing guidance but allowing the participants to develop the ToCs within their own contexts.

The main stakeholders involved in Quarter four were NDMA, the County Planning office and the County and ward adaptation committees. NDMA and the county planning unit were involved in the collection of Track 1 baseline data as well as scoring the county's capacity for climate risk management by filling in

the scorecard (Annex 1). The adaptation committees were involved in the validation of the draft M&E framework.

Table 1: Stakeholder involvement in Quarter four

Actor/Institution	Expected Involvement Quarter Four	Assured Involvement Quarter Four
NDMA (Ministry of Devolution and Planning) county level	<p>Collection of Track 1 baseline information</p> <p>Participate in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&amp;E framework validation meeting</p> <p>Continued engagement with county government</p> <p>Providing input and filling in of CRM Isiolo score card</p> <p>Participate in the monitoring visit</p>	<p>Collected Track 1 baseline information</p> <p>Participated in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&amp;E framework validation meeting</p> <p>Continued engagement with county government</p> <p>Provided input and populated the CRM Isiolo score card</p> <p>Participated in the monitoring visit</p>
County Planning Unit	<p>Collection of track 1 baseline information from county</p> <p>Participate in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&amp;E framework validation meeting</p> <p>Providing input and filling in of CRM Isiolo score card</p> <p>Participate in the monitoring visit</p>	<p>Collected Track 1 baseline information</p> <p>Participated in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&amp;E framework validation meeting</p> <p>Provided input and filled in the CRM Isiolo score card</p> <p>Integrated adaptation actions in the CIDP and will integrate the County M&amp;E framework post Quarter 4).</p> <p>Participated in the monitoring visit</p>
Department of Water (Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources)	<p>Participate in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&amp;E framework validation meeting</p> <p>Participate in the monitoring visit</p>	<p>Participated in the Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&amp;E framework validation meeting</p> <p>Participated in the monitoring visit</p>
Department of Livestock (Ministry of Agriculture)	<p>Participate in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&amp;E framework validation meeting</p> <p>Participate in the monitoring visit</p>	<p>Participated in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&amp;E framework validation meeting</p> <p>Participated in the monitoring visit</p>
Department of Crop Production (Ministry of Agriculture)	<p>Participate in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&amp;E framework validation meeting</p> <p>Participate in the monitoring visit</p>	<p>Participated in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&amp;E framework validation meeting</p> <p>Participated in the monitoring visit</p>

Actor/Institution	Expected Involvement Quarter Four	Assured Involvement Quarter Four
Department of Meteorology	Participate in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&E framework validation meeting  Participate in the monitoring visit	Participated in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&E framework validation meeting  Participated in the monitoring visit  Provided seasonal weather outlook and its implications to the county and ward adaptation committees
County Adaptation Committee	Participate in the monitoring visit  Participate in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&E framework validation meeting	Participated in the monitoring visit  Participated in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&E framework validation meeting
Ward Adaptation Committees	Participate in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&E framework validation meeting  Participate in the monitoring visit	Participated in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&E framework validation meeting  Participated in the monitoring visit
County Government (Assembly and Executive)	Participate in a one day meeting on introduction to climate change, adaptation and TAMD  Participate in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&E framework validation meeting	This expected involvement did not materialise despite all arrangements and lobbying done by NDMA
NGOs and CSOs in Isiolo County	Participate in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&E framework validation meeting	Participated in Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&E framework validation meeting

NDMA Isiolo and the County Planning department were the main stakeholders engaged in quarter 4 as they were responsible for collection of track 1 baseline information. They filled in the CRM Isiolo scorecard. The other stakeholders i.e. Department of Water (Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources), Department of LivesToCk (Ministry of Agriculture), Department of Veterinary Services, Department of Meteorology, the County Assembly and Executive, NGOs and CSOs and the Department of Crop Production (Ministry of Agriculture) all expressed assured involvement in participating in the Isiolo County Climate Change Adaptation M&E framework validation meeting and participated in the second monitoring visit.

New actors whose involvement was expected were the Isiolo County government (County assembly and County Executive) in the validation meeting of the adaptation M&E framework. They however did not attend the meeting. Getting buy-in from these two arms of the County government has been a challenge. This may be attributed to the fact that the process in the County began before the two organs were established in the new devolved government structures. As such they were not involved from the beginning and getting their buy-in has proved difficult.

## THEORY OF CHANGE ESTABLISHED

There were two types of ToCs developed in participatory processes. Each ward developed their individual ToC in Q2 whilst the county and ward adaptation committees developed an overall ToC in Q3 which showed attribution between Tracks 1 and 2. The ward TOCs with their outputs, outcomes, impacts, indicators and assumptions were presented in the Q2 report. The overall ToC outlining CRM interventions, outputs, outcomes, impacts at local levels, indicators and assumptions was presented in the Q3 report and was validated in Q4 by both Track 1 and 2 stakeholders. Baseline information against all indicators in the 5 ToCs and the overall ToC was collected.

The ward ToCs will assist the wards in monitoring the changes in adaptive capacity they expect to achieve as a result of implementing adaptation actions financed from the CAF process. The overall ToC will be tested by the county government as part of the institutionalisation of TAMD into the county planning and forms the basis of the adaptation M&E framework.

## INDICATORS (TRACK 1 AND TRACK 2) AND METHODOLOGY

Below are the main indicators that were developed for Track 1 and 2. Qualitative and quantitative indicators were selected during the participatory process of developing the ToCs. For Track 1 indicators, members of various departments in the Isiolo county government were invited to a meeting in quarter two to develop the indicators whilst Track 2 indicators were developed with the Isiolo ward adaptation committee members. The indicators were selected by their measurability and availability of sources of information against the indicator. Measurability was the main criteria used in identifying the indicators.

Table 2: Main indicators in track 1 and 2

Track 1 Indicators	Track 2 Indicators
<p><b>Output level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Types and number of information and communication products</li> <li>• Percentage of population reached</li> <li>• DRR department established and operationalized</li> <li>• DRR policy document produced</li> <li>• Number of duplicated activities</li> <li>• Number of development agencies undertaking the same activities</li> <li>• Number of community project proposals developed and budgets justified</li> <li>• Number of dedhas established</li> <li>• Number of NRM meetings held</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Types, numbers and frequency of adjustments to climate change adaptation activities</li> <li>• Operational county contingency and DRR fund</li> <li>• Increased number of projects targeting infrastructure &amp; services on transport, health, water and sanitation, security, education, food security and income generation</li> <li>• Number of climate change projects financed through budget allocation</li> <li>• Number of livestock with access to water and pasture during dry season</li> <li>• Number of households with access to water during dry season</li> </ul> <p><b>Impact level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % decrease in poverty levels at county and ward levels</li> </ul>	<p><b>Output level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of constructed/rehabilitated water sources for livestock and humans</li> <li>• Number of trainings held for natural resource management committees (dedhas)</li> <li>• Number of livestock laboratories rehabilitated</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of livestock and households with access to water during dry season</li> <li>• Number of months that water is available in the constructed/rehabilitated water points</li> <li>• Time spent fetching water for domestic use</li> <li>• Time spent trekking livestock to water points</li> <li>• Prevalence of livestock and human disease outbreaks per year</li> <li>• Number of hours spent fetching water at water point for domestic use</li> <li>• Number of hours spent fetching water at water point for livestock use</li> <li>• Quantities of milk and meat produced per household per year</li> </ul> <p><b>Impact level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Household expenditure patterns</li> <li>• Quantities of food surplus sold at the markets</li> <li>• Frequency of marriage and other cultural ceremonies held per year</li> <li>• Number of conflict incidences</li> <li>• Number of families migrating due to climate hazards</li> <li>• Number of children born</li> </ul>

Track 1 Indicators	Track 2 Indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction of households requiring humanitarian assistance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of schools, dispensaries, mosques, permanent settlements constructed</li> <li>Number of children enrolled and retained in schools</li> <li>Presence of cheese (<sup>1</sup>ititu)</li> <li>Number of families on food relief</li> <li>Numbers of livestock</li> <li>Number new businesses or small scale traders</li> </ul>

The robustness of both Track 1 and 2 indicators has not yet been tested as the adaptation interventions are yet to be completed.

## METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The methodological approach used during the feasibility testing has been before and after analysis which was used due to its ease of application. The availability of secondary data from sources in the county was also a factor in choosing the before and after analysis. The purpose of the chosen method was to assess attribution of climate change adaptation planning and interventions in the county. The method worked well as there was data available at ward and county levels to enable before and after analysis.

The collection of baseline data was straightforward as the data was easily available hence providing a clear picture of the status before the interventions are implemented. This method also worked very well because stakeholders were willing to share data and information.

However, whilst the baseline scenario was established before the implementation of the adaptation actions, it was not possible within the timeframe of the TAMD feasibility stage to test the after implementation stage. This is because most of the interventions are yet to be complete or deliver benefits to the targeted groups. However M&E plans against Track 1 and Track 2 interventions form part of the draft County Adaptation M&E framework and will assist in assessing adaptation and development benefits after completion of interventions.

## EMPIRICAL DATA COLLECTION (a) TRACK 1 (b) TRACK 2

### Baseline Data

Baseline data was collected against each indicator in Track 1 and Track 2. For Track 1 this data was collected by the County planning unit through desk review of county reports and documents as well as interviews with key county personnel (See Annex 2 for full report). For Track 2 data was collected through household surveys and meetings with local government officials by each ward (See Annex 3 for full report). A data collection tool was designed for the collection of data against each Track 2 indicator and was annexed to the Q2 report. A total of 90 households were interviewed by representatives from the ward committees. The breakdown of households per ward is shown in Table 3 as follows:

Table 3: Number of surveyed households per ward

Ward	No. of households surveyed
Merti	10
Oldonyiro	10

<sup>1</sup> Traditional Borana cheese

Kinna	15
Garbatulla	5
Sericho	50

For Track 1, a tool and reporting format were designed and sent to the County Planner. These were used to collect baseline information as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Track 1 baseline information

Level	Indicator	Numbers at baseline (2012)
Impact	Percentage decrease in poverty levels at county and ward levels	77% of population considered poor
	Reduction of households requiring humanitarian assistance	47% of population require humanitarian assistance
Outcome	Types, numbers and frequency of adjustments to climate change adaptation activities	28 adjustments to climate change 4 types of adjustments i.e. livelihood, infrastructure, policy and planning, innovation adjustments
	Operational county contingency and DRR fund	1 County contingency fund from NDMA
	Increased number of projects targeting infrastructure & services on transport, health, water and sanitation, security, education, food security and income generation	323 projects targeting infrastructure & services on transport, health, water and sanitation, security, education, food security and income generation
	Number of climate change projects financed through budget allocation	0
	Types and number of information and communication products	12 Early warning bulletins and 2 food security assessment reports
Output	Percentage of population reached	10% of population reached
	DRR department established and operationalized	0
	DRR Policy document produced	0
	Number of duplicated activities	40% of development activities duplicated
	Number of development agencies undertaking the same activities	40% of development agencies undertaking the same activities
	Number of climate change adaptation community project proposals developed and budgets justified	19

## Use of Score Card

The LTS team contextualised the TAMD score card and sent it to the County Drought Coordinator and County Planner to fill in. Table 5 below summarises the scores against the criteria used to measure the county's capacity for climate risk management. The details are in Annex 1.

Table 5: Score card results

Climate Risk Management Criteria	Summary of scores
----------------------------------	-------------------

<b>Climate Risk Management Criteria</b>	<b>Summary of scores</b>
<b>Climate Change mainstreaming/Integration into county planning</b>	<p><b>20%</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Isiolo county does not have a climate change plan or strategy and is working to integrate climate change into the county integrated development plan, it also has no formal/legal requirement to mainstream adaptation/mitigation into development planning however project implementation is guided by environmental impact assessment (EIA) regulations</li> <li>– Climate change adaptation projects have been funded through the County Adaptation Funds</li> <li>– There lacks expertise in Isiolo to screen interventions for climate risk and climate safeguard systems are not in place.</li> </ul>
<b>Institutional Coordination</b>	<p><b>85%</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– In Isiolo county, NDMA is tasked with coordinating climate change planning and actions and a County Steering Group has convening authority</li> <li>– NDMA convenes the County Steering group which coordinates all development activities in the county</li> <li>– There is no dedicated funding for sustaining the institutional coordination</li> <li>– The CSG is made up of major county heads of department ensuring regular contact between departments</li> </ul>
<b>Budgeting and Finance</b>	<p><b>55%</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The CAF is funding pilot measures that address climate change and the CAPC has funds that could be utilised to support mainstreaming of climate change.</li> <li>– Currently there are no mechanisms/capacities to assess the costs associated with measures to address climate change. Funding to cover necessary climate change measures is limited and mainly available through NGOs</li> <li>– The county government has not mainstreamed climate change issues into their budgeting and planning as yet</li> </ul>
<b>Institutional knowledge/capacity</b>	<p><b>65%</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The County Planner and NDMA staff have received training on climate change issues</li> <li>– County Planning Secretariat has members who have academic qualifications on climate change planning and mainstreaming. NDMA and county development planning staff have been trained on mainstreaming processes</li> <li>– Only 2 staff involved in the planning process have the required training</li> </ul>
<b>Use of climate information</b>	<p><b>55%</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Planning in the county takes into account observational data and climate projections from the County Meteorological offices as well as the national met offices</li> <li>– Climate information generated by foreign and</li> </ul>

Climate Risk Management Criteria	Summary of scores
	<p>international bodies is not sufficient as the main source of information is Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWSNET)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of scientific information is complemented by local generated indigenous information from communities in the county.</li> <li>- The county has limited capacity to interpret and use climate information and it does not conduct vulnerability assessments.</li> </ul>
<b>Planning under uncertainty</b>	<p><b>40%</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not all planning in the county takes into account climate projections however NDMA considers climate projections when planning. Planning mainly uses various kinds of assessments such as food security assessments but does not actively use scenario planning</li> <li>- Planning in NDMA does not consider risks associated with maladaptation, the team does not have a clear understanding of maladaptation. NDMA only conducts contingency planning and budgeting to address uncertainty.</li> <li>- NDMA reviews it's plans every 6 months, in these reviews planning can be updated with new climate information</li> </ul>
<b>Participation</b>	<p><b>90%</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The county has a planning secretariat with membership from public and non-public sectors with representatives vulnerable groups e.g. women, disabled people and youth as well as representatives from marginalized and vulnerable groups</li> <li>- Mostly they are involved at the planning stage but not at the implementation stage. They are never involved also in the monitoring and evaluation activities. Social Audit has not been taken seriously at community level</li> </ul>
<b>Awareness among stakeholders</b>	<p><b>65%</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There have not been any serious sensitization programs conducted at community levels on climate change</li> <li>- Very few stakeholders are aware of potential, available or ongoing climate change response actions and those that do are limited to areas where ward climate change adaptation committees exist.</li> <li>- NDMA circulates all relevant climate information to all stakeholders and the dissemination of relevant information is one of the core functions of the authority</li> <li>- NDMA has very limited funding for awareness creation</li> </ul>

## Resilience Assessments

With regards to resilience assessments, these had been conducted by IIED before the LTS team began the TAMD feasibility testing under CAF. Thus TAMD sought to compliment the adaptation interventions that had been prioritised under this exercise.

# CHALLENGES AND LESSONS

## Political buy-in

This has been a challenge in Isiolo as the County government was not in place when the feasibility phase began. As such it has proved difficult to get them on board and also institutionalise the county and ward adaptation committees that were also formed during the former government regime. Due to this the roll-out of TAMD in other counties is ensuring that the County government is brought on board from the beginning and participates fully in all activities and decision making.

## Attribution

Attribution of development outcomes that contribute to enhanced adaptive capacities at local levels due to CRM processes will be measured by collecting evidence of expected changes when the adaptation interventions are complete. The expected changes are clearly outlined in the ward ToCs and M&E plans have been developed by the wards to track these changes.

Measuring increased resilience to climatic shocks due to implementing adaptation actions is not really possible at this stage as the communities are yet to experience any shock in order for this to be ascertained. So currently it is too early to tell whether the adaptation actions being implemented will actually lead to enhanced resilience in the absence of a climatic shock.

Collection of evidence to prove adaptive capacity is a long term endeavour and cannot be within a project context. The one year period for the TAMD feasibility testing has been to establish an adaptation M&E system based on adaptation ToCs which includes training the stakeholders on how to collect evidence of adaptation in the long term. Thus the working of this system is yet to be tested and attribution measured.

## Shifting baselines

From our experience shifting baselines in measuring increased resilience is still a concept that has not yet been understood by the stakeholders we are working with as they are used to working within a project set-up where evaluations use the before and after analysis. There is a challenge with the use of climate risk information in planning as has been detailed in the score card. In addition the adaptation actions that TAMD based its testing on did not take climate risk information into account in the design phase. Thus the concept of shifting baselines can only be understood when the importance of using climate risk information takes root and is internalised by stakeholders in the long term.

Discussions have been held with stakeholders, from five counties on the same during a TAMD M&E workshop. Ideas emanating from these discussions suggest that close monitoring of climate conditions and adaptation interventions is necessary over time. This is so that changes in climate variability can be detected early in order to adjust implementation of adaptation actions and also assess whether the original baselines still hold true or need to be adjusted.

This requires that a comprehensive adaptation M&E system is designed, properly resourced and implemented with proper documentation taking place at all stages over a time frame not less than 5 years. The TAMD feasibility testing has been unable to do this due to the short time frame. In Isiolo, some elements of the system are in place such as the County and Ward ToCs and the overall adaptation M&E plan is still in development. However the full system of data collection, storage and analysis is not in place. It is imperative that this system is put in place if evidence on how to account for shifting baselines is to be tested.

## Long-time scales

Long-time scales have been catered for in the resilience impact statements at County and ward levels. These were formulated by specific ward adaptation committees and the County adaptation committee.

Indicators to measure enhanced resilience were also formulated. They measure progress in development objectives such as reduction to poverty and increased incomes. Over time a combination of adaptation actions with climate risk management processes being implemented by the county government should lead to long term impacts even if shocks are experienced in the short to medium term. As such even with shifting baselines monitoring of adaptation or development benefits should seek to gather information and data over the long term that shows that incremental benefits accruing whilst factoring in the impacts of climatic shocks. Thus monitoring and aggregating data on a minimum number of development indicators can generate this information at County level. In Isiolo all output and outcome indicators in Track 1 and 2 will be aggregated in the long term despite climate shocks to show that poverty has reduced and there are fewer households that require humanitarian assistance.

Hence the development of the Isiolo County Adaptation M&E framework which should be used to measure adaptation/development benefits accruing from adaptation actions that have been planned and budgeted for by the county government. This framework is meant to be reviewed/adjusted together with the County Integrated development plan every five years.

# CONCLUSIONS AND EMERGING LESSONS

## Main achievements

During the TAMD feasibility testing phase the following have been accomplished in Isiolo:

- Literature review and scoping visit to Isiolo. This was done to understand adaptation interventions that were being undertaken by different actors (government and civil society) and what indicators were being used to measure adaptive capacity.
- Training and developing the theory of change with 5 community committees in Sericho, Garbatulla, Merti, Oldonyiro and Kinna wards.
- Developing indicators with communities that can measure various results at output, outcome and impact levels of the local adaptation plans being implemented in the County (Track 2).
- Developing a county level adaptation theory of change that includes inputs, outputs, outcomes, impacts and their respective indicators (Track 1) with the County Adaptation committee. The committee is comprised of officers from the National Drought Management Authority (NDMA), ministries of livestock, agriculture and water, meteorological department, county planning unit, a representative of civil society and representatives from the 5 committees.
- Collecting baseline data on both Track 1 and Track 2 indicators at county and community levels. At the county level the data was collected by the County Planner and at community level by the 5 communities involved in the research.
- Using a score-card to collect baseline information on CRM at county level on climate change mainstreaming/integration into county planning, institutional co-ordination, budgeting and finance, institutional knowledge/capacity, use of climate information, planning under uncertainty, participation and awareness amongst stakeholders.
- Conducting two monitoring visits with the County Adaptation Committee to check progress on adaptation interventions being implemented by communities and verifying baseline information.
- Establishing the linkages between community level adaptation actions and county level adaptation priorities.
- The final output for the County, currently being developed, is the County Adaptation Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. This is meant to be integrated into the County M&E system and reviewed after the end of 5 years together with the County Integrated Development Plan.

## Key lessons

Some of the key lessons that have been learnt are as follows:

- The TAMD concept is easily understood by stakeholders and has been greatly appreciated by all. The wards even talk about top-down and bottom-up indicators and activities in different forums. Thus working with communities whose livelihoods have been continuously adapting to climate hazards is easier when describing the Track 1 and Track 2 evaluation context.
- The theory of change was a new concept to all stakeholders but it was also easily understood and there are now champions in Isiolo such as the County Planner who has been used by the research team to guide other counties in developing their own ToCs.
- Communities were able to develop the ToC in less than half a day because they had already been sensitized on climate change by participating in resilience assessments. Thus prior knowledge on climate change ensures quick uptake of the ToC and attribution concepts.
- When an adaptation M&E framework is being established it is important to have all stakeholders on board as everybody has a role to play from designing adaptation actions, collecting and analysing monitoring data, reporting e.t.c. In Isiolo, there is now a strong team of ward and county representatives who are involved in collecting adaptation information.
- A comprehensive M&E system that is designed to collect adaptation and climate risk information is crucial if enhanced resilience is to be proved through an evaluation process. This system needs to be well resourced with human and financial resources if it is to work. This is yet to be achieved in Isiolo.



## ANNEXES

### Annex 1: Isiolo County Score Card

<b>Isiolo County</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Supporting evidence/narrative</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Include 2-3 sentences</b>
<b>I. Climate Change mainstreaming/Integration into County Planning</b>	1. Is there a climate change plan or strategy set out in a dedicated strategy document and/or embedded in the principal planning documents at the level being assessed (e.g. national, sector, ministry)?						There is no climate change plan but we are in the process of mainstreaming of climate change into the County Integrated Development Planning.
	2. Is there a formal (e.g. legal) requirement for climate change (adaptation/mitigation) to be integrated or mainstreamed into development planning (cf Requirement for EIA for certain activities/projects)?						There is no legal framework for climate change mainstreaming into the county development planning. On projects implementation, we guided by Environment Impact Assessment and Audit regulations 2003 (Legal Notice No. 101)
	3. Have specific measures to address climate change (adaptation/mitigation) been identified and funded?						Several projects at ward levels have benefited from donor funding. Currently the County Government is working on Natural Resource Management Legal Framework which will address among other things climate change adaptation and mitigation.
	4. Are climate-relevant initiatives routinely screened for climate risks?						Lack expertise and experience in the county
	5. Is there a formal climate safeguards system in place that integrates climate risk screening, climate risk assessment (where required), climate risk reduction measures (identification, prioritisation, implementation), evaluation and learning into planning?						Climate change safeguard systems are yet to be developed at the county level.

<b>II. Institutional co-ordination</b>	. Has an authoritative body been tasked with coordinating climate change Planning and actions?						National Drought Management Authority has offices in the county
	. Does the coordinating body have high convening authority/hierarchical Importance across other cross sectoral departments or ministries?						The coordination is done through County Steering Group
	. Has a dedicated institutional mechanism been defined for coordination and implementation across sectors?						National Drought Management Authority convenes the County Steering Group whose major mandate is coordination of development activities
	. Is there dedicated funding or certainty of long term funding for sustaining this institutional coordination mechanism?						The funding at NDMA is very limited. CSG has no funding of its own.
	. Is there regular contact between the coordinating body and relevant ministries and agencies (e.g. in key climate-sensitive sectors)?						Most of the county heads of departments and major NGOs operating at the county are members of CSG.
<b>III. Budgeting and finance</b>	1. Is funding available to pilot measures that address climate change (e.g. adaptation, risk management, mitigation, low-carbon development)?						Currently Climate Change Adaptation Fund is financing projects in only 5 out of 10 wards in Isiolo County.
	2. Is funding available to roll out/support mainstreaming/integration of climate change?						County Climate Change Adaptation Committee has funds that can be utilized
	3. Do mechanisms/capacities exist for assessing the costs associated with measures to address climate change, such as those identified during climate screening/risk assessment?						NDMA does not have the capacity to address the costs associated with measures to address climate change
	4. Is funding available to cover the costs of the necessary climate change measures identified (and costed) during climate screening/risk assessment?						Some funding are available with the NGOs but very inadequate
	5. Are actions to address climate change supported by an authoritative financial entity (e.g. at national level, Ministry of Finance)?						The county government had not mainstreamed climate change issues into their budgeting and planning process

<b>IV. Institutional knowledge/capacity</b>	1. Does planning involve individuals with some awareness of climate change?						Planning Officer and NDMA staffs have been trained on climate change issues.
	2. Does planning involve individuals with formal training in climate change issues?						Most of Planning and NDMA staff have at least attended a short training course on climate change issues
	3. Does planning involve individuals who have attended accredited courses on climate change, development, planning and “mainstreaming” issues?						County Planning Secretariat draws its membership from all sectors with vast academic qualifications on climate, development, planning and mainstreaming issues
	4. Is integration of climate change into planning overseen by individuals with in-depth knowledge of integration/mainstreaming processes?						NDMA and County Development Planning Staff have been trained on mainstreaming processes.
	5. Are enough people with the required training involved in planning processes?						The county has only one development planning office. There are only about 2 people who have the required training
	<b>V. Use of climate information</b>	1. Does planning take account of observational data relating to climate trends and variability?					
	2. Does planning take account of climate projections - is climate information (forecasts, projections, information on responses) readily accessible via information sharing platforms or networks (e.g. for screening)?						Planning does take into account climate projections mainly from climate information provided by the Kenya Meteorological Department through the head office and also the county offices. The county offices send NDMA climate information regularly but the info. is also available from the KMD website
	3. Is there sufficient access to climate information generated by foreign and international organisations (e.g. IPCC, research bodies, academic institutions)?						NDMA has access to climate info generated by FEWSNET, in the past FEWSNET used to send the authority information regularly however NDMA now has to ask for the information or get it from their website
	4. Is the use of scientific information from external sources complemented by the use						NDMA consults with local elders who have their own local/indigenous methods of forecasting.

	of domestically generated information including local/traditional/ indigenous knowledge?						
	5. Does the capacity to interpret and use climate information (e.g. in scenario planning, risk frameworks, vulnerability assessments) exist?						The capacity does not exist
<b>VI. Planning under uncertainty</b>	1. Is planning informed by climate projections where feasible?						Not all planning are informed. Planning within NDMA takes into account climate projections
	2. Does planning make use of scenario planning exercises that are informed by climate projections						The planning mainly used various kinds of assessments such as vulnerability assessments and does not actively use scenario planning
	3. Does planning explicitly address risks associated with 'maladaptation'?						Planning in NDMA does not address risk associated with maladaptation, the team does not have a clear understanding of maladaptation
	4. Is planning guided by well-developed frameworks and methodologies that address uncertainty?						NDMA only contingency planning and budgeting to address uncertainty.
	5. Do mechanisms exist for ensuring that planning guidance is updated with new information on climate change as it becomes available?						NDMA reviews it plans every 6 months, in these reviews planning can be updated with new climate information
<b>VII. Participation</b>	1. Are all relevant levels of governance (national, provincial/district, local/community) (required to be) represented in planning process?						We have a county planning secretariat with membership from public and non-public sectors
	2. Are those who might be adversely affected by climate change initiatives represented in planning/decision-making?						The county planning secretariat include representatives vulnerable groups e.g. woman, disabled people and youth
	3. Are those most in need of / likely to benefit from measures to address climate change represented?						The county planning secretariat include representatives vulnerable groups e.g. women, disabled and youth

	4. Are the poorest and most marginalized members of society represented?						The county planning secretariat include representatives from marginalized and vulnerable groups
	5. Is the participation of all the above groups sustained throughout planning and implementation (i.e. at the start, end and throughout an initiative)?						Mostly they are involved at the planning stage but not at the implementation stage. They are never involved also in the monitoring and evaluation activities. Social Audit has not been taken seriously at community level
<b>VIII. Awareness amongst stakeholders</b>	1. Are stakeholders aware of climate change and its potential implications (e.g. for their sector, for society at large)?						No serious sensitization programs have been conducted at community levels
	2. Are stakeholders aware of potential, available, or on-going climate change response options?						Very few and may be limited to only areas where ward climate change adaptation committees exist.
	3. Does relevant information reach key stakeholders (e.g.) in climate-sensitive sectors?						NDMA circulates all relevant climate information to all stakeholders
	4. Do institutional mandates raise awareness of and disseminate information about climate change (risks, impacts, responses, etc.)?						NDMA circulates all relevant climate information to all stakeholders and the dissemination of relevant information is one of the core functions of the authority
	5. Is adequate funding available for awareness raising among relevant Stakeholders and public at large?						NDMA has very limited funding for awareness creation



[Annex 2: Track 1 Baseline report \(separate report\)](#)

[Annex 3: Track 2 Baseline Report \(separate report\)](#)



## Project materials

---

### Climate Change

---

*Keywords:*

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E),  
TAMD, Kenya



International Institute for Environment and Development  
80-86 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8NH, UK  
Tel: +44 (0)20 3463 7399  
Fax: +44 (0)20 3514 9055  
email: [info@iied.org](mailto:info@iied.org)  
[www.iied.org](http://www.iied.org)

Funded by:



This research was funded by UK aid from the UK Government, however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of the UK Government.