

# **COMMUNITY SCORE CARD**

on livelihood development,  
infrastructure and security;

West Pokot and Baringo  
Counties of Kenya



**Konrad  
Adenauer  
Stiftung**

*A project implemented by  
Konrad-Adenauer- Stiftung  
e.V., Kenya*

# COMMUNITY SCORE CARD (CSC) REPORT ON FOOD SECURITY IN BARINGO AND WEST POKOT COUNTIES

BMZ special initiative "One World, No Hunger"

© September 2017

*A project implemented by Konrad-Adenauer- Stiftung e.V., Kenya*

All rights reserved. Publication of this report in full or part, and use of the information and data contained therein must only be done upon prior permission from Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung and only for non-commercial use.

For permission requests, indicate "Permission: CSC report FS 03-17", and address to the following:  
Thigiri Hilltop/off Thigiri Ridge /  
Road P.O. Box 66471 /  
00800 Nairobi/Kenya  
Email: info.nairobi@kas.de

# TABLE OF CONTENT

|   |                   |
|---|-------------------|
| 3 | Acknowledgements  |
| 4 | Acronyms          |
| 6 | Executive Summary |

---

|    |                    |                                    |
|----|--------------------|------------------------------------|
| 10 | <b>CHAPTER ONE</b> | <i>BACKGROUND AND CSC OVERVIEW</i> |
|----|--------------------|------------------------------------|

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 10 | 1.1 Introduction                                     |
| 11 | 1.2 Objective of conducting a CSC exercise           |
| 12 | 1.3 Specific objectives of the CSC exercises were to |
| 12 | 1.4 Demographics of Baringo and West Pokot           |
| 13 | 1.5 CSC Overview                                     |
| 15 | 1.6 Methodology and scope of work                    |
| 17 | 1.7 Data collection process                          |
| 19 | 1.8 Data analysis process                            |

|    |                    |  |
|----|--------------------|--|
| 20 | <b>CHAPTER TWO</b> | <i>FOCUS GROUP HEARINGS AND FINDINGS</i> |
|----|--------------------|--|

|    |                                     |
|----|-------------------------------------|
| 20 | 2.1 Introduction                    |
| 21 | 2.2 Findings on Livelihoods         |
| 25 | 2.3 Findings on Road Infrastructure |
| 27 | 2.4 Findings on Peace and Security  |
| 29 | 2.5 Action Matrices                 |
| 30 | 2.5.1 Sigor (Wei Wei) Action Matrix |
| 31 | 2.5.2 Chepararia Action Matrix      |
| 32 | 2.5.3 Kabartonjo Action Matrix      |
| 33 | 2.5.4 Margiat Action Matrix         |

|    |                      |   |
|----|----------------------|---|
| 34 | <b>CHAPTER THREE</b> | <i>CHALLENGES, OPPORTUNITIES AND LESSONS LEARNT</i> |
|----|----------------------|---|

|    |                               |
|----|-------------------------------|
| 35 | Opportunities, Lessons learnt |
|----|-------------------------------|

---

|    |                     |                                       |
|----|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 36 | <b>CHAPTER FOUR</b> | <i>CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</i> |
|----|---------------------|---------------------------------------|

|    |                   |
|----|-------------------|
| 38 | <b>CONCLUSION</b> |
|----|-------------------|

---

|    |            |
|----|------------|
| 40 | References |
|----|------------|

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 41 | Appendix I: Infrastructure Community Score Card      |
| 42 | Appendix II: Peace and Security Community Score Card |
| 43 | Appendix III: Livelihood Score Card                  |
| 46 | Appendix IV: Input Tracking Matrix                   |

## Acknowledgements

The Makwiny team of Researchers would like to thank the members of the Marigat, Kabartonjo, Chepararia and Sigor (Wei Wei) communities both in Baringo and West Pokot Counties who enthusiastically engaged with us in filling the Community Score Cards during Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and Interface meeting.

We would also like to register our appreciation to government the service providers who participated in this exercise as key informants as the interviews were insightful in populating the input tracking matrix for both counties. Special thank you note goes to Ambrose Merian, the programme Coordinator for the Pokot Rural Development Programme based in West Pokot and Andrew Chesire, the Director of I Serve Kenya in Baringo for mobilizing communities for the FGDs and for facilitating meetings with county government officials.

We would also like to thank Mr. Justus Ochieng from the KAS Kenya office who accompanied the team to West Pokot County and Edwin Ottichilo, KAS EHow Programme Coordinator who accompanied the team to Baringo County, and who also provided close supervision on the entire exercise, from the inception report, to the review of tools for data collection to the final compilation of this report. We are also thankful to Ms. Laura Lebens of KAS, Kenya Office for helping with the editorial of this report.

Finally, in a special way, we would like to thank Dr. Jan. Cernicky, the Resident Representative for the opportunity to carry out this exercise, the overall guidance and advice we received from the onset of preparing for this exercise to its completion greatly played to this success.

*We say, Thank you!*

Team Leader,  
Achieng Osogo

## Acronyms

[illegible]

## Preface

This Community Score Card (CSC) Report forms part of KAS interventions in the area of food security in Kenya integrating itself in the framework of the initiative one world–no hunger (Eine Welt ohne Hunger) initiated by the German Ministry for economic cooperation and development. KAS has been active in the two counties of Baringo and West Pokot since mid-2015 implementing with local partners, the food security and crisis prevention project. As a political foundation, we have been inclined towards facilitating spaces where stakeholders, communities, politicians as well as respective institutions of government can deepen their knowledge and skills on policy concepts and equally engage on political processes that would help to eventually improve the food security situation as well as reduce the prevailing disaster risks.

Our rationale for conducting the CSC is to eventually contribute to evidence based advocacy campaigns (one of our implementation approaches) which will in particular be important in pushing forward the recommendations of this report. The essence of the CSC was to assess how some of the pillars like the livelihood, peace and security as well as climate-proofed infrastructure as provided in the common program framework for Ending Drought Emergencies (EDEs) were being integrated and implemented in the two counties. The exercise was limited in scope to four wards of Marigat, Kabartonjo (low lands) in Baringo and Sigor (Wei Wei) and Chepararia (Chesra) in West Pokot County. There were various reasons for the selection of these four wards as highlighted within the text but they are all agro-pastoralist zones with the biggest hazard being drought.

Each of the three pillars were assessed by community members through the administration of the score cards and with the help of matrices that were populated through key informant interviews. The average scores were discussed and qualified during from the interface meetings with ways forward being agreed upon. It is our hope that you will find this report interesting and worthwhile in strengthening your advocacy work especially in the arid and semi-arid counties of Kenya. Furthermore, it's our hope that partners and other stakeholders will look through the findings and engage in a more informed manner to improve on service delivery areas that communities felt less satisfied.



Dr. Jan Cernicky  
Country Director  
Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung  
Kenya Office

## Executive Summary

Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (KAS) Kenya engagement in the area of food security and disaster risk reduction is informed by an emerging necessity to support the County Governments of Baringo and West Pokot to engage in political processes that can provide more integrated planning and long term solutions to the challenges of food insecurities. KAS carried out the Community Score Card exercise in the two counties in order to empower the communities in using social accountability tools to hold respective government institutions to account, as well as working with the same institutions to improve on their efficiency in delivering services. Since the two counties are prone to disasters mainly, drought and resource based conflicts, strengthening governance processes is important in managing the adverse effects of future disasters.

Marigat, Kabartonjo in Baringo County, Chepararia and Sigor (Wei Wei) in West Pokot County were targeted for the Community Score Card exercise. The exercise scored three service delivery areas; (livelihoods, peace and security and road infrastructure) based on inclusive governance and crisis prevention pre-set of indicators or variables. The process of scoring was done through Focus Group Discussions in which members of the community were purposively selected to assess the delivery of services by the county government in light of promoting the implementation of the Ending Drought Emergencies (EDE) programme framework<sup>1</sup>. Each Ward had three focus group discussions, one for each of the three areas of focus.

On livelihoods and road infrastructure, the collection of information took cognizance of the legal functions of the devolved government as per the Constitution of Kenya. Data/information collected in the area of peace and security was based on the supporting role of the County Governments of Baringo and West Pokot in terms of allocating resources and more so her ability to influence the deployment of security resources and programmes appropriately, across the counties by the National Government. Community members filled in the Score Cards, which had a scale of between 1-5 with 1 being the lowest score and 5 being the highest.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Ending Drought Emergencies (EDEs) is a new approach by the NDMA that recognizes droughts as the major source of emergencies and therefore the need to support delivery of services and goods such as security, infrastructure and human capital (education, health and nutrition) and sustainable livelihoods in drought-prone areas as they are often weak. See, <http://ndma.go.ke/resource-center/ede-reports/send/43-ending-drought-emergencies/4241-ede-overview>

The scores were further broken down guided by the indicators/pre-set variables, which were discussed prior to each participant being allowed to give a score representative to their experience and perception. The questions were discussed and translated in their own language (Pokot and Tugen among others) for ease of understanding.

For example under the peace and security, community concern regarding whether there was a police post in the ward or presence of the post closest to the ward, received responses guided with the following ratings: 1-none, 2- available but inaccessible, 3- available but with very few officers, 4-available and accessible but poorly equipped police officers, and 5-available, accessible with enough police officers who are fully equipped. Note: a score of 5 was the best while a score of 1 was the poorest. The input matrices on the other hand were filled out by the service providers based on the three focus areas prior to conducting the score cards, providing records of the human resource, the cost for providing the services in the respective Wards, and last but not least, the challenges and state of affairs in respect to the services.

The input from county government officials based on the Key Informant Interviews (KII) pointed to gaps and contradictions between the service provider and service user. The service providers tended to exaggerate successes on delivery of projects. Some of the contradictions were highlighted in Sigor (Wei Wei) Ward where for example, the County Government of West Pokot indicated they had increased the number of cattle dips from one to three, equipping an existing cattle dip to start working for the community. The community members on the other hand pointed out during an interface meeting that there was only one cattle dip that needed repair (meaning not equipped as alleged) and were aware of an additional one under construction at Lomut (which is a different Ward within Sigor Constituency) but not of a third cattle dip even as livestock related diseases was a huge challenge to the local community which is largely agro-pastoralists. Each interface meeting in the two Counties of Baringo and West Pokot had 15 people; 12 members of the community and 3 government officials.

From 120 FGD respondents across 4 wards; Marigat and Kabartonjo in Baringo County and Chepararia and Sigor (Wei Wei) in West Pokot County, none of the three areas of focus i.e. peace and security, livelihoods and infrastructure, earned an average score of 3.0 or more. The rating speaks majorly to the challenges of service delivery. Under the livelihood sector, 2.0 was the score average for Sigor (Weiwei), 2.3 was the score for Chepararia while 2.2 and 1.5 were the scores for Marigat and Kabartonjo respectively. Under the peace and security sector, 1.7 was the score average for Sigor (Weiwei), 2.3 was the score for Chepararia while 2.8 and 2.6 were the scores for Marigat and Kabartonjo respectively. Under the road infrastructure sector, 1.7 was the score average for Sigor (Weiwei), 2.3 was the score for Chepararia while 2.8 and 2.6 were the scores for Marigat and Kabartonjo



respectively.

Under the reason for the scores, majority of the participants in the FGD indicated that the average score in the two counties in respect to road infrastructure was due to fact that the tarmac roads either had numerous potholes, were incomplete although under construction or in extremely poor state and the murram roads were impassable during rainy seasons, which increased transport costs during this period.

In the livelihood sector, the general reasons for the score were, that Baringo County Government for instance, had drilled boreholes in both Kabartonjo and Marigat but the boreholes were not enough to serve the community. On the other hand, water pans often dried up and the few ones were often contaminated after staying for longer periods of time without treatment. Chepararia and Sigor (Wei Wei) in West Pokot were endowed with permanent and seasonal rivers yet households still did not have access to clean water. The two communities had taken upon themselves to solve the water problems by coming up with water kiosks (commercial water collection points) and engaging in irrigated schemes with the help of Non-Governmental Organizations. Attempts to hand over the successful water projects to the County Government in Chepararia had failed.

Augmented with the findings from the Input Tracking Matrix, even though the two counties had agricultural offices, these offices lacked the capacity in respect to the number of staff and resources with which to address the concerns of the community. In Kabartonjo there were concerns regarding lack of support on farm production in areas where communities were practicing irrigated agriculture on communal lands with supply of seed and fertilizer being a huge problem. Sigor (Wei Wei) farmers on the other side were frustrated by pest invasion and crop diseases as well as lack of water supply due to the prolonged drought. The score was therefore low in Sigor (Wei Wei) because their repeated requests to the County Government of West Pokot to provide them with drought resistance seeds were not acted upon.

Last but not least was the peace and security sector, where the general reasons for the score alluded to the fact that insecurity was high, like in the lowlands of Kabartonjo (Kipsaraman), Marigat and Sigor (Wei Wei) Wards with the usual factors such as resources, political impunity, police brutality, and banditry among others that contributed to insecurity were not being addressed.

One thing to note is perhaps that the Community Score Card was conducted one month before the Kenyan 2017 General election and the community members were purposely selected with the help of KAS partners domiciled in the two counties. Given that, a Score Card is a feedback mechanism on performance of government (service provider), the participants treated the exercise with some excitement, especially in West Pokot County where the participant perceived the exercise as a channel to air their political views concerning the security and livelihood challenges they were faced with. The exercise allowed the service providers to gain the per-

ceptions by the communities on the services they offered.

In communities where Community Score Cards had created positive impact like in the case of Afghanistan's Integrity Watch study and Malawi's CARE International study, it was possible to assess the impact of the Community Score Card by comparing the scores attained during different times. In both cases, the Community Score Card was conducted annually. It is therefore recommended that the Score Card is conducted annually to revisit and assess whether there have been improvements by the service providers as well as perceptions by the communities. To this end, KAS and her partner have to work with the different communities and government departments/agencies in the three focus areas, to firstly, ensure that the budget passed and implemented is designed to offset the challenges highlighted in this report, secondly, to contribute to capacity building of government institutions to gain more knowledge on public administration and food security integrated governance techniques, and thirdly, to work with the communities to hold their own government to account.

---

## BACKGROUND AND CSC OVERVIEW

---

### 1.1 *Introduction*

Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (KAS) is implementing the food security project in Kenya to help change the mind-set of county governments and local communities especially in Baringo and West Pokot and to equip them with the capacity to make sustainable contributions in the management of drought episodes and prevention of famine. The two counties of Baringo and West Pokot are increasingly vulnerable to disasters such as drought (which is particular in the agro-pastoralist and pastoralist zones), inter-communal and natural resource based conflict, flooding as well as landslides.

In April 2016 KAS Kenya carried out a baseline study through Chatham house based in the United Kingdom. The Chatham study entitled 'early warning systems in Kenya: Linking development and drought resilience planning' evaluated the existing early warning policies and institutions at the national and at Baringo and West Pokot level. The study found that NDMA's Ending Drought Emergencies (EDE) programme promoted an integrated approach towards looking at the disaster risk reduction approaches and the larger food security concept. As long as hazards were not responded to in time, they would lead to disasters eventually activating emergencies and humanitarian assistance.

The report recommended on the need to position interventions on food security within the wider development planning and not as isolated initiatives. Inclusion of these issues was meant to allow both policy and law makers to address the perennial problems relating to food insecurity based on medium term expenditure framework. In doing so, political and administrative governance became an important tool in preventing future crisis, where county and community issues were identified, packaged through policy instruments, plans for implementation drawn and decision passed based on the existing resources and priority. Thereafter, the plans would be implemented in coordination with existing multi-sectoral and departmental organs. The implementation of these plans would be intended to deliver on services and public goods and if rationalized, the outcomes could be realized as intended. The rationalization of services could best be assessed by using social accountability tools.

The results would help the communities and the Non-State Actors track progress and locate areas for advocacy campaigns among other aspects of civic engagement. Such engagements would help to hold the government accountable and be responsive to development based on disaster risk reduction.

---

## 1.2

### *Objective of conducting a CSC exercise*

The objective of the exercise was to strengthen the usage of social accountability tools in Baringo and West Pokot Counties to improve service delivery and promote discussions in the area of food security.

## 1.3

*Specific objectives of the CSC exercises were to:*

- a** Obtain and analyze the feedback and satisfaction of communities (service users) on the availability, access and quality of services they get from the road infrastructure, existing government sponsored livelihood options, and peace & security in target wards in Baringo and West pokot Counties.
  - b** Bring together communities (service users) and service providers to identify obstacles in effective service delivery and to clarify roles and responsibilities of duty bearers and right holder at all levels.
  - c** Disseminate the findings in a manner that will create awareness and generate political discussions on matters, food security.
- 

## 1.4

*Demographics of Baringo and West Pokot*

Baringo County is situated in the Rift valley region and more than 80% of the land size is arid and semi-arid. The county borders Turkana County and West Pokot County to the North, Samburu County and Laikipia County to the East, Nakuru County and Kericho County to the South, Uasin Gishu County to the South West and Elgeyo Marakwet County to the West. The predominant ethnic-communities are the Tugen, Pokot and Njemps.

There are six sub counties namely: Baringo Central Sub County, Baringo South Sub County, Tiaty Sub County, Baringo North Sub County, Eldama Ravine Sub County and Mogotio Sub County. The County has 3 main livelihood zones namely, Agro Pastoralism, pastoralism and mixed farming.

West Pokot County is located in the Rift Valley region and borders Turkana County to the North, Baringo County to the East, Elgeyo Marakwet County and Trans

Nzoia County to the South and The Republic of Uganda to the West.

The predominant ethnic-community is the Pokot. There are four Sub Counties namely, Sigor, Kapenguria, Kacheliba and Pokot South. West Pokot has 3 main livelihood zones namely Agro Pastoralism, pastoralism and mixed farming.

The roads in both Baringo and West Pokot were mainly earth and mixed type. These roads are usually impassable during the rainy season. This impeded livestock marketing, which are the main sources of livelihood for majority of the communities.

---

## 1.5

### *CSC Overview*

Mostly, the purpose of any CSC exercise is not just to produce a Score Card, but to go a step further and use the documented perceptions and feedback of a community regarding service, to actually bring about an improvement in its functioning through subsequent advocacy and lobbying campaigns. The World Bank for instance breaks down the CSC exercise into six key stages (i) preparatory groundwork, (ii) developing the input tracking matrix, (iii) generation of the community score card, (iv) generation of the self-evaluation score card or else the population of the input tracking matrix by facility or programme service staff, (v) the interface meeting between community and providers, and (vi) the follow-up process of institutionalization.

Integrity Watch Afghanistan define the Community Score Card as a research and advocacy tool used to measure perceptions and hold public officials accountable. It is a widely used social audit approach carried out around the world - particularly in developing countries - to improve governance, provide accountability to the public and encourage public participation in the decision-making process.

The Integrity Watch in Afghanistan employed the Community Score Card to improve service delivery and governance in Kabul Municipality Districts.

Overall, out of a score of 100, the average rating for the service delivery and governance of Kabul municipality was 44 in 2015 from 34 in 2014. In 2016, Health Policy and Plan conducted a review of eight projects on CARE's Community Score Card experience and evidence.

The study found that (i) the Community Score Card contributed to citizen empowerment, service provider and power-holder effectiveness, accountability and responsiveness (ii) The Community Score Card contributed to improvements in service availability, access, utilization and quality.

The CSC approach was adopted by KAS to look at three main sectors of livelihoods, climate proof infrastructure (road) and peace and security in line with the NDMA Common Programme Framework for Ending Drought Emergencies (EDE). KAS identified a gap in knowledge where reports and studies on the role of CSC in strengthening discourse around social accountability in the area of food security especially in the ASAL counties of Kenya was not sufficient. This was despite CSC as a tool being designed to demonstrate the potential of the social audit approach in holding service providers to account. KAS equally identified that the role of the Non-State Actors to hold their governments at the local level accountable on issues of disaster risk management and food security needed strengthening, with CSC providing a chance to generate evidence for advocacy campaigns for community based organizations.

Until recently, national levels organizations (CSOs) in the two counties had for a long time adopted a technical and service oriented approach where the local governments were assisted in carrying out their functions with little questions on the state of their resources and whenever disasters struck, humanitarian organizations came in handy to provide food and other types of emergency assistance. This relationship was practiced for decades and the international communities in support of humanitarian assistance framework at the regional level established a continuum of funding. Organizations engaging the locals and their governments on political issues and processes were not active especially on sectoral issues that needed political engagements in the ASAL region.

Social accountability tools such as the Community Score Cards, were therefore not commonly tried out in the two counties by CSOs to provide information of findings that could be used to steer dialogue on service improvement<sup>2</sup> amid the perennial food insecurity that faced majority parts of the two counties.

Generally, CSC exercises have helped to document perceptions and feedback by communities regarding public institutions, community attitudes toward such institutions and the quality of services they provided at the community level.

2 See, a workshop report by Pact, 2016, titled "Community Scorecards: Linking Communities with Providers to Improve Services" which describes the role of CSC in promoting service delivery.

In addition, the Community Score Card empowered citizens to hold their public officials accountable. A unique feature of the Community Score Card was the immediate feedback because the methodology provided for an interface between the residents in a particular area and public officials responsible for service delivery.

Members of the community engaged in a conversation with government officials, with both sides expressing their expectations and their level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. In the process of dialogue, confusion was minimized, objectivity was attained, misunderstandings were clarified and the environment for cooperation between the service providers and service users kicked off. This was documented under the chapter on findings.

---

## 1.6

### *Methodology and scope of work*

Community Score Card exercise was conducted by Makwiny Consult Limited on behalf of KAS in July 2017 in Baringo and West Pokot Counties as a means to provide a baseline for subsequent exercises that are meant to exert social and public accountability pressure on service providers. The CSC exercise was anchored on two approaches of data collection, namely Focus Group Discussions and Key Informant Interviews. The FGD assisted with soliciting user perceptions in order to get feedback on quality, efficiency and transparency of the sector programme implementation.

Key Informant Interviews with county government officials assisted the research team to fill in the input tracking matrices that were categorized into three areas, namely, Peace and Security, Livelihoods, Road Infrastructure.

All the service providers, including departmental heads of roads, agriculture, water and irrigation, and livestock among others and administrative officers including the Ward Administrators, Chiefs and Budget and Planning Officers working to support service delivery in the four wards were engaged.



Makwiny's research team developed two main tools: the Community Score Card and the input tracking matrix. The concerns that were addressed in both tools were informed by findings from secondary research on the three pillars. Similar issues were presented to the community and county officials. The indicators covered issues that directly involved the public and had substantial impact on the road infrastructure, peace & security and livelihood options.

For each of the indicators, five options were assigned, which were then qualified depending on the question. Each of the options was given a number to signify the level of satisfaction of citizens. Score one (1) signified total dissatisfaction while score five (5) signified complete satisfaction.

Due to time and resource constraints, the initial idea of involving the communities in developing the indicators or variable for every sub thematic area for the three areas of sector focus was not possible. Instead, the research team decided to pre-set the variables based on the initial information gathered from the input tracking matrix, and afterwards testing the same Score Cards with six (6) community participants each from within Kapenguria and Kabarnet Town. This process allowed for the improvement of the Score Card. A column dubbed "reason for the score" was introduced to ensure that the FGD participants who wanted to qualify their scores further beyond what was provided for them in the Score Card could do that. In Sigor (Wei Wei), there were 13 people in the Livelihoods FGD, 10 in the Peace and Security FGD and 7 in the Infrastructure FGD while in Chepararia each FGD had 10 people. Kabartonjo had a uniform 12 participants per FGD whereas Marigat recorded 8 participants per FGD.

One of the challenges of implementing CSC worth noting is that the exercise makes it tough to generalize data across the County due to the limited scope and uniqueness of the areas of coverage. For instance, it will be difficult to generalize the data emanating from Sigor (Wei Wei) and Chepararia to other wards such as Kapenguria or Suam whose livelihood zones and political culture may be different. Having conducted the CSC in two ASAL counties, what came out was that the culture of holding public service providers to account is as strong as other counties and this is for a number of reasons. Local communities are deemed ignorant of their civic duties, while the intricate web of funding of programmes by development aid, as well as existing weak structures of governance and public administration have been argued as some of the factors contributing to this culture.

While usually a small size could create bias perceptions, the research teams focused on only four wards and sampled community opinion leaders who had engaged in the respective focus areas. These participants equally drew a high level of respect from the communities. In the security sector, linkages with the national government through the chiefs and the sub-county administrator were provided in terms of responsibilities, managing in return confrontations during the interface meetings.

# 1.7

## *Data collection process*

Two research teams engaged concurrently in the two counties. Each team had a consultant, a KAS representative, a community mobilizer and a local facilitator who assisted with moderation and interpretation. Furthermore, there was an FGD facilitator in each of the FGD exercises to assist the research team with documentation and organization of the topics for presentation, discussions and scoring.

It took six days to conduct the Community Score Card in the 4 wards. Appointments were sought and secured with county officials, especially for the key informant interviews and community members were mobilized in advance by KAS local partners in the respective wards. Day one and two involved the research team meeting with the county officials (public providers). Apart from explaining the concept of Community Score Card and its importance to service delivery promotion, the service providers were also engaged through an input-tracking matrix to answer questions of resource input, planning, implementation and outcome.

The third and fourth days were used by the research teams to concurrently conduct the twelve focus group discussions; six in each of the counties. In order to identify the members of the community who participated in the Focus Group Discussions, we used stratified sampling by clustering the target respondents into their wards. A sample of interviewees was then drawn randomly from each of the clusters. The community mobilization teams assisted with the mobilization. An average of ten participants in each focus group ensured meaningful conversation because almost all the participants could participate in the one and a half hour meeting.

On the fifth and sixth days, two interface meetings were held between the service providers and the service users (community members). The county officials who were engaged in the preparation of the input-tracking matrix including area Chiefs, Security Officers and the Ward Administrators participated in this event where findings from the Score Cards were being presented and deliberated upon. The interface meetings also provided the service providers with a platform to prioritize issues for further engagements through their offices. Each FGD started with an introduction of the participants to be engaged in the FGDs and their role in their communities. The facilitator then opened the meeting with an overview of the Community Score Card and its importance in empowering people and making the public officials accountable.

Assistance was provided by the facilitators to ensure that the discussions followed the sequence as provided in the various Score Cards. On some instances, the issues raised were beyond those listed.

(7)

Source: Focus Group Discussions, Marigat. Community Score Card on road infrastructure

Their responses included updates on the present state of the issues raised and what their offices were doing to address the issues. The meeting then agreed on one issue which they would pursue jointly in order to seek a solution. This was then filled out in an action matrix.

---

## 1.8

### *Data analysis process*

To count the final community scores, the exercise adopted the Community Score Card analysis method. Based on this method, the participants gave a score of 1 to 5 for each indicator, in the sense that one (1) indicated the lowest score and five (5) indicated the highest score.

The community score was calculated by getting an average of the scores of individual participants for each sector for each Ward. The public hearings in the form of interface meetings allowed for the research team to analyze and interpret the data from the Score Cards as well as from the input-tracking matrix. The input-tracking matrix on the other hand informed future steps in the CSC process with information on resource inputs.

## FOCUS GROUP HEARINGS AND FINDINGS

---

### 2.1 *Introduction*

This section discusses the findings of each ward. The feedback from the community and that from the county officials based on the input matrix frame have been analyzed and key issues highlighted.

## 2.2

### *Findings on Livelihoods*

A number of concerns were discussed in the FGDs that tackled on livelihoods. Water resource development was the most discussed topic with the highest score on boreholes drilled being at 2.4 in Marigat, on a scale where (1-represented insufficient borehole) (2-seasonal borehole) (3-borehole drilled but contaminated/salty) (4-boreholes present but distance covered is long) (5-sufficient boreholes within the accepted radius with clean water). Scores for the water pans illustrated that they were relatively accessible and scored between 2.4 for Chepararia and 2.5 in for Marigat respectively on a scale where (1-represented No water pans) (2-Dried water pans) (3-Contaminated yet the pans are present) (4-Water pans available although not sufficient for domestic use) (5-Water pans are available and sufficient for domestic use). The communities in Wei Wei had a permanent river, although distribution of water was deemed a huge challenge due to lack of investment on agricultural technologies around the rivers. In Marigat, there was the Lake Baringo, which has served as a source of livelihood for the Njemps (an indigenous community).

Other communities living far from the shores of the Lake have accessed water for domestic use and livestock from water pans that were set up by the NDMA. However, for the opposing views, the participants argued that a lot of them especially within Marigat town had to walk long distances to access the Lake for purposes of fetching water for domestic use. In Chepararia, participants shared that the local communities had attempted to pipe water without subjecting it to any form of treatment. The water had become popular among other communities but whenever it rained, there were typhoid and cholera epidemics.

In both Sigor (Wei Wei) and Chepararia, the Ward administrators indicated that the government had made efforts to avail piped water. Community members however insisted that they still have challenges in accessing water in most parts of the two Wards. It emerged that communities that lived far from the source of the water pipes, had no water because those closer to the source and who had been left out in the process of piping, went ahead to destroy the pipes in order to access water affecting those from far ends.

In the four Wards namely, Marigat, Sigor (Wei Wei) and Chepararia, the County Governments had initiated successful bee keeping, meat goat breeding getting scores of 2.5, 2.8 and 5.0 respectively. On beekeeping in Baringo, the county had registered over 20 co-operative groups in Kimalel and within Marigat town getting a score of 2.5. Not much has been done in Kabartonjo with only non-commercial off takes being recorded in the interface meeting as some of the progress made.



This is according to the Agriculture and livestock sectors.

The County Government of West Pokot had made headway in introducing alternative farming, specifically poultry farming in Wei Wei, which was reared by women. The active presence of the Agricultural Sector Development Support Programme (ASDSP) in Chepararia, where it engaged the locals on value chain projects may have influenced almost all of the participants to rate the sub section as having performed extremely well with 5 out of 5. Despite the positive impact realized from the value chain projects, the value chains did not go as far as granting market linkages in the four counties. The mango project that had been initiated by the government in Kabartonjo had resulted in high production, most of which ended up rotting because of lack of market hence the score of 1.0 on post-harvest handling (Food storage) assistance. Food storage programs in Baringo were ran by co-operatives. The county government officials indicated that there were plans to distribute hermetic bags (airtight) in Marigat to facilitate the preservation of food even though this was in dire need. In a bid to reduce post-harvest loses, the County Government of Baringo had put up initiatives such as maize milling.

While participants in all the four Wards acknowledged that, there were agricultural extension officers providing them with agricultural advisories and due to them, they have been able to prevent widespread of both crop and animal diseases. For instance, Sigor (Wei Wei) and Marigat have benefited hugely from the extension officers who move from one village to the other using motor cycle. This is reflective of the scores, where Kabartonjo had 2.1, Marigat, 3.5, Chepararia 3.2 and Sigor (Wei Wei) with a score of 3.4. Given the numerous interventions in Marigat where the Zai Pit technology is being practiced in large scales, the participants recommended on the need to increase the number of agricultural officers in order to reach more members of the community.

Closely linked to water was livestock keeping, which was the main economic activity in all four wards. Access to water for livestock was easier than it was for humans. Most conflicts arose from search for pasture for the livestock. The communities suggested that community land ownership was a major contributor to the conflict since grazing was not well-managed forcing pastoralists to encroach into areas where dry land farming was being practiced. This was a big problem in Kabartonjo and Chepararia which scored poorly (1 out of 5) on in-farm irrigation.

The quality of cattle and care that they received was an equally major concern in Marigat and Kabartonjo as it arose that ticks had become immune to the pesticide used in the dips, but government had not changed the pesticide. In Sigor (Wei Wei), there was a cattle dip that had no water hence the scores of 2.5, 1.8, 2.0 and 2.2 respectively for Kabartonjo, Marigat, Chepararia and Sigor (Wei Wei) on livestock disease control.

The scale was based on where: (1-no vaccination was done in the past one year) (2-vaccination conducted once a year but not to all animals) (3-vaccination was done more than once but not to all animals) (4-vaccination was done to all animal) (5-vaccination was done more than once and to all animals). Essentially, most animals were vaccinated once in a year.

Communities in the respective wards also suggested that there was a need for the ward offices to respond to drought disasters in time in view of saving livestock and human lives. For instance, the participants in Kabartonjo, Marigat, Chepararia and Sigor (Wei Wei) scored 2.9, 2.8, 1.0 and 1.9 respectively on disaster response actions. Chepararia low score was connected to the fact that pastoralist communities in this Ward lost most of their animals in the recent drought and to the time of conducting the CSC, had not been compensated by either level of government in view of building resilience.

### *Livelihood Scores in Kabartonjo, Marigat, Chepararia and Sigor (Wei Wei)*

|  | Kabartonjo          | Marigat             | Chepararia          | Sigor/WeiWei        |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Input Indicator  | Average score (1-5) | Average score (1-5) | Average score (1-5) | Average score (1-5) |
| Boreholes drilled  | 1.6                 | 2.4                 | 1.0                 | 1.2                 |
| Water pans established   | 1.4                 | 2.5                 | 2.4                 | 1.5                 |
| Household under cash and food for assets program                     | 1.0                 | 1.6                 | 1.5                 | 1.5                 |
| Livestock diseases control   | 2.5                 | 1.8                 | 2.0                 | 2.2                 |
| On farm irrigation systems   | 1.0                 | 1.9                 | 1.0                 | 2.7                 |
| Livestock commercial off take programs implemented                   | 1.0                 | 1.9                 | 1.4                 | 1.3                 |
| Post-harvest handling (Food storage) assistance from government      | 1.0                 | 2.5                 | 3.3                 | 2.1                 |
| Market Linkage (programme) by government                             | 1.1                 | 1.5                 | 1.4                 | 1.5                 |
| Demonstration farms/plot by government                               | 1.4                 | 2.3                 | 4.0                 | 1.6                 |
| Value Chain project by government (bee keeping, dairy and meat goat) | 1.0                 | 2.5                 | 5.0                 | 2.8                 |
| Institutions (Agricultural offices)                                  | 2.1                 | 3.5                 | 3.2                 | 3.4                 |

Source: Focus Group Discussion based Community Score Cards



The average scores of livelihoods in the different wards were Marigat with 2.2, Kabartonjo with 1.5, Sigor (Wei Wei) with 2.0 and Chepararia with 2.3.

All the community participants engaged felt that government had performed below expectations, although county officials held different opinions.

It was observed that county officials judged themselves from the time devolution began, and therefore tended to rank themselves highly for offering services that previously did not exist. Members of the community on the other hand assessed the county government based on their history of never having had most of the facilities. It was evident that communities had high expectations of county government, having imagined that solutions would be immediate.

In conclusion and in respect to irrigation, Mrel Irrigation Scheme in Wei Wei Ward was allocated Ksh 5 million but the supplementary budget reduced the allocation to Ksh 1.3 million. The County Government was also in the process of repairing the Ptokou and Wakor water furrows in Wei Wei Ward at a cost of Ksh 500,000 each. There were no irrigation projects currently being supported by the County Government in Chepararia. However, as discussed in the interface meeting there were constructions of cattle dips at Chemotong and Chepturunguny in Chepararia. A close review of the County Budget for 2016/17 (supplementary) indicated an allocation of Ksh 1.2 and 1.0 million consecutively. A score of 2.0 was given for Chepararia in respect to livestock diseases control, an illustration of the efforts being made by the County Government.

In Weiwei, the community members pointed out in the interface meeting that the problems of livestock diseases have led to limited livelihood options with many of them having sold their cattle during off take ventures by the National Drought Management Authority, meant to avert the dire impact of the drought that raged the county between the periods of February 2017 and May 2017.

The County Government officers indicated that the government had promised to start a Breeding programme which would commence soon, perhaps the same would be budgeted for in the 2017/18 budgetary year.

“The previous financial year was over-stretched and therefore Ward Administrators were not able to get development expenditure vote head and circulars for this programme implementation,” said the officer.

## 2.3

### *Findings on Road Infrastructure*

Most of the roads in the four wards were murram roads. The only tarmac roads were the national government (highway) roads connecting with the county roads. The challenge with the highways was the fact that most of them were incomplete or in poor state (in need of repairs) especially sections passing through the four wards. Participants in the FGD sessions held in Sigor (Wei Wei) for instance gave an average score of 1.0 in respect to the sufficiency of tarmac roads in their Ward. This was a lower score compared to 2.5 that was the score in Chepararia as well as 3.0 and 3.1 that were the scores in Kabartonjo and Marigat respectively. Areas in Sigor (Wei Wei) and Marigat that were close to the tarmac reported cheaper food prices as there was ease in accessing the local markets.

In West Pokot, the County Government's Department of road had no immediate plans for tarmacking county level roads, insisting that all the key roads within the county that required tarmacking would be done by the National Government partly due to the huge costs of such projects. "Somehow, this explains why even though 1.7 was the average score, 3.0 was the specific score for murram roads", said one of the County Government officials present.

The scores for sufficiency of murram roads were; *(1-no county government funded road) (2-less than 2 county government funded, roads majorly community made) (3-county government road to half of the public utility)(4- county government road to all the public utilities) (5-county government road to all public utilities and beyond)*. Chepararia had the least average score at 1.8 a score that was explained by the fact that the community took most of the initiatives of developing trekking routes by clearing bushes and rocks that made the routes impassable.

Amid this challenge in Chepararia, a 26 Km murram road from Simotwo-Motpokor to Ywalateke was said to have been allocated by the Government approximately Ksh 3.7 million. The road work had started although half way done.

A 15 Km drainage along Cheplurngung was also allocated Ksh12 million for construction. The work was yet to begin as there were no funds. What was noteworthy was that the County Government of West Pokot had budgeted for approximately Ksh 508 million on development expenditure in 2016/17 within the roads public works and transport sector.

In Sigor (Wei Wei), data collected through the input-tracking matrix showed that the National Government had completed the construction of the Wei-Wei- Ketpol-uk and Akiriamet-Masol Footbridges in Sigor (Wei Wei) at approximately Ksh.10 and 11 million consecutively. This was however part of the highway.

On the side of the County Government, a supplementary budget was introduced in 2016/7 financial year to help with the construction of a 20 Km Wei Wei-Tamkal road and 14 Km Tamkal-Solion murram roads each at a cost of over six million. This was indeed reflect in the programme based supplementary budget for the said fiscal year, where under vote head 3110401 where the work was estimated at a cost of Kshs. 6,243,246/= and 6,282,900/= respectively.

In Kabartonjo, the input-tracking matrix revealed considerable amount of funding set aside annually for developing the murram roads, opening the villages to the main tarmac roads developed by the national government. However, the matrix showed no input in terms of resources set aside to maintain the same murram roads, a factor that may explain why the participants scored the state of the murram roads in Kabartonjo at an average of 1.8.

Chepararia and Sigor (Wei Wei) were prone to landslides and participants shared that it was a common scene to find roads blocked by mudslides during rainy seasons. “Unfortunately, the government did not always unblock the roads since they were not considered major economic-impactful roads” said one of the participants in Chepararia. In Kabartonjo, the County Government officials admitted that communities had occasionally mobilized themselves to pull out rocks and seal huge potholes on murram roads. The question on the state of the road looked at whether the roads were; *(1 not passable on foot/motorbike/bicycle when it rains) (2-partly passable) (3- all have a part that is passable) (4-all are passable) (5-all passable & regularly maintained)* had 2.0 as the best average score in Marigat and Chepararia.

While during the rainy season, water becomes easily accessible in areas such as Kabartonjo and Sigor (Wei Wei), making access to other facilities such as hospitals, markets, schools among others difficult since roads were rendered impassable. This argument points to the poor state of murram road in the two counties as tabled below.

*Road infrastructure Scores in Kabartonjo, Marigat, Chepararia and Sigor*

|   | Kabartonjo    | Marigat       | Chepararia    | Sigor (Weiwei) |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| DESCRIPTION                             | Average score | Average score | Average score | Average score  |
| Sufficiency of murram roads in the ward | 2.9           | 2.5           | 1.8           | 3.0            |
| State of murram roads in the ward       | 1.8           | 2.0           | 2.0           | 1.9            |
| Sufficiency of tarmac roads in the ward | 3.0           | 3.1           | 2.5           | 1.0            |
| State of tarmac roads in the ward       | 2.8           | 3.4           | 3.0           | 1.0            |
| <b>Average Score</b>                    | <b>2.6</b>    | <b>2.8</b>    | <b>2.3</b>    | <b>1.7</b>     |

Source: Focus Group Discussion based Community Score Cards

## 2.4

### *Findings on Peace and Security*

The presence of police posts was reported to play a major role in building confidence of the local communities especially in the four Wards which are conflict prone. In West Pokot, the participants gave a score of 2.6 and 3.1 in respect to their proximity to police in Chepararia and Sigor (Wei Wei) respectively. Proximity to police posts scored highly in Baringo at 4.5 and 4.3 in Kabartonjo and Marigat respectively, on a scale where *(1-none) (2- available but inaccessible) (3- available but with very few officers) (4-available and accessible but poorly equipped police officers) (5-available, accessible with enough police officers who are fully equipped)*.

According to the area chiefs that participated in the interface meetings, Marigat had recorded increased cases of banditry attacks in the last six months. However, interviews with the Deputy County Commissioner in Marigat intimated that the national government had invested two more police posts as well as deployment of more administration police in the area. The government had procured more motorcycles for coordination and logistics of security activities and there were discussions of hiring more police officers and police reservists especially in Sigor (Wei Wei) boarder. Unfortunately, the general attitude towards uniform police was poor in Baringo because of the way the police previously conducted security operations. In respect to community policing and in particular, equipment's for patrolling, all the four Wards performed dismally with Kabartonjo having the lowest score of 1.0. Marigat had a score of 1.4 while Chepararia had a score of 1.9. Sigor (Wei Wei), which borders East Pokot (Baringo County), has a score of 2.5.

The communities from three wards with the exception of Kabartonjo, had more confidence in the police reservists but opined that the police reservists were not fairly distributed or deployed. Participants in Marigat gave a score of 2.8 in respect to the police reservists being present. Chepararia had a score of 2.0 while Sigor (Wei Wei) had a score of 2.8. The increase of cattle rustling in Kabartonjo especially in the pastoralist zones may have contributed to the score of 1.0 given by the participants. From the interface meetings, one chief participant argued that the case of Kabartonjo was to do with the bad state of roads *(and in this case, murrum roads)*.

There were numerous reactive efforts by different players including the county government departments of disaster management to promote peace, with scores not recording 2.0 for Kabartonjo, 2.0 for Marigat, 2.3 for Chepararia and 2.2 for Sigor (Wei Wei). The score meant that the respective County Governments were engaging in peace building initiatives where by a score of *(1-would mean none or no initiative at all, 2-only held after conflict occurrence, 3-held regularly but with no timeline, 4-held regularly with timelines, 5-held regularly with a timeline)*

*and sustainable solution agreed and implemented*). Community participants were aware of peace seeking meetings but their opinion was that the meetings did not yield positive results. Participants perceived that the government was not objective whenever it conducted disarmament. Furthermore, participants in Marigat argued that officers exercised favoritism, which only further fueled conflict.

Lighting of market centres was reported to have played a big role in reducing night time attacks particularly in Kabartonjo and Marigat which had a score of 3.4 and 2.8 respectively. In Kabartonjo however, it was confirmed both in the interviews with the government service providers and in the FGDs that the lighting infrastructure was very reliable in Kabartonjo while Marigat had an almost similar situation except it was not functioning well in the past three Months. The scores were informed by the following indicators: *(1-none) (2-one available but not functioning) (3-Functioning but not all times) (4-several light functioning but in safe zone) (5-several high masts and street lights present in volatile areas)*. Chepararia had street lighting in the market centres 2.3 score while in Sigor (Wei Wei) not all market centres were lit hence the score of 1.9.

County government of West Pokot had assessed themselves on the basis of the infrastructure they had put in place, and admitted that cattle rustlers had therefore changed their routes amid strengthen security measures such as lighting. On average, Marigat peace concerns was scored at 2.5, Kabartonjo at 2.3, Chepararia at 2.0 and Sigor (Wei Wei) at 2.3. Only the community i.e. Marigat felt that the government was doing at least half of what they expected the government to do.

### *Peace and Security Scores in Kabartonjo, Marigat, Chepararia and Sigor*

|   | Kabartonjo    | Marigat       | Chepararia    | Sigor (Weiwei) |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| DESCRIPTION   | Average score | Average score | Average score | Average score  |
| Police post in the ward or closest to the ward                    | 4.5           | 4.3           | 2.6           | 3.1            |
| Community policing and equipment's/ facilities for patrolling     | 1.0           | 1.4           | 1.9           | 2.5            |
| Intervention to promote cohesion, tolerance and minimize violence | 3.0           | 2.0           | 1.7           | 2.5            |
| Peace seeking missions (Intercommunity meeting and negotiations)  | 2.0           | 2.0           | 2.3           | 2.2            |
| Lighting/street lights  | 3.4           | 2.8           | 2.3           | 1.9            |
| Presence of Police Reservists                                     | 1.0           | 2.8           | 2.0           | 2.8            |
| Presence of Anti-stock theft unit                                 | 1.4           | 2.1           | 1.1           | 1.3            |
| <b>Average score</b>  | <b>2.3</b>    | <b>2.5</b>    | <b>2.0</b>    | <b>2.3</b>     |

Source: Focus Group Discussion based Community Score Cards

According to the Baringo County Commissioner's office, the national government has provided five (5) vehicles per ward however there was no specific budget for maintenance and fueling the same while on security missions.

The peace seeking mission meetings however do not have a budget and rely on Non-State Actors. The FGDs in Sigor (Wei Wei) and Chepararia shared that communities had traditional peace building structures for example, the kokwopoi (which is a council of elders) that is highly respected by not used in peacekeeping missions. These structures had their own ways of gathering intelligence and mobilizing their communities against any criminal elements or aggression, a perfect structure for promoting community cohesion and political tolerance. However, the structures had been ignored, reducing the flow of actionable early warning information and significantly impounding on peace and security.

Furthermore, on intervention to promote cohesion, tolerance and minimize violence, community participants in Kabartonjo, Marigat, Chepararia and Sigor (Wei Wei) gave an average score of 3.0, 2.0, 1.7 and 2.5 respectively.

This meant that West Pokot County Government were perceived not to have engaged majority of the communities in promoting cohesion, tolerance and cohesion. According to the interface meeting, this may have been attributed to the fact that the locals are predominantly from the Pokot community and this may have been presented as a non-priority area for the specific Ward.

---

## 2.5

### *Action Matrices*

Action matrices are mostly aimed at institutionalizing the practice for iterative civic actions. It was unanimously agreed during both interface meetings, that the greatest concern was access to clean water for domestic use and pasture for livestock. If water were to become easily available, they argued, conflicts related to pasture would be manageable, while irrigated farming would increase food production. Communities in West Pokot pointed out severally on the need to improve the road infrastructure network as this would open up areas that are known for livelihood production.



An example of Lelan in Kapenguria Ward was mentioned as due to the current tarmacking in light of increasing milk distribution as one of the areas that Wei Wei Ward could learn from.

Participants in Baringo preferred a similar approach; they identified key issues such as water resource development, community security and livestock promotion as important areas that could be pursued and prioritized under the annual ward development plan. It is important to note that the Community Score Card concept was quite new in both counties so the approach was one of taking a little risk and assessing progress.

### 2.5.1 Sigor (Wei Wei) Action Matrix

| What can we do to make things better?  | Proposed actions  | Who  | When (year) |
|--|---|--|-------------|
| i) Engage the water resource development contractor in a bid to understand why it is taking too long to complete the Kopro/Weiwei Water project and establish whether water kiosks can also be developed in the market centre upon completion of project | a) Constitute a community committee (Committee was constituted on 15/07/2017) to engage with the contractor and find possible modalities    | Ward Administrator's office  | 27/07/2017  |
|  | b) Committee to give feedback to the community in a chief's baraza to be held at Sangat Kiteswa   | Chief will call <i>baraza</i> in consultation with the Ward Administrator's office | 29/12/2017  |
| ii) Address the challenges of water piping along Ipet-Salgat by members of the community   | a) Discuss consequences for destroying water pipes and development of a water resource pact that will provide responsibility to communities | b) Chief will call a <i>baraza</i> and the Department of Water will be engaged     | 24/11/2017  |

### 2.5.2 Chepararia Action Matrix

| What can we do to make things better?   | Proposed actions   | Who  | When (year) |
|---|--|--|-------------|
| Exert pressure on County government through letters signed by 1,000 members of the community, to uphold agreement in takeover of water in Chepararia and implement; | a) Draft letter to Water Department highlighting an urge to come up with an agreement that will provide modalities for the establishment of a water treatment plant  | water committee members)   | 24/010/2017 |
|   | b)Collection of 1,000 signatures from community members to support the development of the pact and inclusion of the priorities within the county government planning | b) Chair of the water committee members in Chepararia created by the Ward Administrators Office) | 31/07/2017  |
|   | c) Delivery of the Pact and priorities to the Department of Water and Irrigation, as well as the Ministry of Devolution.   | c) Chair of the water committee members)   | 04/08/2017  |



### 2.5.3 Kabartonjo Action Matrix

| What can we do to make things better?  | Proposed actions   | Who   | When (year)                |
|--|--|---|----------------------------|
| a)Farm demonstrations on alternative farming (dryland farming)   | Lobbying campaigns by CBOs for special provision of more extension officers in Baringo especially in the agricultural  | Ward - Administrator  | 2018 Financial Year        |
| b)Get resource increment and guideline for the Ward Office to promote the use of pesticides for cattle dips.(Cattle ticks were immune to the pesticide used in the dips) | Advisories to farmers by technical agencies as well as reflecting the resource need into the ward budget   | County government' budget and planning, Department of Agriculture | 12/02/2018                 |
| c)security patrols and lighting in the hostile areas   | Lobby County government to erect flood lights in volatile areas as well as complement the National Government in buying patrol equipments for the Kenya Police | County government annand community leaders                        | 30/06/ 2018 Financial Year |

### 2.5.4 Marigat Action Matrix

| What can we do to make things better?  | Proposed actions  | Who   | When (year)                |
|--|---|---|----------------------------|
| a)Animal feed supplements during drought (Feeding supplements are available but only from NGOS like Action AID, Red Cross and WHO) | Lobby for the approval of the Disaster Risk Management Policy in the County Assembly and subsequent creation of ending drought emergency fund to deal with resilience building. | Civil society organization (CSOs) and County government                                 | 30/06/ 2018 Financial Year |
| b)Establishment of storage facilities for farmers  | Develop a storage map and strategic location to influence budgeting in the Ward   | County government, Department of Agriculture (extension officer) and community leaders. | 30/06/ 2018 Financial Year |
| c)Sinking of boreholes   | Appeal to drill 2-3boreholes in Ngoswe. Communities to donate land for the drilling and approach the department with a concept for  | County government, Department of Water and Ward Administrator's office                  | 30/06/ 2018 Financial Year |

# CHAPTER --- THREE

03

## CHALLENGES, OPPORTUNITIES AND LESSONS LEARNT

---

## *Challenges*

The exercise was conducted less than a month to the general election. Given that a score card is a feedback mechanism on performance of a government (service provider), participants treated the exercise with suspicion, especially in West Pokot County where the contest for the position of Governor was stiff. County government officials at the headquarters were equally suspicious and only cooperated where they had positive reports. It was not easy to get all key parties to attend the interface meetings despite prior confirmations. The team therefore had to make do with fewer government officials.

Culture played an interesting role at the start of all FGDs. Participants from all four communities were from the Kalenjin community. The culture of this community is such that the men do not complain or criticize one another publicly. They were generally a conservative people. They perceived giving negative feedback as complaining and therefore initially struggled with the concept of giving feedback. They began to participate when they felt the information given by the women was not correct. The women were okay with being viewed as complaining and therefore helped drive the discussion at the start.

The people of Baringo and West Pokot were unhappy with the services they were getting from their county government and used the interface meeting as an opportunity to interrogate the county officials especially on issues of water and security.

---

## *Opportunities*

### Lessons learnt

Community members gave their inputs with suggestions on how some of the issues that affect them could be addressed. They admitted repeatedly that some of the scores were given could still be informed to larger extent by the prevailing political environment whereby the country was preparing for general elections and dissatisfaction or lower scores would signal displeasure and eventually promote opportunities for political campaigns around the same issues.

The exercise provided a learning experience for communities especially on how to go about engaging government officials. CSC was deemed by one of the participants at an interface meeting in Kabartonjo Ward in Baringo as having promoted principles of public participation.

County Government officials working at the Ward level were willing to work with the community to engage their relevant departments and management teams based at the County headquarters to follow through on stalled projects and unfulfilled promises in the three sectors. A discussion on service delivery and food security allowed the participants in Marigat and Sigor (Wei Wei) to point out on the challenges and difficulties those communities had in terms of understanding the concepts and their application in line with their traditions. They felt that most of the interventions did not take into account their heritage and therefore presented some level of resentment.

---

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, this exercise helped to underscore the importance of community participation in decision making processes.

Majority of the participants engaged in the Community Score Card even though being opinion leaders in their own right, were hardly engaged on issues of promoting food security in their own areas. A number of them also seemed not to understand the process of public participation. A perception had been created whereby many in the interface meetings thought initially that their participation was as a punishment by the authorities, an illustration of some level of ignorance about the benefit of the civic engagement. Nonetheless, the exercise rekindled the call for the County Government to priorities projects like county level road construction, sinking of strategic boreholes, introduction and support to irrigation schemes and equipping of police posts among others that would impact positively on both disaster risk management and on food security.

In Kabartonjo and Marigat concerns regarding lack of support on farm production in areas where communities were practicing irrigated agriculture on communal lands and land disagreement should be addressed. In Sigor (Wei Wei) on the other hand, lack of basic water supply especially during prolonged drought calls for more development of strategic boreholes on public land to accommodate all communities. Generally, the successful feedback as computed in the score tables speaks to the willingness of the communities to participate in governance towards addressing food insecurity.

### *Recommendations:*

Water resource management should be sustained by the county governments or a public body that reports to the county governments. It was beyond the capacity of the communities to handle water. There were instances, where the Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) funded water projects in Chepararia and Marigat Wards but handed over the project to the community upon completion of the project lifeline. The transfer of such resources to the communities was met with numerous challenges of management because the community lacked the resource and human capacity to sustain the life of such kinds of projects. As much as water has existed in the four wards, the most common source of water were the water pans of which have sparked debates on whether they are safe for human consumption.

Maintenance of County Roads and water resource management should be taken up by two respective county governments, particularly the maintenance of murrum roads. This would ensure their continued accessibility irrespective of the weather. Clearing of mud from roads after mudslides, which was reported in Sigor (Wei Wei), should be conducted by county government in order to ensure proper clearing of the road and that the mud does not end up on the property of another thereby causing conflict.

Given the vast nature of the two counties and that there are endless security concerns in both, investment in police reservists would be ideal, but it would require training and motivation a task that can be best performed by the National Government. Given their reach, each part of the two counties would be covered in terms of presence of police reservists. Participants in Marigat and Kabartonjo had raised concerns about the conduct of police reservists while in Sigor (Wei Wei) it emerged that police reservists were constantly undermined by the ordinary police, which then demotivated the police reservists.

Given that they are known people among the society, it would be important for national government to facilitate training in order to build capacity as well as emphasizing to them the key role that they play.

It was recommended that copies of this report should be shared with the office of the Governors in the two counties; firstly to communicate the concerns of the public and the reasons behind those concerns. Some of the concerns may be beyond the scope of the officials that were involved during the exercise, yet are critical and need to be addressed. Secondly, to express what was requested from the government in terms of support and improved services with a view to getting commitment of the Governors.

To be able to assess the level of improvement and general outcome, it was recommended that the Score Card be conducted annually. This will help assessing whether or not the advocacy campaigns and subsequent commitments based on the action points discussed in the interface meetings have been addressed. It would be important for community leaders and the civil society organizations to involve other development partners that are directly involved in the delivery of services or assisting the county governments in performing their functions.

---

## *CONCLUSION*

Whereas the Constitution of Kenya in Articles 118(1)(b) and 196(1)(b) directs the national and county governments respectively to “facilitate public participation” in order for citizens to participate in decision-making and that both counties had Public Participation guidelines, it was evident that there was great misunderstanding between the governments and members of the community on the quality of the meetings taking place. The dialogue was therefore welcome by both government officials and members of the public as providing more content and techniques for not only holding government to account but for engaging communities in participation. The communities were able to tie the link between road networks, peace and how the two affected livelihoods.

The meetings had lots of counter accusations at the beginning but these were dealt with. The greatest lesson was that it was a joint responsibility; the community needed to engage the government and vice versa.

The pilot CSC on food security provided a rare but welcome opportunity for citizens to express their opinions to the government. It accorded the county governments an opportunity to gain a multidimensional perspective of the situation on food security, problems and shortcomings and to observe the good practice occurring in public service delivery.

During the interface meetings, government officials got an opportunity to equally point out the frustrations they encounter while dealing with the public and pointed out ways the public could partner with the government in order to support the execution of their responsibilities.

The members of the public as represented by participants in the FGDs became aware of their role in tasking government to deliver services that address their needs, a role that they immediately took up as evidenced in the action matrices. The realization of one single success will go a long way in affirming to the public that indeed they could dialogue with government and get the government to deliver services as agreed and will go a long way in cultivating a culture that will lead to the transformation of accountability towards achieving food security.

---



## REFERENCES

Baringo County Government. 2016. Programme Based Budget. Fy 2016/2017. For the year ending 30th June, 2017.

---

Health Policy Plan. 2016 . A review of CARE's Community Score Card experience and evidence. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5091339/#>

---

Integrity Watch Afghanistan, 2016. Community Scorecard of Kabul Municipality. [www.iwaweb](http://www.iwaweb)

---

Pact Inc. 2016. Community Scorecards: Linking Communities with Providers to Improve Services.

---

President's Delivery Unit. National Government Programmes in West Pokot and Baringo County. Accessed 15/08/2017. <https://www.delivery.go.ke/>

---

West Pokot County Government. 2016. Supplementary Programme Based Budget. Fy 2016/17 (2013 -2017). For the year ending 30th June, 2017. Accessed, 11/08/2017. <http://www.westpokot.go.ke/images/downloads/generaldownloads>

## APPENDIX I: Infrastructure Community Score Card

| <b>GROUP NAME/LOCATION/WARD:</b>             |   | <b>DATE:</b>  |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>COUNTY:</b>                               |   |   |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>PROGRAMME/SECTOR: Road Infrastructure</b> |   |   |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO   | COMMUNITY CONCERNS                      | SCORE (1-5) The details of the scores are broken down further for each question with 1 being the lowest score and 5 being the highest   | REASONS FOR THE SCORE |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>The road infrastructure</b>               |   |   |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | Sufficiency of Murram roads in the ward | <p>(1-no county government funded road) (2-less than 2 county government funded, roads majorly community made) (3-county government road to half of the public utility)(4- county government road to all the public utilities) (5-county government road to all public utilities and beyond)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> | 1                     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2                                       | 3   | 4                     | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |   |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2  | State of Murram roads in the ward       | <p>(1 not passable on foot/motorbike/bicycle when it rains) (2-partly passable) ( - all have a part that is (3- all have a part that is passable) (4-all are passable) (5-all passable &amp; regularly maintained)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>   | 1                     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2                                       | 3   | 4                     | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |   |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3  | Sufficiency of tarmac roads in the ward | <p>(1-none in the ward) (2-available but heavily pot holed) (3-only the highway is tarmacked) (4-roads to key public utilities are tarmacked) (5-roads to all utilities are tarmacked)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>   | 1                     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2                                       | 3   | 4                     | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |   |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4  | State of Tarmac roads in the ward       | <p>(1-none in the ward) (2-available but heavily pot holed) (3-pot holed but with parts that are passable) (4-pot holes are filled, hence passable) (5-all passable &amp; regularly maintained)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>  | 1                     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2                                       | 3   | 4                     | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |   |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX II: Peace and Security Community Score card

| <b>GROUP NAME/LOCATION/WARD:</b>             |  | <b>DATE:</b>  |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>COUNTY:</b>                               |  |   |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>PROGRAMME/SECTOR: Road Infrastructure</b> |  |   |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO   | COMMUNITY CONCERNS   | SCORE (1-5) The details of the scores are broken down further for each question   | REASONS FOR THE SCORE |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Peace and Security</b>                    |  |   |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | Police post in the ward or closest to the ward                                   | <p>(1-none) (2- available but inaccessible) (3- available but with very few officers) (4-available and accessible but poorly equipped police officers) (5-available, accessible with enough police officers who are fully equipped).</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>   | 1                     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2  | 3   | 4                     | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2  | Community policing and equipment's/ facilities for patrolling                    | <p>(1-no facilities or equipment and no community policing) (2-One vehicle available for community policing) (3-more than one vehicle present but poorly serviced) (4-Vehicles actually used for policing) (5-Vehicles are well equipped and adequate police for community policing)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> | 1                     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2  | 3   | 4                     | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3  | Intervention to promote cohesion, tolerance and minimize violence related deaths | <p>(1-none) (2-Only held after a conflict occurrence) (3-Held regularly but no timeline) (4-Involve the community ad held regularly with timelines ) (5- Held regularly with a timeline and community recommendations are implemented)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>   | 1                     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2  | 3   | 4                     | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4  | Peace seeking missions (Inter-community meeting and negotiations)                | <p>1-none) (2-Only held after conflict occurrence) (3-Held regularly but with no timeline) (4-Held regularly with timelines) (5-Held regularly with a timeline and sustainable solution agreed and implemented)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>  | 1                     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2  | 3   | 4                     | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 5 | Lighting/<br>street lights              | (1-none) (2-one available but not functioning)<br>(3-Functioning but not all times) (4-several light<br>functioning but in safe zone) (5-several high masts<br>and street lights present in volatile areas)   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   | <table><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2                                       | 3   | 4 | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Presence of<br>Police<br>Reservists     | (1-none) (2-available but few)(3- available, considerable<br>number but with no adequate weapons) (4-available,<br>good number, well equipped but poorly trained<br>(5-available, good numbers, well equipped and<br>well trained)  |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   | <table><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2                                       | 3   | 4 | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Presence of<br>Anti-stock theft<br>unit | (1-not operational) (2-operational but help comes from<br>outside the ward) (2-operational, stationed in the ward<br>but only in the safe zone) (3-Operational in the volatile<br>areas in the ward but with few patrols) (5-Operational<br>in volatile areas in the ward with regular patrols) |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   | <table><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2                                       | 3   | 4 | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### APPENDIX III: Livelihood scorecard

| <b>GROUP NAME/LOCATION/WARD:</b>     |  | <b>DATE:</b>   |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>COUNTY:</b>                       |  |  |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>PROGRAMME/SECTOR: LIVELIHOODS</b> |  |  |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO                                   | COMMUNITY CONCERNS                               | SCORE (1-5) The details of the scores are broken down further for each question  | REASONS FOR THE SCORE |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Lifelihoods</b>                   |  |  |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1                                    | Boreholes drilled                                | <p>(1-insuffucient borehole) (2-seasonal borehole)<br/>(3-borehole drilled but contaminated/salty)<br/>(4-boreholes present but distance covered is long)<br/>(5-sufficient boreholes within the accepted radius with clean water).</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>   | 1                     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1                                    | 2  | 3  | 4                     | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                      |  |  |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2                                    | Water pans established                           | <p>(1-No water pans) (2-Dried water pans)<br/>(3-Contaminated yet the pans are present)(4-Water pans available although not sufficient for domestic use) (5-Water pans are available and sufficient for domestic use)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>   | 1                     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1                                    | 2  | 3  | 4                     | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                      |  |  |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3                                    | Household under cash and food for assets program | <p>(1-None) (2-fewer than half of the households benefit) (3- half of the households benefit)<br/>(4-more than half of the households benefit) (5-three-quarter of the households benefit)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>  | 1                     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1                                    | 2  | 3  | 4                     | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                      |  |  |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4                                    | Livestock diseases                               | <p>(1-no vaccination was done in the past one year)<br/>(2-vaccination conducted once a year but not to all animals) (3-vaccination was done more than once but not to all animals) (4-vaccination was done to all animal) (5-vaccination was done more than once and to all animals)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> | 1                     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1                                    | 2  | 3  | 4                     | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                      |  |  |                       |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 5  | On farm irrigation systems  | <p>(1-none) (2-one available but not functioning) (3-Functioning but not all times) (4-several light functioning but in safe zone) (5-several high masts and street lights present in volatile areas)</p> <table> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2   | 3   | 4 | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6  | Livestock commercial off take programs implemented                  | <p>(1-none) (2 mostly after a disaster/drought has struck, (-only during a disaster/drought occurrence period when (4-regularly but with no specific timeline) (5-regularly with specific timeline)</p> <table> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2   | 3   | 4 | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7  | Post-harvest handling (Food storage) assistance from government     | <p>(1-none) (2 it's not present) (3- present but inadequate in terms of facilities and equipment space (4-adequate but accessibility challenges due to distance) (5-adequate and easily accessible)</p> <table> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2   | 3   | 4 | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8  | Market Linkage (programme) by government                            | <p>(1-no programme) (2 heard of the programme but no engaged) (3- engaged with the programme but not satisfied) (4-engaged and satisfied) (5-engaged and highly satisfied)</p> <table> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2   | 3   | 4 | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9  | Demonstration farms/plot by government                              | <p>(1-none) (2-available but irrelevant and inaccessible) (3-available but irrelevant) (4-available and relevant) (5-available, relevant and accessible)</p> <table> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2   | 3   | 4 | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Value Chain project by government (bee keeping,dairy and meat goat) | <p>(1-none) (2-available but irrelevant (3-available) (4-available and relevant) (5-available, relevant and profitable)</p> <table> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2   | 3   | 4 | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|    |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 11 | Institutions<br>(Agricultural<br>offices)                    | <p>(1-none) (2 Present but inactive) (3-Present, active but with insufficient staff) (4-present, with sufficient staff) (5-Present, active programmes and with adequate staff)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2  | 3   | 4 | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Drought<br>Alert (Early<br>warning<br>information)           | <p>(1-none) (2 receive inaccurate alerts) (3-Received alerts after a disaster strikes) (4-regularly alert but with no specific timeline) (5-regular alerts with specific timeline)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2  | 3   | 4 | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Disaster<br>response<br>actions e.g.<br>feed supple-<br>ment | <p>(1-none) (2 Present but not in all disasters) (3-present during all disasters but provide short term solutions and only benefit very few households) (4-present during disaster and provide sustainable solutions but for a few households) (5-Present after every disaster and provide sustainable solutions to majority households)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | 2  | 3   | 4 | 5 |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## APPENDIX IV: Input Tracking Matrix

| <b>COUNTY NAME:</b>                                  |                       |               |         |
|--|-----------------------|---------------|---------|
| <b>DATE:</b>   |                       |               |         |
| INPUT INDICATOR                                      | INPUT AND ENTITLEMENT | ACTUAL OUTFIT | REMARKS |
| The road infrastructure                              |                       |               |         |
| Murram roads in the ward                             |                       |               |         |
| Tarmac roads in the ward                             |                       |               |         |
| Street lighting project                              |                       |               |         |
| Recreation parks / beauty gardens                    |                       |               |         |
| Airstrips/airport                                    |                       |               |         |
| livelihood options                                   |                       |               |         |
| Boreholes drilled                                    |                       |               |         |
| Water pans established                               |                       |               |         |
| Household under cash and food for assets program     |                       |               |         |
| Livestock vaccination                                |                       |               |         |
| Irrigation venture by county and national government |                       |               |         |
| Livestock commercial off take programs implemented   |                       |               |         |
| Livestock under government insurance programme       |                       |               |         |
| Food storage program                                 |                       |               |         |
| Access to formal markets                             |                       |               |         |
| Demonstration farms/plots                            |                       |               |         |
| Construction and equipping of bee keeping workshop   |                       |               |         |

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| Agricultural administration offices   |  |  |  |
| Drought Alert (Early warning information)   |  |  |  |
| Disaster response actions<br>Eg feed supplement                                   |  |  |  |
| peace and security  |  |  |  |
| Police posts in the ward or closest to the ward                                   |  |  |  |
| Community policing and equipment's/facilities for patrolling                      |  |  |  |
| Interventions to promote cohesion, tolerance and minimize violence related deaths |  |  |  |
| Peace seeking missions<br>(Intercommunity meetings and negotiations)              |  |  |  |

ISBN 978-9966-111-22-7

