

Lake Naivasha Landscape

Site Report from Policy Dialogue

Krista Heiner, EcoAgriculture Partners

6/1/2014



Contents

Description of landscape and platform.....	3
Description of methodology for consultations	4
Key ILM issues	5
Innovations and Challenges	5
Financing of landscape activities	9
Supportive government action and gaps in government	10
Recommendations for government action.....	16
Learning themes	19
Reflections on the field work	20

Description of landscape and platform

The Lake Naivasha landscape is located in the eastern Rift Valley in Kenya and encompasses about 3,400 km² the Lake Naivasha watershed, including the upper water catchment area in the mountains, the middle water catchment area, and the lower catchment area which feeds into the lake, which is designated as a Ramsar Convention site and an Important Bird Area. Two main rivers feed into Lake Naivasha: the Malewa, which drains from the Aberdares Mountains, and the Gilgil, which drains from the Mau escarpment ridges. The catchment area also includes the Mau (Eburru and Ol Turoto), Aberdares and Kipipiri forests. The Lake itself varies in size between 100 and 150km², as well as in water level depending on the level of water abstraction from water users within the catchment. The major cities in the region are Naivasha town, Hell's Gate, Gilgil and Engineer. The principal land use activities in the landscape are smallholder agriculture, pastoralism, forestry and tourism. The population of Lake Naivasha has grown substantially in the past 30 years due to the increase in economic activities related to irrigated horticulture and floriculture and geothermal energy generation (Imarisha Naivasha 2012). The Lake Naivasha landscape covers area in three administrative counties: Nakuru, Narok and Nyandarua.

The Imarisha Naivasha Management Board was officially created in May 2011 by the Kenyan government to manage the coordination of the Lake Naivasha Catchment Restoration Programme. The Board is composed of representatives from various stakeholder groups, including national and local government officials, pastoralists, Water User Associations, Lake Naivasha Riparian Association, Lake Naivasha Growers' Group; Community Forest Associations; Beach Management Units; local businesses; the tourism industry; and civil society organizations. The Board reports to the Inter-Ministerial Technical Committee, which is now housed in the Ministry of the Environment, Water and Natural Resources (after the elections in 2013 and the dissolution of the Office of the Prime Minister, which is where it was previously housed). The objectives of the Imarisha Naivasha Management Board are, broadly, to coordinate the activities of the various stakeholders who are engaged in the conservation of the Basin; monitor compliance with laws and regulations; develop and enforce local codes of conduct; and develop and execute a Trust to receive and manage financial resources for the conservation of the Basin (Imarisha Naivasha 2012).

The stakeholders who are directly affected by and influence the resources in the Lake Naivasha Basin are primarily community user groups, such as community forest associations (CFAs), water resource users associations (WRUAs), small-scale farmers associations, commercial flower and horticulture growers, tourism operators, pastoralists groups, self-help groups, and riparian landowners associations. Additionally, the Government of Kenya (at both the county and national levels), international non-governmental organizations (NGOs), like WWF and national NGOs, like Reconcile, are involved in capacity building, advocacy and lobbying within the Basin. Finally, many development partners, such as the German Development Cooperation (GIZ), the Dutch Government, various international tourism operators, the horticulture industry, and research institutions also have a significant interest in the activities within the Basin. Imarisha Naivasha currently coordinates the activities of various stakeholders in the Basin, solicits resources from the national government and international development partners, and mobilizes capacity from the government as well as civil society organizations. It functions as more of a forum and a vehicle for funding, than as an implementation agency. In consultation with stakeholders in the basin, in 2012, Imarisha Naivasha developed the Sustainable Development Action Plan (SDAP) for 2012-2017, and it plans to release an integrated management plan for the entire Lake Naivasha Basin in April 2014.

Description of methodology for consultations

The policy dialogue workshop in the Lake Naivasha landscape was facilitated by EcoAgriculture Partners and the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) over a three day period from April 22-24, 2014. The meetings were organized by the members of the Imarisha Naivasha Board, who developed a list of relevant stakeholders and coordinated the invitations. The first half day of meetings involved 17 governmental officials (in both the county and national government structures) within the Lake Naivasha Basin and took place in the Imarisha-Naivasha Trust Offices in Naivasha town. Thirty-five representatives from a broader selection of relevant governmental and non-governmental stakeholder groups (who were identified by Imarisha Naivasha) attended the second day of meetings, including several of the governmental officials who were present on the first day. Finally, the facilitation team split up into two groups for the last day of meetings and met individually for two hours with representatives from 6 key non-governmental stakeholder groups, including 21 members of the Enaiborr Ajijik Pastoralist Group, 10 members of the three Community Forest Associations, 10 members of the Mkungi and Upper Turasha Water Resource Users Associations, 7 members of the Beach Management Unit, 14 members of the Gilgil Environmental Protection and Advocacy Group (GEPA), and a riparian land owner.

During all of the meetings the facilitators introduced the participants to the landscape framework, the Landscapes for People, Food and Nature (LPFN) initiative, as well as the learning landscape network and the policy dialogue process. Additionally, staff from the Imarisha Naivasha Board gave a brief introduction on the vision, objectives and activities of the Imarisha Naivasha platform.

In the first half day meeting with governmental officials, the facilitator asked the participants to discuss their work related to integrated landscape management currently and the challenges they have encountered. Then, the facilitators split the participants up into 4 small, mixed groups with at least one person from each sector to discuss and present what they thought could be done within the government to better support integrated landscape management.

On the second day of meetings with the full stakeholder group, the facilitators asked the whole group to identify issues within the Lake Naivasha landscape and then prioritize those into five key landscape issues. The facilitators then split the group randomly into five groups that corresponded to the five key landscape issues. The groups were asked to identify and present key challenges they face when trying to deal with these issues, as well as key innovations, or successful activities or practices, they are currently using to address these issues. Then the groups were asked to discuss ways the government is helpful in promoting these innovations and overcoming these challenges, as well as what the government could do better. Finally, the facilitators asked the whole group to reflect on key policy recommendations to communicate to the county- and national-level government officials, and then identify specific innovations and challenges they want to share with and learn from other landscapes in a learning landscape network.

On the third day of meetings, the facilitators asked the smaller stakeholder groups specific questions about their activities, the financing of their activities, the challenges they have encountered and the specific policy recommendations they have for county- and national-level government officials. (A full program for all three days of the meetings can be found in Annex 1.)

Key ILM issues

In a plenary session, the full group of stakeholders identified several issues that impact the Lake Naivasha landscape. The full list includes: pollution, deforestation, encroachment of riparian land, climate change, conflict over resources, forest degradation, land fragmentation, unsustainable fishing, exotic species, flooding and siltation in the lake, population pressure, land use planning, water allocation planning, lack of access to public areas, fragmentation of land, lack of crop variety, poor waste management.

The group was then asked to prioritize which were the five key issues to focus on during this discussion. To do this, the facilitators requested that each person vote for the two issues they felt were the most important in the landscape. The following five issues received the most votes:

1. *Water Allocation Planning*: The Lake Naivasha Basin has experienced considerable problems with water scarcity due to the high-level of water abstraction from various users (especially with the increase in water use from industrial floriculture and horticulture), degradation of water catchments, reduced ground water recharge, and climate change. There are also areas of the landscape with poor access to water and sewerage services, and semi-arid areas where developing adequate water coverage is exceedingly difficult. Furthermore water quality is poor, especially due to the high fluoride content in the Naivasha Basin (RVWS 2006).
2. *Pollution*: Water pollution, especially from farmlands, settlements and industries within the catchment, is causing significant problems for the health of Lake Naivasha and the livelihoods of people who depend on resources from the lake (e.g. fishers, tourism operators). Water quality is also poor for drinking due to the high quantity of fluoride. In addition, solid waste is poorly managed, and sewage treatment plants are inadequate.
3. *Land use planning/ land fragmentation*: The land is being subdivided into increasingly smaller parcels, which are often not as usable by farmers. Also, there is a lack of coordinated land use planning in the Lake Naivasha Basin and unplanned urban development often occurs.
4. *Deforestation*: The forests in the upper part of Lake Naivasha Basin are being degraded and deforested due to overgrazing, high demand for timber, fuelwood and charcoal, encroachment (especially cultivation on steep slopes and riparian areas), and forest fires.
5. *Public Access to Natural Resources*: There are many public natural resources that the stakeholders within the Lake Naivasha Basin have a difficult time accessing. These include the Eburru, Kiburu and Geta forests; Lake Naivasha, Lake Oloiden, and Crater Lake; wetlands and swamps; public dams; Gilgil, Malewa and Marmanet rivers and riverine zones; Hell's Gate National Park; and the land beside public roadways, which is being claimed for private use.

Innovations and Challenges

1. *Water allocation*:

Innovations

- The development of rain water harvesting techniques and water pans for water storage (both on an individual and collective basis)

- The renovation and desiltation of dams
- The construction of treatment ponds and wetlands, primarily by the horticulture and floriculture industry, to help treat waste water
- The collaboration with international partners to finance water conservation structures (i.e. WWF providing water pan liners for farmers).
- Imarisha helped to organize a training conducted by the Kenya Agriculture Research Institute (KARI) for the Gilgil Environmental Protection and Advocacy Group (GEPA) (a community-based organization within the landscape) on arid farming techniques, set up a demonstration farm in the community, and provided agroforestry saplings and drought resistant crop seeds to farmers within that group.
- The development of WRUAs, which are community-based groups that protect and rehabilitate riparian areas in the Basin and were established in 2006 through a provision of the Water Act (2002)
- The development of a water allocation plan for the Basin, which is to be implemented and enforced by WRMA and the WRUAs
- The development of a payment for ecosystem services (PES) scheme in 2010 to deal with the problems of water scarcity in the Basin, in which 600 upstream farmers, primarily on steep land, are paid 1,300 shilings/year and given tree seedlings and napier grass by downstream users (especially the private landowners and large farms) to implement on-farm conservation agriculture practices to prevent soil erosion on their land.

Challenges

- Inadequate quantity of water in the lake, rivers and boreholes to meet the demand from the population. Competing demands for water between different stakeholder groups, including the hotels, flower industry, farmers and pastoralists
- Balancing the distribution of water between competing uses, such as human consumption, biodiversity, environmental requirements, livestock, and fish, especially given the uneven distribution of water throughout the landscape (i.e. riparian areas have more access to water, while areas in the middle catchment have less)
- Some water users are not adequately considered in the water allocation plan (i.e. pastoralists).
- Not all farmers are able to participate in the PES program, because there are often not enough buyers for the services downstream and not all farmers are aware of it.
- The duplication of efforts to conserve and regulate water use among various partners and government agencies and the lack of communication between sectors on water allocation issues causes confusion.
- The high expense of improved water conservation practices and the lack of funds for improving infrastructure for water storage (i.e. dams) prohibit the degree to which technical solutions can be used to solve the water scarcity problem.

2. Land Use Planning:

Innovations:

- The PES program
- The development of WRUAs

- The restoration and establishment of water pans and small dams
- Training and support for land use planning and management
- The development of land use rules within the catchment

Challenges:

- Inadequate training on good agricultural practices due to a lack of extension services and farmers' ignorance
- Policies on land use are often poorly implemented and the regulations are not well enforced, particularly in riparian areas.
- Unplanned development in urban areas and unplanned waste management
- Climate change

3. *Pollution:*

Innovations:

- The PES program
- Constructed wetlands
- Solid waste management programs that separate composting, trash and recycling
- The promotion of sustainable land management practices, like integrated pest management and the use of biological control for invasive species
- The increase in levels of public knowledge and awareness about pollution, especially as a result of the Environmental Impact Assessment process
- The development of institutions like NEMA, WRUAs, and Imarisha, which monitor pollution levels in the water
- The provision of facilities to monitor pollution, especially by research institutions like Kenya Marine Fisheries Research Institute (KEMFRI)

Challenges:

- Poor urban infrastructure planning
- The high cost of waste management
- The lack of access to and adoption of technology
- Weak policies and awareness of those policies
- Ineffective monitoring and enforcement
- Inadequate awareness of the impacts of pollution
- Limited information on the sources of non-point source pollution

4. *Deforestation:*

Innovations:

- The formation of Community Forest Associations (CFAs), which started with the passing of the Forest Act (2005)
- The development of participatory forest management plans that identify community user rights (such as beekeeping, grazing, traditional medicine, etc.) to forest resources and

mechanisms to improve the livelihoods of forest users (such as the development ecotourism, wool preparation, improved stoves, and bamboo handicraft businesses)

- The signing of forest management agreements between the CFAs and KFS, which allow for the co-management of forest resources
- The Plantation Establishment and Livelihood Improvement Scheme (PELIS) program, in which protected land that is used for plantation forestry by KFS is subdivided among CFA members who are allowed to grow crops, harvest grass and firewood, and graze animals in the forest land, in exchange for helping KFS plant and care for the plantation trees
- The fencing off of several forests (including areas in Eburru and the Aberdares)
- Reforestation programs initiated by NEMA, KenGen, Lake Naivasha Growers' Group, KFS, the county government, and the private sector
- The practice of planting trees during ceremonies (such as burials, world environment day, and launching events)
- Imarisha, in partnership with KFS and the Ministry of Agriculture, actively supports GEPA, the CFAs and the WRUAs to develop nurseries and plant trees in riparian areas.

Challenges:

- The increase in human population in the Basin
- Lack of awareness of the impacts of deforestation
- High demand for timber, fuelwood and charcoal
- Poverty
- Excision of forest land by the government
- Inadequate enforcement of policies and legislation
- Corruption and bad politics
- Forest fires

5. Lack of public access to natural resources:

Innovations:

- For forest resources, the establishment of CFAs and forest conservancy committees, the development of management plans and management agreements, and the establishment of WRUAs
- For access to resources in the lake, the commencement of stakeholder meetings to address the issue of public access, the development of integrated management plans, and the presence of public-private partnerships to promote more equitable access to riparian resources
- For access to wildlife resources, there are community partnerships with KWS
- For access to public land near roadways, the county government has ordered the reclamation of land near roads to deal with the problem of encroachment by private landowners

Challenges:

- For forest resources, public access is a challenge because the forests are controlled by KFS and the bureaucracy is difficult to navigate in order to obtain the required permits.
- The resources in and around the lakes are difficult to access because of the enclosure of many riverine areas by private landowners and the lack of structures in place to promote the public use of the lake.
- Water from storage areas, like dams, is also difficult to access because many dams have been claimed by private landowners.
- The public also has very restricted access to the national parks and wildlife resources in the Basin, which are controlled by Kenya Wildlife Services.
- Finally, the reserves alongside public roads are also being used by private landowners, and this blocks water pathways and causes problems for water drainage.

Cross-cutting issues:

Innovations:

- Imarisha provides a platform for the coordination of various bodies, including between civil society organizations, like the CFAs and WRUAs who work together on tree planting in riparian areas, as well as between civil society and government bodies.
- There is a District Civil Society Organization (CSO) Forum (formerly the Lake Naivasha CSO forum), in which representatives from civil society groups within the district can meet and discuss current programs and activities.
- There are many management plans within the Lake Naivasha Basin, including the Sustainable Development Action Plan, sub-catchment plans for the WRUAs, and a Water Allocation Plan

Financing of landscape activities

The funding for Imarisha Naivasha's programs are largely based public-private partnerships between floriculture and horticulture retailers and the Government of Kenya. Four UK retailers, ASDA, Tesco, Marks, and Spencer and Sainsbury's, provide over \$300,000 per year for Imarisha's activities, and the Lake Naivasha Growers Group (LNGG) agreed to pay a new tax to the town of Naivasha to fund infrastructure (Kissinger 2014). The LNGG members also contribute payments for a PES program, which compensated smallholders in the upper catchment to address issues with soil erosion.

The Government of Kenya (GOK) has dedicated \$3,500,000 to fund the operational support for Imarisha and activities of various line ministries operating in the Basin (Kissinger 2014).

Additionally, a significant amount of funding comes from partnerships. For example the Kenyan Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands committed KES 420 million in 2012 for the IWRAP program, which will be implemented by WWF Kenya, Imarisha Naivasha, WRMA, community associations, and other technical assistance partners. The German Development Corporation (GIZ) also provides short-term funding for 12 WRUAs to help implement sub-catchment management plans in the Basin. Development partners can also contribute through mechanisms within the Government of Kenya itself, like the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) contributing to the GOK-sponsored Water Services Trust Fund, which funds some of the activities of the WRUAs (Kissinger 2014).

Most of the smaller, community-based organizations fund their activities in the landscape through a combination of membership contributions, donor-funded projects, and small-scale grants from the government. In the case of GEPA, farmers sell seedlings and vegetables as a source of financing, and they are further supported by the government sponsored Women's Fund, as well as projects funded by WWF and Imarisha. Similarly, the CFAs receive money from membership fees, annual fees that farmers pay to participate in the PELIS program, and fees for the use of forest resources that are managed by the CFA. WRUAs also receive money from members' contributions, as well as from government grants, such as the Water Service Trust Fund.

Supportive government action and gaps in government action

1. Water Allocation:

Supportive government action:

- *Incentivizer*
 - Direct funding to individuals and groups through the Njamarufuku program for constructing water harvesting structures (water pans, desiltation of dams, etc.)
 - Funding for WRUAs to develop and implement activities identified within their sub-catchment management plans through the Water Services Trust Fund (established by the Water Act (2002))
 - Funding for Imarisha-Naivasha Program
- Knowledge and capacity developer
 - Water Service Board and Department of Agriculture provide training on the construction of water harvesting structures
 - Water Resources Management Authority (WRMA), Department of Agriculture and Kenya Forest Service (KFS) educate and provide training to the WRUAs and riparian users about how to conserve and rehabilitate degraded land to stabilize river banks (sometimes as part of the PES program)
 - Fisheries Department works with Imarisha Naivasha to advocate for alternative livelihoods which do not rely on water abstraction, such as fish farming
 - WRMA and Imarisha have developed 8 large signs posted throughout the landscape to alert users about the current water level and advise water users on the amount of water abstraction allowed given the current conditions.
- Infrastructure developer for ILM
 - Ministry of Water rehabilitates silted dams
 - Rift Valley Water Services Board (RVSB) assists with the development of water supply systems
- Lawmaker/regulator
 - NEMA, WRMA, RVSB regulate water quality
 - Water Act (2002) provides a means for regulating water use by allocating permits issued by WRMA

- Water Allocation Plan (WAP) developed by WRMA in collaboration with Imarisha-Naivasha and other stakeholders to manage the water abstraction from the Basin
- Convener of stakeholders
 - Development of the WRUAs (through a provision in the Water Act (2002)), which allows WRMA to reach grassroots and coordinate actions across the Basin
 - Development of Imarisha-Naivasha Program

Gaps in government action

- Lawmaker/regulator
 - Lack of enforcement of the Water Act and Water Allocation Plan due to inadequate resources and lack of political good will
 - WRMA does not have enough staff, resources (there is only 1 vehicle), or technical capacity to adequately enforce the regulations
 - WRUAs do not have the power to prosecute people who abstract water illegally
 - Competition between the national and county governments regarding the ownership of water
 - PES not legislated/mandated
- Incentivizer
 - WRMA and Department of Water do not have enough resources to fund administration or personnel
- Knowledge and capacity developer
 - WRMA and Department of Agriculture do not have enough staff, resources or technical capacity to support riparian users
- Convener of stakeholders
 - Duplication of efforts and lack of coordination of government entities managing water (i.e. Water Services Board, WRMA, Ministry of Water, etc.)

2. Land use planning

Supportive government actions:

- Lawmaker and regulator
 - Forest Act (2005), Water Act (2002), Environmental Management and Coordination Act (EMCA) (1999), Wildlife Conservation and Management Act (2013)
- Knowledge and capacity developer
 - Devolution makes it easier for grassroots to access government services
 - Extension agents (especially in the Department of Agriculture) build the capacity of community members and promote sustainable agriculture (including soil conservation, agroforestry, and improved cook stoves).
 - Green initiatives in schools (i.e. tree nursery development)

- Development of mobile soil nutrient testing, which provides farmers with important information about soil quality in different areas of the landscape
- Supports development of technology by funding research institutions, such as Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KEMFRI) and Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI)
- Imarisha-Naivasha helped support the training of several Department of Agriculture officers
- Incentivizer
 - Direct funding to individuals and groups through Njamarufuku program

Gaps in government actions:

- Lawmaker and regulator
 - Lack of enforcement of regulations dealing with land use
 - Many national-level policies have not yet been adopted by the county-level government regarding agriculture
 - Establishment of industrial parks has been suggested, but not fully adopted
- Convener of stakeholders
 - Lack of coordination within government bodies regarding land use planning
- Knowledge and capacity builder
 - Department of Agriculture does not have much interaction with farmers, unless the farmers solicit their services by coming to their office, because of the lack of resources and trained extension personnel
- Incentivizer
 - Department of Agriculture has not yet received funds to carry out their work from the county government. They currently conduct most of their work through partnerships with Imarisha Naivasha and WWF.

3. Pollution

Supportive government actions:

- Lawmaker and regulator
 - Enactment of Public Health Act (Rev. 2012), EMCA (1999), Water Act (2002)
 - Provide security, conflict resolution structures, and arbitration, which supports the development of the actions by other stakeholders
 - Development of structures for pollution management (i.e. NEMA, WRMA, Water Services Board)
- Incentivizer
 - Resource mobilization for personnel and infrastructure
- Knowledge and capacity builder
 - Support KEMFRI and KARI leading to innovation and technology development

Gaps in government actions:

- Lawmaker and regulator
 - Weak enforcement of regulations on water quality and solid waste management due to inadequate resources and lack of political good will
 - No customization of national policies at the county level to better fit with local conditions
 - Unclear roles of national and county government regarding pollution management
 - Lack of transparency and accountability of government bodies
 - Slow decision-making processes

4. Deforestation:

Supportive government actions:

- Lawmaker and regulator
 - Revision of Forest Act (2005)
 - Conditions for benefits sharing with CFAs
 - Provisions for participatory forest management/co-management of forest resources
 - Reintroduced the PELIS program
 - Recent revision of Wildlife Act (2013)
 - Enforcement of regulations by KFS, KWS, CFAs
 - KFS patrols forest areas
 - KFS manages forest fires
 - KWS mitigates and compensates for human-wildlife conflicts
- Knowledge and capacity builder
 - KFS provides training to CFAs in forest management
 - Green initiatives in schools to plant 100,000 seedlings
 - KFS collaborates with farmers to construct tree nurseries and reforest areas of the watershed
- Incentivizer
 - KFS facilitates funding/financing of forest-related projects
 - KFS provided modern stoves to CFA members
- Convener of stakeholders
 - Pending merger of KFS and KWS
- Visioner
 - National goal of reaching 10% tree cover by 2030

Gaps in government action:

- Convener of stakeholders
 - Conflicting roles and policies between government entities

- CFAs have difficulty accessing KFS officials, which often impedes their projects
- CFAs have a somewhat antagonistic relationship with KFS, in that they feel like many KFS officials do not fully support co-management policies.
- Regulator and lawmaker
 - Unclear devolution guidelines regarding the management of forest resources
 - Inadequate enforcement of Forest Act due to lack of resources and political goodwill
 - Forest Act (2005)
 - Allows for formation of community management agreements/plans, but the process of creating them is very expensive and time consuming and KFS is often reluctant to undertake that process; therefore, many CFAs were forced to rely on international donors, like WWF, to fund the development of their participatory management plans
 - Rules regarding benefit sharing are unclear
- Knowledge and capacity builder
 - KFS has difficulty convincing farmers in riparian areas to plant and care for seedlings on their land
- Visioner
 - KFS has inadequate money and staff to reach goal of 10% tree cover by 2030

5. Lack of public access to natural resources:

Gaps in government action:

- Lawmaker and regulator
 - Lack of enforcement and implementation of policies because of shortage of personnel
- Convener of stakeholders
 - Competition between government agencies and sectors
 - Overlapping mandates between government agencies and levels of government which lead to duplication and conflicts of interest
- Knowledge and capacity builder
 - Lack of a central point for access to and dissemination of information

General landscape management issues:

Supportive government action:

- Convener of stakeholders
 - Development of partnerships between local, county, national and international entities
 - Development of several community-based natural resource management entities, including the CFAs, WRUAs, and Beach Management Units (BMUs)(organizations of fishermen around the lake)

- County government is also starting to provide funding for intra-county forums for natural resources management
- Ministry of Devolution and Planning coordinates activities in the devolution process
- Monthly sub-county meetings for county-level ministries to exchange and coordinate activities (District Executive Committees that coordinated activities within the district are no longer existent due to the changes from devolution)
- Information
 - Marine Fisheries Department disseminates technical information and research on fisheries management in the lake through annual stakeholder forums and Open Days
- Lawmaker and regulator
 - Development of arrangements to provide for co-management of resources with CFAs, WRUAs and BMUs
- Knowledge and capacity builder
 - Ministry of Devolution and Planning provides training to sub-county organizations in monitoring and evaluation

Gaps in government actions:

- Knowledge and Capacity Builder
 - Community-based groups, including Gilgil Environmental Protection and Advocacy group, must now seek the help of government representatives by going to their offices, instead of the government coming to the farmers to provide extension services as was previously the case
 - Lack of information about government programs
 - Lack of transparency and accountability of government bodies
 - Lack of a central point for the access and dissemination of information
- Convener of stakeholders
 - Competition between sectors in the government
 - Mechanisms for cross jurisdictional-boundary collaboration are not currently in place
 - Difficult to coordinate activities between groups in the upper, middle and lower parts of the watershed, because the Basin is located in three counties
 - Difficult to harmonize planning between different sub-counties, because some technical officers (i.e. WRMA) operate in the entire county, while others operate within sub-counties boundaries (i.e. Ministry of Agriculture, KFS)
- Lawmaker and regulator
 - Much uncertainty regarding the roles of the parastatal organizations, boards and ministries
 - Waiting for an Executive Order in the next few months to clarify their new roles and responsibilities

- Lack of harmonization and coordination between the national and county-level governments, largely the result of unclear devolution guidelines, which have resulted in unclear responsibilities, overlapping mandates and conflicts of interest
- Incentivizer
 - Many county-level governments have not yet disbursed funds to the devolved ministries (Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries Department, etc.)

Recommendations for government action

1. Water allocation:

- Lawmaker and regulator
 - Revise the Water Act (2002)
 - Give WRUAs the power to help WRMA enforce the Water Act and the Water Allocation Plan and be compensated for their efforts (This is currently being piloted in the landscape.)
 - Designate a percentage of money collected by WRMA for fines and permits for the coordination and management of the WRUAs
 - Enforce Water Act and Water Allocation Plan more effectively
 - Mandate PES to encourage more farmers and buyers downstream to participate
- Knowledge and capacity builder
 - Build capacity and awareness of riparian users about the PES program in order to improve participation
 - Build capacity of WRUAs on water management and help them to create awareness about the benefits of conserving and rehabilitating riparian land among the larger community
- Incentivizer
 - Encourage the participation of the private sector in the PES program through incentives like tax breaks
 - Provide mechanisms for more equitable sharing of benefits (of conservation) with the communities who conserve water and riparian areas
 - GEPA emphasized that it is difficult to convince the community to participate in riparian land conservation, if they themselves do not have adequate access to clean water. They recommended that the government work through Water Services Providers to ensure that clean water is provided (i.e. water distribution system and routes for livestock to access the river) to communities who participate in landscape-wide water conservation schemes.

2. Land use planning:

- Knowledge and capacity builder

- Train the pastoral community in agri-pastoralism techniques
- Train farmers in agroforestry and other techniques to more effectively use small land parcels
- Lawmaker and regulator
 - Review current policies and eliminate conflicting laws, especially between WRMA, the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of the Environment regarding activities allowed within riparian areas
 - Review and realign Agriculture Act with the devolution of the government
 - Agriculture committees (which used to be housed under the District Government) are no longer in place following devolution
- Convener of stakeholders
 - Form task forces and technical working teams at the county and national level to improve collaboration and integrated planning

3. Pollution:

- Knowledge and capacity builder
 - Increase the training of county and sub-county government officials on monitoring pollution and pollution management
 - Play a more active role in the dissemination of information regarding pollution to the public
 - Fund applied research to develop technologies to address pollution more effectively
- Incentivizer
 - Provide a tax exemption for farmers who manage pollution effectively
- Lawmaker and regulator
 - Enhance enforcement of current laws regarding pollution
 - Put in place policy mechanisms to allow for the rapid response to pollution
- Convener of stakeholders
 - Develop a public-private partnership for pollution management

4. Deforestation:

- Lawmaker and regulator
 - Revise the Forest Act (2005) to include clear guidelines on benefits sharing
 - The CFAs recommend that a percentage of the timber sold by the government as part of the PELIS program be given to the CFAs to support their operations.
- Knowledge and capacity builder
 - Improve training of CFAs
 - Include CFAs in trainings with KFS officials, so that the two groups can become familiar with each other and begin to trust each other more.
- Convener of stakeholders
 - Improve coordination of CFAs

- Provide a mechanism to fund the coordination and organization of CFAs within the landscape
- KFS, CFAs, WRUAs and WRMA should jointly decide which areas should be reforested, in order to enhance synergies between their different goals

5. Public Access to Natural Resources:

- Convener of stakeholders
 - Develop periodic inter-county forums to better coordinate the activities between these jurisdictions
 - Enhance collaboration between KFS and KWS to avoid duplication of activities and confusion
 - Better incorporate county governments into the management system already in place
 - Enhance opportunities for public consultation and participation in policy making
- Visioner
 - Prioritize issues within the government, so that critical areas within the landscape receive funding first

General recommendations:

- Lawmaker and regulator
 - Improve the enforcement of current policies. This was especially the case for the Water Act (2002) and the Water Allocation Plan for the Basin
 - The GEPA group suggested that the government involve the chiefs more in the enforcement of laws, like the Water Act, because they are well respected among the community members.
 - Ensure the effective and timely transfer of resources from the county government to sub-county entities is needed in order to implement and enforce the existing policies
 - Improve integration of current policies at both county and national levels
 - Review current policies in order to find incongruences and conflicts between sectors and harmonize current policies so the sectors are in greater agreement
 - Review devolution policies to clarify roles of national and county governments
 - Allow county governments to develop their own policies that are better tailored to local conditions than the current national policies
 - Review sanctions and provide more support to the county level to enforce national-level policies
- Knowledge and capacity builder
 - Devote more resources to creating awareness of current policies and building the capacities of government and civil society to implement policies already in place

- Promote information sharing within government entities at the sub-county level, in order to harmonize policies that are in effect within the county
- Increase the number and training of government personnel, especially extension services
- Better link national level research institutions to government extension services, so that the more up-to-date information can be passed on to the grassroots level
- Increase capacity and awareness among both government officials and civil society regarding the new policies and structures within the devolved government system and about the activities of government institutions in various sectors and their roles
- Enhance communication and information sharing between sectors and between different partners. Establish a database that would be accessible to all stakeholders
- Increase capacity of governmental staff in integrated landscape management ideas
- Develop a curriculum about landscapes in primary and secondary schools and universities
- Convener of stakeholders
 - Increase the participation and consultation of the community in the policy-making process
 - Promote the development of public-private partnerships between the community, investors, and the government
- Incentivizer
 - Allocate adequate resources (both human and material) to allow the government officials at the county level to better perform their roles
- Visioner
 - Increase high-level political support for integrated landscape management

Learning themes

In a plenary session, all of the stakeholders identified several innovations that they would like to share with other landscapes in a learning network. They include:

- Using the principle of public private partnerships (PPP) to improve integrated landscape management
- How to involve multiple stakeholders in the process of planning
- How to have forums for information sharing
- How to develop a PES program
- How to deal with water-related conflicts (especially the relationship between WRMA and the WRUAs within the water catchment)
- The importance of having a well-defined territory in order to bring people together
- The process of integrated planning, especially starting from sector-level plans (i.e. beach management, CFAs, WRUAs) and then moving to the SDAP, and finally to the integrated management plan
- The importance of having a well-defined vision, roles and responsibilities of the coordinating platform; and
- How to raise financial resources, especially through the PPP process.

Similarly, in a plenary session, the stakeholders present also identified things they would like to learn from other landscapes in a learning landscape network. These include:

- How other locations are managing PES programs, especially how they are engaging the affected stakeholders
- Effective governance structures in the management of integrated landscapes
- Modern technologies that can be used to improve waste management in the landscape;
- How to get a consensus among diverse stakeholders on issues, especially given that stakeholders often have different priorities
- How other landscapes promote self-regulation in order to control overexploitation, instead of relying on enforcement from an external party (i.e. the government); and
- How other landscapes are implementing benefits-sharing schemes, so that stakeholders who conserve the resources also benefit from their conservation.

Reflections on the field work

What went well

Large stakeholder meeting: There was good attendance and representation of all of the various government and non-governmental bodies. The meeting was well facilitated, and the flow of the meeting from one session to another was good. There was active participation among many of the participants. To select the priority landscape issues for further discussion, we used a voting system, where each of the participants were able to vote for two landscape issues that they thought deserved the most attention in this workshop. This was a fairly easy and quick way to prioritize the issues. The closure of the large stakeholder meeting was good, and adequate time was devoted to wrapping up the day and discussing next steps. The group work went well; participants generally enjoyed working in small groups of 5-6 people and then presenting their information back to the larger group.

Policymaker meeting: There was a fairly good representation of the government agencies at the meeting. The participants generally understood the landscape approach and were able to contribute useful suggestions for recommendations.

Small-group stakeholder meetings: Meeting with civil society groups individually was very effective. There was a lot of information that was discussed during these short two-hour meetings. It was much easier for the facilitators to clarify unclear statements and ask pertinent follow-up questions. The stakeholders were also very engaged. It was useful to travel to them and interesting to see where they operated in the landscape.

What could have gone better

Large stakeholder meeting: There was not adequate time allocated to the sessions. Many participants felt that they did not have adequate time to respond to the questions and several sessions were modified or cut short in order to accommodate the time constraints. There was too much planned in the program for a one-day meeting; 1.5 days would have been better. Extra time should be added into the program for externalities. Some of the participants wished the meeting had been conducted more in Swahili so that everyone would feel comfortable participating. The logistics of the meeting could have been planned better, however. There was a lack of markers, stationary, flipcharts, etc. The sessions on

the introductions were very heavy and did not require very much participation of the participants. The objectives of the meeting could have been explained better; some participants were not clear why the meeting was taking place. There also need to be more “take home messages” that are very simple (i.e. the stool analogy for ILM). The large stakeholder meeting included representatives from the government as well as civil society, and it seemed that sometimes civil society members were reluctant to contribute honestly in the presence of the government officials.

Policy maker meeting: There was no one from NEMA or KWS at the meeting. The presentations and introductions ran long and there was not enough time for group work. The policy recommendations that were developed were not as specific and clear as they could have been; the facilitators should have done more to make the policy issues and recommendations concrete and concise. There should have been a summary of the key policy recommendations at the end of the meeting so that the policymakers would be able to take certain messages back with them. The recommendations should also be filtered into specific issues.

Small-group stakeholder meetings: The travel between the meeting locations was difficult and the facilitators were late to several meetings, which frustrated the groups. It was sometimes difficult to get specific policy recommendations from the groups; they often preferred to give a list of things they wanted the government to do (i.e. build a school, provide clean water, etc.).

Recommendations for modes of future engagement in the landscape/county

The members of the Imarisha Naivasha Board are very interested in engaging more with the LPFN and EcoAgriculture Partners. They would like a more long-term engagement and were frustrated with the short-term nature of this process. They seemed very excited to discuss policy issues and share information with other landscapes. They will be attending the June meeting in Nairobi. They were very easy to work with and seem to be well respected within the Basin, so I would recommend working through them to engage with specific stakeholders. They have good relationships with both government officials and civil society organizations.