

Public Policy for Integrated Landscape Management in Kenya

Executive Summary of the Report from the National Dialogue

25th-26th June, 2014

Introduction

Challenges with food security, poverty, climate change, ecosystem degradation and biodiversity loss are highly interlinked. These interconnections are increasingly apparent in Kenya's growing economy, where ecosystem degradation enhances food insecurity and poverty, and poverty and food insecurity exacerbate the pressure on scarce natural resources. Furthermore, many of these interactions occur at a scale that spans multiple jurisdictions, only adding to its complexity. Integrated solutions that sustain vital ecosystem services, enhance food production, and improve human health and well-being simultaneously and operate at a landscape scale are required to address these complex challenges. Integrated Landscape Management (ILM) is one increasingly used approach to achieving these types of integrated solutions that maximizes synergies and minimizes tradeoffs between different land uses. ILM refers to the long-term collaboration among different groups of land managers and stakeholders to achieve multiple objectives required from a landscape, which typically includes agricultural production, provision of ecosystem services, protection of biodiversity and development of local livelihoods. While there are many different approaches to ILM, most share features of broad stakeholder participation, negotiation around objectives and strategies, and adaptive management based on shared learning.ⁱ

Despite the many successes with integrated approaches to landscape management in Kenya, there remain considerable challenges, including poor coordination among stakeholders within the landscape, inadequate training and skills, lack of awareness and information, inadequate funding and incentives, and poor infrastructure, to name a few. Furthermore, to be implemented effectively, integrated landscape approaches require a framework of enabling policies and institutions to support multi-sectoral coordination and planning at a landscape scale. With the birth of the new Constitution in Kenya in 2010, provisions were made for the devolution of many functions of the government in multiple sectors to 47 county governments. One of the main objectives of this action was to give the powers of self-governance to the people and enhance their participation in the exercise of the powers of the State and in making decisions that affect them. In addition to new opportunities, these recent changes also present important challenges for policy change and coordination.

To understand these opportunities and challenges further, EcoAgriculture Partnersⁱⁱ, in partnership with the World Agroforestry Centre's (ICRAF) Sustainable Rural Institutions (SRI) projectⁱⁱⁱ under the coordination of the Landscapes for People, Food and Nature (LPFN) Initiative^{iv} began a process to improve the policy and institutional framework for ILM in Kenya based on policy-maker and civil society engagement.

While there are roles for the public sector, private sector and civil society in the promotion of ILM, this process specifically focused on the role of the public sector in creating an enabling policy framework and supportive institutional environment for ILM. Policy in this case refers to a set of principles, rules and guidelines designed to influence actions. A policy dialogue seeks to exchange information and build

consensus recommendations between the public, private, and civic sectors through leaders who are in a position to forge alliances, make decisions, or strongly influence the trajectory of a possible solutions to challenging issues.^v In this case, the goal of the policy dialogue process was to improve the policy and institutional framework for ILM in Kenya based on landscape leader engagement and national and county-level policymaker engagement. More specifically, the objectives of the process were:

- To identify the policy needs and recommendations from Kenyan Integrated Landscape Initiatives
- To assess the elements of Kenya's current policy and institutional frameworks
- To identify ILM policy perspectives of key policymakers
- To facilitate an exchange of ideas among landscape leaders and policymakers
- To develop an action plan for landscape leaders and policymakers to work together to improve the policy environment for ILM.

Policy-Dialogue Process

The Kenya Policy Dialogue process was composed of three components:

1. Landscape-actor scoping

Five sites were selected for in-depth studies to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the policy and institutional environment for ILM. These sites were selected based on the type of agro-ecological zones, livelihood characteristics and the type of institutional arrangements or stakeholder platforms present to ensure a diverse set of integrated landscape initiatives operating in a variety of policy and institutional conditions. These sites included a range of stages of multi-stakeholder coordination: some sites had formal multi-stakeholder platforms, while in others, the stakeholders were only coordinating informally previously and were all brought together for the first time during these discussions. The five sites include:

1. **Embu:** Embu County is located in the humid highland slopes of Mt. Kenya. It covers an area of 2,555.90 km². The main agricultural activities include growing cash crops, such as tea, coffee, cotton and macadamia nuts, as well as livestock rearing and food production for subsistence purposes. While there is no multi-stakeholder collaboration platform that focuses on ILM exclusively at this point, there are many groups of stakeholders that have been collaborating within the landscape on issues of poverty, land fragmentation, market development, environmental degradation, water use, climate change, and human-wildlife conflict. Embu was one of the sites for the Strengthening Rural Institutions (SRI) Project, which builds the capacity of smallholder farmer groups through a participatory process.
2. **Lari:** The Lari Landscape is part of the larger Kikuyu Escarpment that lies on the eastern slopes of the Aberdare Mountains of Central Kenya. The landscape, which is approximately 442 km², is located in Kiambu County. Forest covers about 37,000 hectares and is designated as an Important Biodiversity Area. Ninety percent of the population is engaged in cultivation, and the average size of the land is 0.8 hectares. While tea is the main cash crop in the landscape, there has been shift to livestock rearing and high-value horticultural enterprises in recent years. Dairy production, mostly zero grazing, is practiced due to the small land holding per household. Kijabe Environment Volunteers (KENVO) has been involved in the management of the landscape since 1996, with the aim of achieving both biodiversity conservation and livelihood improvement. In early 2012, KENVO, in partnership with EcoAgriculture Partners, facilitated a visioning workshop for the landscape to discuss the specific objectives and goals of the landscape platform.

3. **Naivasha:** The Lake Naivasha Landscape is located in the eastern Rift Valley in Kenya and encompasses about 3,400 km² of 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. The lake is designated as a Ramsar Convention site and an Important Bird Area. The principal land-use activities in the landscape are smallholder agriculture, pastoralism, forestry and tourism. The Lake Naivasha Landscape includes 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, and it reports to the Inter-Ministerial Technical Committee, which is now housed in the Ministry of the Environment, Water and Natural Resources. 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. 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.
4. **Bungoma:** Bungoma County covers 2,068 km² of land along the foothills of Mt. Elgon in western Kenya. The main economic activity is agriculture, with farmers mainly cultivating maize, sunflower, sugarcane, coffee, tobacco, potatoes, beans and some cattle. While there is no multi-stakeholder collaboration platform that focuses on ILM exclusively at this point, there are many groups of stakeholders that have been collaborating within the landscape around issues of land fragmentation, water scarcity and pollution, poverty, deforestation, and soil fertility. Bungoma was one of the sites for the Strengthening Rural Institutions (SRI) Project, which builds the capacity of smallholder farmer groups through a participatory process.
5. **Laikipia:** The Laikipia Landscape covers the whole of Laikipia County, which is located in central Kenya. It covers an area of 9,462 km², including a plateau bordered by the Great Rift Valley to the West, the Aberdares Mountain Range to the South and Mt. Kenya to the South-East. The Landscape is endowed with several natural resources, including pasture land, forests, wildlife, and water resources. Wildlife has become a major source of conflict between the farming and pastoralist communities; however, tourism plays a key role as a source of income within the County. Eighty-five percent of the population engages in agriculture (both crop and livestock production) which is the most important source of household income. The East Africa Wild Life Society has had a long engagement with stakeholders in the Landscape and has helped the stakeholders to establish the Laikipia County Natural Resources Network (LAICONAR). This platform was formed in February 2012 through a series of consultations on natural resource issues affecting Laikipia County, and it includes Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), Community Based Organizations (CBOs), the private sector, national and county government organizations, and academia.

A team of researchers spent three days in each site to meet the key actors, convene focus groups with important stakeholder groups, review documentation and visit important areas. The researchers surveyed individuals and groups in each of these sites using a five stage process, which was composed of the following elements:

1. **Issue Identification:** Participants were asked to identify landscape issues that incorporate the tenets of agricultural production, environmental conservation and rural livelihoods. Then, through a priority voting mechanism, the participants identified the top ILM issues to be deliberated in the next stages.
2. **Stakeholder mapping:** Participants were asked to identify relevant stakeholders who should be involved in addressing each of the top landscape issues.
3. **Identification of innovations and challenges:** Participants were asked to identify best practices they have used to tackle these landscape issues as well as challenges they currently face.
4. **Role of public policy in the ILM context:** Participants were asked to outline helpful roles the government has played in the landscape as well as current gaps in public policy and recommendations for how policies and institutions could be developed or modified to better support ILM.
5. **Knowledge sharing and learning networks:** Participants were asked to identify successful aspects that they would be willing to share with other landscapes and problem areas in their landscapes that could be addressed by learning about successful practices in other landscapes.

The information acquired from this process in each of the five landscapes was analyzed, and the research team drafted a report on its findings. These reports were then synthesized into a summary report which was circulated to all participants in the national policy dialogue prior to the event.

2. Policy scoping: National and sub-national policymakers representing the agriculture, environment, forestry, wildlife conservation, water, and climate change sectors were identified for key informant interviews. Relevant topics and actors were also identified through supplemental desk research undertaken by EcoAgriculture Partners. A research team interviewed some of these policymakers using a standardized interview protocol to address the following topics:

- Identification of the current elements of policy and institutional environment relevant to ILM;
- Identification of policy and institutional changes in discussion that could be relevant to ILM;
- Implications of the current policy and institutional environment on the implementation of ILM;
- The impact of Kenya's new (2010) constitution, especially the devolution of power to county governments, on this policy and institutional environment and how these changes will impact the implementation and scaling of ILM;
- Opportunities to improve the policy or institutional environment to support ILM, including the identification of priority areas for innovation.

3. Dialogue: A multi-day workshop was convened in June where civil society landscape representatives, two from each of the five target landscapes, county-level policymakers, and national-level policy makers met to discuss and share their experiences. The workshop included presentations based on the reports of the first two components of the policy dialogue process (i.e. policy scoping and landscape scoping), and the discussion focused on the current challenges with the policy and institutional framework and opportunities for future improvement. This report summarizes the findings of the final national-level policy dialogue workshop.

Main results of the National Policy Dialogue

Knowledge sharing on multi-stakeholder collaboration

Representatives from each of the sites presented posters describing the innovations they have developed and challenges they currently face with multi-stakeholder, collaborative management at a landscape scale. Representatives from:

- Embu presented how participatory planning tools have been used to ensure ownership among stakeholders at the community level, as well as challenges with bringing together different stakeholders at the county/landscape level.
- Lari presented how partnerships were built between different stakeholders for sustainable land management, as well as challenges with land subdivision, loss of soil fertility and lack of market access.
- Bungoma presented different kinds of leadership that are needed to successfully pull resources together, as well as challenges faced in providing incentives to various types of stakeholders to work together.
- Laikipia highlighted the collaborative approach to natural resource management that they employ through the LAICONAR platform, as well as challenges with conflicting interests among stakeholders and inter-county tension due to shared resources.
- Naivasha presented their approach to landscape governance through the Imarisha-Naivasha Initiative, as well as several challenges they face in getting a consensus among diverse stakeholders.

Following the presentations by each site, a question and answer session and a more general discussion about how to implement integrated landscape management ensued.

Roles of the public sector

Following a brief presentation on the enabling conditions for ILM and the various actors involved in policymaking, participants brainstormed several possible roles for the public sector in promoting ILM, including: lawmaker and regulator; enforcement and implementation; maintaining law and order; monitoring; technical capacity; capacity building; investment and providing incentives; providing structures for engagement; providing personnel; mobilizing resources; lobbying and sensitization; convening stakeholders, visionary; and infrastructure developer.

Policymaker Panel Discussion

A panel discussion of national- and county-level policymaker took place, including the following participants:

- Nina Landi (FAO)
- Maggy Mwangangi (Transition Authority)
- King'uru Wahome (Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources)
- John Wachihi (KFS)
- Stephen Njiru (Chief Officer- Embu County)
- Paul Njuguna (UTaNRmP)

The main themes discussed during the panel discussion included: how current policies promote integration between sectors; how different governance levels currently interact with each other (i.e. county and national levels); successes and challenges with working across sectors and governance levels; and opportunities for further integration.

Development of cross-cutting recommendations

A representative of each site gave a short summary of the 3-day consultations in each site that took place in April and May 2014. The presentations included a summary of the major landscape issues, supportive government actions, challenges with government actions and recommendations for policies to better support ILM in each site. As each of the recommendations were stated, the facilitation team wrote them on Zopp cards, grouped them by theme, and then posted them on the wall for all of the participants to see. A discussion of these recommendations ensued. Following this discussion, six broad categories of recommendations emerged for how to improve the policy and institutional framework to better support ILM in Kenya. These broad categories include:

1. Empower civil society participation
2. Support multi-stakeholder collaboration/platforms
3. Implement spatial plans/ integrated land use management plans
4. Implement and enforce policies supportive of ILM
5. Harmonize policies vertically and horizontally
6. Develop/ enhance incentive mechanisms/ market opportunities for ILM

Participants discussed these recommendations, including the opportunities and challenges that currently exist to implement them and how they could be implemented.

Action Plan Development

The participants split into small groups based on site (i.e. Embu, Bungoma, Lari, Laikipia, Naivaisha) to develop concrete action steps to tackle these recommendations. Participants from organizations at the national level formed a separate group.

Priority issues for specific landscapes

Naivasha Landscape:

- Empowered CSO participation through sensitization, conflict resolution mechanisms, proper governance and capacity building through the efforts of Imarisha, the County Government and other stakeholders
- Strengthen multi-sectoral collaboration through meetings as arranged by Imarisha
- Strengthen information sharing and stakeholder inventory analysis through magazines, brochures, website by Imarisha
- Implementation of land use plans and resources management by several actors

Bungoma Landscape:

- Empowered CSO participation through developing a policy framework, creating a stakeholder platform, performing SWOT analysis and creating awareness on integrated landscape management. Similarly, empowerment can be done through capacity building of CSOs on landscape issues by county & national governments.
- Support multi-sectoral collaboration, which requires coordination, by identifying and analyzing stakeholders, establishing MOUs and central coordination points

Lari Landscape:

- Broaden stakeholder collaboration by good coordination and CSO mapping
- Analysis of policies through consultancy by steering committees, private sectors, PPC
- Civic education through exchange programs, transition authority and investors

- Providing feedback to the county government by means of courtesy calls to the governor, through steering committees and development partners

Embu Landscape:

- Using the forum approach (inter-county forums), identify stakeholders by CEC NRM, Embu County
- Enforcement and harmonization of existing policies, training and capacity building by CEC NRM and Agriculture, NEMA, KWS and KFS
- Integrated land use management and train on the use of GIS and mapping by CECs

Laikipia Landscape:

- Empower CSOs through seminar workshops, advocacy, capacity building and exchange visits by County Government and partners
- Harmonizing natural resource inventories and establishing a data base
- Addressing human wildlife conflict by advocating for compatible land use practices, the opening of wildlife migratory corridors and the construction and maintenance of electric fencing
- Enhance farm forestry of high value trees

National Government:

- Situation analysis of existing policies
- Formulate and enact the policies
- Harmonize the existing policies through evaluation by the National Land Commission and all stakeholders

Cross-cutting priority issues/ways forward

- Networking with all the 5 landscapes
- Information knowledge and experience exchange
- Sharing resource mobilization skills with other counties
- Sharing on public participation policy
- Organizing fora with natural resource management agencies and civil societies (quarterly)
- Identifying information and sources of such information through proper planning
- Working together to mobilize resources and identify potential investors
- Developing an information sharing platform such as a website and 'mega-database'
- Setting up follow-up meetings for this group

ⁱ Scherr et al. 2013

ⁱⁱ EcoAgriculture Partners is a pioneering non-profit organization that promotes ILM approaches around the world.

ⁱⁱⁱ The SRI project, managed by the Eastern and Southern Africa regional offices of ICRAF, is an action research process to strengthen and improve the institutional capacity of rural grassroots organizations in Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania.

^{iv} The LPFN is a collaborative initiative to foster cross-sectoral dialogue, learning and action.

^v Adler, Peter S. and Kristi Parker Celico. "Policy Dialogue." *Beyond Intractability*. Eds. Guy Burgess and Heidi Burgess. Conflict Information Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder. Posted: December 2003 <<http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/policy-dialogue>>.