

TOWARDS INTEGRATED RISK MANAGEMENT IN THE HORN OF AFRICA

**A GAP ANALYSIS OF REGIONAL FRAMEWORKS FOR
INTEGRATED RISK MANAGEMENT**

Written By: Duncan Okowa

For:

Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre (RCRCCC)

June 26th, 2018

TOWARDS INTEGRATED RISK MANAGEMENT IN THE HORN OF AFRICA: A Gap Analysis of Regional Frameworks Relevant for Integrated Risk Management

Duncan O. Okowa

A note to the reader:

This gap analysis is written to support the Partners for Resilience (PfR) Horn of Africa Regional Programme to promote the building of resilience in the Horn of Africa through ecosystem and climate-smart disaster risk reduction (DRR).

PfR ORGANIZATIONS

CARE Nederland (Netherlands)

Juffrouw Idastraat 11
2513 BE Den Haag
The Netherlands
<http://www.carenederland.org>

Cordaid

Lutherse Burgwal 10
2512 CB Den Haag, The Netherlands

The Netherlands Red Cross

Leeghwaterplein 27
2521 CV The Hague
P.O. Box 28120
2502 KC The Hague

The Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre

A: Anna van Saksenlaan 50
2593 HT, The Hague, Netherlands
PO Box 28120, 2502 KC, The Hague

Wetlands International

P.O. Box 471
6700 AL Wageningen
The Netherlands

Disclaimer:

The views presented in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the Partners for Resilience (PfR) nor those of CARE Nederland, Cordaid, the Netherlands Red Cross, the Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre, or Wetlands International.

About Partners for Resilience (PfR)

Partners for Resilience (PfR) is a strategic partnership between the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Trade and Development Co-operation and an alliance of five Netherlands-based humanitarian, development, climate and environmental civil society organizations and their partner civil society organizations in the South. The five civil society partners are CARE Nederland, Cordaid, the Netherlands Red Cross, the Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre, and Wetlands International. These organizations together believe that communities can be able to reduce the overall impact of disasters and sustain development if they are strong, well organized and able to manage the risks they face. Simply, they believe that resilience is key to effectively dealing with disasters, hence the name Partners for Resilience. The group believes that as disasters, exacerbated by climate change and ecosystem degradation among other factors wipe out development gains, the poor and the marginalised people are the worst affected, with disasters trapping them in a vicious circle of poverty and vulnerability.

In recognition of the importance of ecosystems and a changing climate to sustainable livelihoods, the PfR Alliance has been working in the field of Integrated Risk Management (IRM) since 2011. The new strategic partnership (2016–2020), led by the Netherlands Red Cross, is working to strengthen and protect livelihoods of vulnerable communities by integrating Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Ecosystem Management and Restoration (EMR) and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA), which together constitute Integrated Risk Management (IRM). PfR focuses primarily on climate-related natural hazards, whose underlying causes and potential for disasters result to a large extent from human-induced processes. The Alliance aims at combining and strengthening knowledge, expertise and networks between the partners and the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Trade and Development Co-operation on IRM to enable enhanced capacity of stakeholders in policy, investments and practice domains so as to promote the increased and sustained application of IRM at local, national, regional and global levels. In the strategic partnership, synergies are sought through regular dialogue, including with embassies, to maximize intervention results. It builds on experience and existing access to key stakeholders and contributes to national and international agreements.

At the Horn of Africa (HoA) Regional level, the PfR Strategic Partnership, seeks to influence policies and support effective policy implementation in the region, more especially in Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda and South Sudan. The stakeholders targeted include national and regional bodies and institutions including IGAD, AU, and EAC, but also policy influencers and decision makers among the international donors, UN agencies, and INGOs as well as the media. The Regional PfR Strategic Partnership program 2016 – 2020 draws on experience, evidence and lessons from Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda, in terms of Disaster Risk Management, Climate Change Adaptation and Sustainable Ecosystem Management during the implementation of the first phase of the Partners for Resilience Program (2011-2015) and lays emphasis on the need for improved understanding necessary for promoting resilience of communities. The Partnership aims to create advocacy space for promotion of necessary policy and practice change. It aims to tackle common misconceptions that prevent swifter and more appropriate action. Climate change and population expansion are global challenges and policy makers must act quickly to reverse the growing threat to the natural resource base in the countries and in the region.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....	vi
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	viii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background.....	1
1.2. The Horn of Africa.....	2
1.3. Limitations of the Study.....	5
1.4. Layout.....	5
2. METHODOLOGY.....	6
3. THE INTEGRATED RISK MANAGEMENT APPROACH.....	7
4. A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF HORN OF AFRICA REGIONAL FRAMEWORKS RELEVANT FOR INTEGRATED RISK MANAGEMENT.....	10
4.1. Introduction.....	10
4.2. Africa regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction.....	10
4.2.1. Overview.....	10
4.2.2. Institutional arrangement for Implementation.....	11
4.2.3. Implementation Progress.....	13
4.2.4. Strengths and gaps in relation to Integrated Risk Management.....	15
4.2.5. Engagement opportunities for the Partners for Resilience (PfR).....	16
4.3. Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP).....	17
4.3.1. Overview.....	17
4.3.2. Institutional Arrangement for implementation.....	18
4.3.3. Implementation Progress.....	19
4.3.4. Strengths and gaps in relation to Integrated Risk Management.....	21
4.3.5. Engagement opportunities for the Partners for Resilience (PfR).....	22
4.4. Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa: Securing, Protecting and Improving the Lives, Livelihoods and Rights of Pastoralist Communities.....	23
4.4.1. Overview.....	23
4.4.2. Institutional Arrangement for Implementation.....	24
4.4.3. Implementation Progress.....	24
4.4.4. Strengths and gaps in relation to Integrated Risk Management.....	25
4.4.5. Engagement opportunities for the Partners for Resilience (PfR).....	28
4.5. IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI).....	29
4.5.1. Overview.....	29

4.5.2.	Institutional Arrangement	29
4.5.3.	Implementation Progress.....	31
4.5.4.	Strengths and gaps in relation to Integrated Risk Management	32
4.5.5.	Engagement Opportunities for the Partners for Resilience (PfR).....	34
4.6.	Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 in Africa	34
4.6.1.	The Sendai framework and its Africa Programme of Action	34
4.6.2.	Institutional arrangement for Implementation	36
4.6.3.	Implementation Progress.....	36
4.6.4.	Strengths and gaps in relation to Integrated Risk Management	38
4.6.5.	Engagement opportunities for the Partners for Resilience (PfR)	40
4.7.	Agreement on the Nile River Basin Cooperative Framework.....	41
4.7.1.	Overview	41
4.7.2.	Institutional arrangement for implementation	42
4.7.3.	Progress in implementing the Agreement on the Nile River Basin Cooperative Framework	43
4.7.4.	Strengths and Gaps in Relation to Integrated Risk Management.....	45
4.7.5.	Engagement opportunities for the Partners for Resilience (PfR)	46
4.8.	East African Community Climate Change Policy and East African Community Climate Change Master Plan.	47
4.8.1.	Overview	47
4.8.2.	Institutional arrangement for implementation	48
4.8.3.	Progress in implementation.....	49
4.8.4.	Strengths and Gaps in Relation to Integrated Risk Management.....	51
4.8.5.	Engagement Opportunities for the Partners for Resilience (PfR).....	53
5.	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PFR HORN OF AFRICA REGIONAL PROGRAMME	55
5.1.	Conclusion.....	55
5.2.	Recommendations	57
	REFERENCES	61

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my gratitude to the many people who have contributed to this work and have generously shared their time, comments and feedback. Special thanks to the Partners for Resilience (PfR) organizations who have helped establish and facilitate this gap analysis, namely CARE Nederland, Cordaid, the Netherlands Red Cross, the Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre, and Wetlands International. I would particularly like to thank Shaban Mawanda, Policy and Resilience Advisor at Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre who was the PfR team lead for this analysis. Special thanks also go to the PfR Horn of Africa Regional Programme country team leads comprising Titus Wamae, Policy and Advocacy Officer at Wetlands International Kenya, Marceline Oyier, Kenya Country Coordinator at Cordaid, Annet Kandole, Technical Manager at Care International Uganda and Dr Shilleh as well as the rest of the PfR Horn of Africa team.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ARSDRR	Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction
AWG	Africa Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction
AMCEN	African Ministerial Conference on the Environment
AU	African Union
AUC	African Union Commission
CAADP	African Union Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
ACP-EU	African, Caribbean and Pacific region - European Commission
DoP	Agreement on Declaration of Principles on the GERD
ASALS	Arid and Semi-Arid Lands
AUC-DREA	AU Commission on Rural Economy and Agriculture
BR	Biennial Report
CFA	Nile Basin Agreement Cooperative Framework
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CEWARN	Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism
CPPs	Country Programming Papers
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DDPM	Department of Disaster Preparedness and Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EAC	East African Community
EACCCP	East African Community Climate Change Policy
ENTRO	Eastern Nile Technical Regional Office
ECCAS	Economic Community of Central African States
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EMR	Ecosystem Management and Restoration
EEWRN	ECOWAS Early Warning and Response Network
ENSO	El Niño Southern Oscillation
EDE	Ending Drought Emergencies
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
PoA	Extended Programme of Action (PoA) for the Implementation of the ARSDRR
FEWSNET	Famine Early Warning Systems Network
FAO	Food and agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FGM	Female Genital Mutilation
GBV	Gender-based violence
GAFSP	Global Agriculture and Food Security Program
GFDRR	Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction
GERD	Grand Renaissance Dam
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HoA	Horn of Africa
HFA	Hyogo Framework for Action
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
ICPAC	IGAD Climate Prediction and Applications Centre
IDDRSI	IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative

ICPALD	IGAD Centre for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organization
ICZM	Integrated Coastal Zone Management
IRM	Integrated Risk Management
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IDPs	Internally Displaced Persons
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
CIWA	International Waters in Africa
GFDRR	Lake Victoria Basin Commission
LAPSSET	Lamu Port –South Sudan –Ethiopia Transport Corridor
LDC	Least Developed Countries
NCCRS	National Climate Change Response Strategies
NDMU	National Disaster Management Unit
NDMA	National Drought Management Authority
NAIP	National Agriculture Investment plans
NPDPM	National Policy for Disaster Preparedness and Management
NEPAD	New Partnership for African Development
NPCA	NEPAD Planning and Coordination Agency
RAIP	Regional Agriculture Investment plans
NBI	Nile Basin Initiative
Nile-COM	Nile Council of Ministers
NELSAP-CU	Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Program Coordination Unit
NRBC	Nile River Basin Commission
PfR	Partners for Resilience
PREPARED	Planning for Resilience in East Africa through Policy, Adaptation, Research, and Economic Development
PIF	Policy and Investment Framework
PEV	Post-election Violence
PIAs	Priority Intervention Areas
ACMAD	Regional Centre and the African Centre of Meteorological Application for Development
RCMRD	Regional Centre for Mapping of Resources for Development
RECs	Regional Economic Commissions
RPLRP	Regional Pastoral Resilience Project
RPP	Regional Programming Paper
ReSAKSS	Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System
OSS	Sahara and Sahel Observatory
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SADC DMC	Southern African Development Community’s Drought Monitoring Centre
Nile-TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
UN	United Nations
UN-IATF	UN Inter-Agency Task Force on Disaster Reduction
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNISDR	United Nations Office of Disaster Risk Reduction

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Horn of Africa has borne a major brunt of natural hazards-related disasters that are exacerbated by climate change and degradation of ecosystems in addition to other cultural and political factors. In response to increasing disaster impacts and the region's vulnerability, several regional frameworks have been developed to support disaster risk reduction (DRR) in the region. Although disaster risks have typically been addressed separately, the link between disaster risks, climate change and degradation of ecosystems has become increasingly clear. DRR interventions therefore need to integrate Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) and Ecosystem Management and Restoration (EMR). Mainstreaming CCA, EMR and such governance principles as local ownership, livelihoods, timescales, integration and partnerships constitute the integrated Risk Management (IRM) approach. This gap analysis critically examines the range of programmes, strategies and policies with the aim at identifying the opportunities and the gaps that exist with regard to achieving IRM in the region. The findings will support the Partners for Resilience (PfR) Horn of Africa Regional Programme, to promote resilience-building in the Horn of Africa through IRM-smart interventions.

The analysis was conducted through desk-top literature review in which data and information were drawn from an extensive range of literature, mainly the Horn of Africa regional frameworks related to disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and ecosystem management and restoration. Specifically, the report analysed the Africa regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction; the African Union Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP); the Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa; and the IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI). Others are the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework; the Agreement on the Nile River Basin Cooperative Framework; and East African Community Climate Change Policy. It looked at a range of including institutional arrangement; IRM-related strengths and weaknesses and how those relate with IRM, and opportunities for PfR to influence framework implementation.

Key Findings

The analysis identified a number of opportunities with regard to IRM. These include: recognition of climate change adaptation (CCA) and ecosystem restoration and management as critical cogs of disaster risk management; recognition of local communities, women, youth and other vulnerable groups in policy and decision-making; deliberate focus on livelihood support systems; and promotion of partnerships in the efforts to achieve framework goals. Some of the frameworks have made laudable efforts towards integrating CCA and EMR in their disaster risk management approaches. For instance, there is significant integration of both CCA and EMR in the CAADP and IDDRSI, the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa (PoA), the Nile Basin Cooperative Framework, and the EAC Climate Change Policy (EACCCP).

The ARSDRR and the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai framework in Africa (PoA) offer good examples on the role of partnerships in frameworks design and implementation. These frameworks prescribe roles and coordination among a broad range of actors. The CAADP, the Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa, the IDDRSI, the Agreement on the Nile Basin Cooperative Framework and the EACCCP also underscores the importance of partnerships and collaboration. Other than the Agreement on the Nile Basin Cooperative Framework whose operation appears to be more at the macro-level, the rest of the frameworks have significantly mainstreamed livelihoods and inclusion of women, youth and other vulnerable groups in their approaches.

Despite these progressive provisions, a number of gaps stand on the way of the frameworks in relation to being fully IRM-smart. For instance, some frameworks' strategies are fairly narrowly focused and fail to integrate the broader aspect of risk management that includes targeted actions on DRR, CCA and ERM. For instance, ARSDDR's main focus is DRR and none of its strategic directions addresses CCA or ERM. The Policy Framework for pastoralism in Africa also falls short of prescribing clear strategies to deal with climate change, despite recognizing the link between climate change and vulnerability of pastoral systems. Institutional weaknesses came out strongly as a key impediment not only to the realization of IRM but also to the achievement of individual frameworks' goals. A good example is the African Union Commission Department of Rural Economy and agriculture (AUC-DREA) which has an extremely broad mandate yet is very lean in terms of staffing and resources. Insufficient technical skills and capacity in programming is also a problem in a number of the frameworks. Other identified weaknesses are inadequate interinstitutional and intersectoral coordination and non-commitment by some member states to some of the frameworks.

Recommendations

The following are some of the recommendations made to the Partners for Resilience (PfR) Horn of Africa Regional Programme team to support its initiative to promote resilience-building in the Horn of Africa through Integrated Risk Management (IRM) approach.

(a) African Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (ARSDDR) and the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa.

- i. PfR should explore opportunities to participate in the extended Africa Working Group on Disaster Risk reduction (AWGDRR) in order to have a greater influence on critical decisions regarding the implementation of the ARSDDR and the Programme of Action.
- ii. The PfR Horn of Africa Regional Programme can explore opportunities to support the AUC-DREA in implementing the AU monitoring and reporting system.
- iii. PfR Horn of Africa Regional Programme should reach out to and support the operationalization of the EAC DRR Unit.
- iv. PfR Horn of Africa Regional programme should consider supporting the EAC DRR unit on the implementation of specific important initiatives such as: integration of DRR into education curriculum and development of regional emergency response plans
- v. PfR country teams should support the National DRR Platforms technically and/or financially to improve their programming capacities.

(b) African Union Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP)

- i. The PfR HoA Regional Programme should support initiatives to fast-track the review and implementation of CAADP Malabo Regional Agricultural Investment Plans (RAIPs), and strengthening regional policies on trade, and resilience to climate change.
- ii. PfR country teams should support implementation of NAIPs and improvement of data systems for improved planning and adequate reporting on all CAADP/Malabo indicators.
- iii. PfR country teams should lobby the governments to allocate adequate national resources to discharge the CAADP agenda, and to enhance stronger inter-sectoral collaboration.

- iv. PfR Kenya and Uganda country teams should lobby the respective governments to increase funding to agriculture to meet the CAADP target of 10 percent.
- v. PfR Ethiopia country team should lobby the Ethiopian government to double agricultural productivity to meet the related Malabo target.

(c) The Policy Framework for pastoralism in Africa

- i. PfR country teams should explore opportunities to strengthen capacities of national steering committees and national inter-disciplinary support team of experts.
- ii. PfR country teams can also identify and support national pastoralist organizations and movements to enhance their advocacy strategies
- iii. The PfR Ethiopia country team should advocate for greater recognition and support for economic viability of pastoralism.

(d) The IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI)

- i. PfR should sensitize the PSC on the need to conduct a resilience investment mapping with the aim of increasing the geographical coverage of the IDDRSI activities and PIAs
- ii. PfR country teams should support National IDDRSI Coordination Platforms to improve their coordination role.
- iii. PfR should lobby for the establishment and capitalization of the IDDRSI Multi-donor Trust Fund (MDTF).

(e) The Agreement on the Nile basin Cooperative framework

- i. PfR HoA Regional Programme should lobby for more national and water shed level initiatives, programmes and projects in addition to the wider basin-level initiatives.
- ii. PfR HoA Regional Programme should support the Nile-Sec to review the CFA monitoring strategy
- iii. PfR country teams should seek opportunities to advocate for and/or support their review of water policies or legislations that are out-dated or are out of touch with modern realities.

(f) East African Community (EAC) Climate Change Policy

- i. PfR HoA Regional Programme should lobby and support the EAC Secretariat and EACCCCU to review the EAC Climate Change Policy and The EAC Climate Change Master Plan
- ii. PfR HoA regional programme should lobby EAC partner states to establish and promote capitalization of the EAC Climate Change Fund.
- iii. PfR country teams should lobby national governments to allocate sufficient resources for domestic climate change initiatives, including the NDC activities.
- iv. PfR HoA Regional Programme should support capacity enhancement for EAC Climate Change Coordination Unit (CCCU).

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

While disasters affect both developing and developed countries, they tend to impact developing countries more adversely by negating little development gains and worsening poverty. Within the developing countries, the poorest people, being the most vulnerable and having the least capacity to cope and recover, are often hit the hardest by disasters. Africa's continental share of reported disasters in relation to the world total has increased significantly over the past decade. The continent's disaster profile is characterized by extreme hydro-meteorological events, which will likely increase in frequency and magnitude due to climate change.¹ The situation is even worse in Sub-Saharan Africa where disasters are often exacerbated not only by the vulnerability of the population and economy but also by the region's low capacities to cope. Within Sub-Saharan Africa, the Horn of Africa has particularly borne a major brunt of disaster impacts owing to its unique characteristics such as extreme poverty, conflict, demographic pressure, environmental stress, poor infrastructure, high gender inequality, and vulnerability to climate change. The region is one of the most food-insecure in the world, with a fast-growing population which places further pressure on the increasingly scarce natural resources.² The region is arid and semi-arid and the population is mainly pastoralists and agro-pastoralists. Majority of the region's population live in rural areas although there is massive migration into urban areas, resulting in further risks and illegal settlements.

Disasters have become a key impediment to sustainable development, affecting more people and causing rising economic losses³. Not surprisingly, disaster risk reduction (DRR) has become a key sustainable development agenda, especially since 2005 when the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) was agreed on.⁴ As a follow-up to the HFA, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction⁵ set the year 2020 as the deadline for all countries to have strategies in place to reduce disaster losses. To date, several other global, regional and national instruments, policies, programmes, plans and other initiatives have been developed to support DRR.

Although disaster risks have typically been addressed separately, the link between disaster risks, climate change and degradation of ecosystems has become increasingly clear. Natural hazards-related disasters are exacerbated by climate change and degradation of ecosystems in addition to other cultural and political factors such as population growth and urbanization. Over the last 20 years, climate change-related disasters – floods, storms, heatwaves, droughts and other weather-related events - accounted for 90% of major disasters.⁶ On the other hand, degradation of ecosystems and landscapes has led to a steady decline in the ecosystems' ability to support livelihoods and to act as buffers against hazards through regulating services such as climate regulation, water flow and water quality regulation, erosion control and pollination. From the foregoing, it is clear that initiatives that target DRR without integrating Climate Change Adaptation

¹ The World Bank, 2010

² UNEP, 2012

³ AU & NEPAD, 2004

⁴ The Hyogo Framework was the first global blueprint for disaster risk reduction efforts between 2005 and 2015. Its goal was to substantially reduce disaster losses by 2015 - in lives, and in the social, economic, and environmental assets of communities and countries. *See United Nations, 2005.*

⁵ United Nations, 2015a

⁶ CRED & UNISDR, 2015

(CCA) and Ecosystem Management and Restoration (EMR) may not be effective, hence the need for an Integrated Risk Management (IRM) approach which is at the core of this gap analysis.

The analysis critically examines the range of programmes, strategies and policies relevant for integrated risk management (IRM) in the Horn of Africa region. Specifically, it aims at identifying the opportunities and the gaps that exist with regard to achieving the IRM approach in the region. The findings will support the Partners for Resilience (PfR) Horn of Africa Regional Programme, in an initiative that seeks to promote the building of resilience in the Horn of Africa through ecosystem and climate-smart disaster risk reduction (DRR).

1.2. The Horn of Africa

The Horn of Africa (HoA) or “the region” as used in this report refers to the area occupied by the eight Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) member countries comprising Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, and Uganda. Within the region itself, the report places greater emphasis on Ethiopia, Kenya, South Sudan and Uganda which together constitute the focus area for the PfR Horn of Africa Regional Programme. The region covers an area of 5.2 million km² constituting about 17 percent of Africa’s landmass. It has about 6960 Km of coastline (with the Indian Ocean, Gulf of Aden, Gulf of Toudjoura and the Red Sea) and a about 6910 km of international borders with Egypt, Libya, Chad, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda and Tanzania. About 70 percent of the region comprise Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs) while the rest represents a fair diversity of climates and landscapes including cool highlands, swamp areas, and tropical rain forests.⁷

The region is home to about 226,765,000 people, accounting for approximately 21 percent of Africa’s population. The average population density is about 30 persons per km² although there are great variations across countries and ecological zones with desert areas scarcely populated and less dry rural areas more densely populated.⁸ The region has one of the highest population growth rates in the world at 2.9 percent, with nearly half the population under the age 14⁹. It is predicted that by 2050, the region’s population will be 400 million, 55 per cent of which will be below 20 years.¹⁰ The region is characterised with extreme poverty, with half the population living below the poverty line of one US Dollar (USD) per day.¹¹ The region is also characterised with pervasive economic underdevelopment. All countries in the region fall within the world’s Least Developed Countries (LDCs). Economic underdevelopment is both a consequence of and cause of poor and inefficient transportation and communication infrastructure in the region. The railway systems have aging tracks which are not properly maintained and which have different gauges across the countries. Overall, the region has inadequate air traffic control and airport infrastructure, and the air traffic is not matched with enhanced connectivity across the region. The infrastructure situation is particularly dire in remote rural areas, where incidentally, disasters tend to hit hardest.

The region is prone to conflicts and has been characterised as one of the most fragile regions in the world. The Fragile States Index 2017¹² ranked South Sudan, Somalia and Sudan as the most, second-most and fifth most fragile states respectively, while at position 15, Ethiopia was named the most

⁷ IGAD, 2016

⁸ Ibid

⁹ Mesfin 2011

¹⁰ See supra note 7

¹¹ Ibid

¹² FFP, 2017

worsened of the 178 countries ranked. With Eritrea, Kenya and Uganda at positions 19,22 and 24 respectively, seven out of the eight HoA countries fall within top 25 most fragile states. Djibouti ranked 41. Although several devastating inter-state wars, civil, and inter-communal wars and conflicts have ravaged the region, three major conflicts stand out: the long-lasting fragmentation of Somalia, the unresolved dispute between Ethiopia and Eritrea, the messy separation of South Sudan from Sudan and the subsequent civil war in South Sudan. Other notable major recent conflicts in the region are the Darfur conflict in Sudan and Kenya's post-election crisis of 2007–8. In addition to these, there have been myriad armed conflicts between different ethnic and clan groups within and across national borders in the region. The conflicts have been attributed to competition for natural resources; cultural factors including ethnicity, language and religion; contestations for political power; and dysfunctional governance practices among other causes.¹³

Recurrent droughts and dry spells make the HoA one of the most food-insecure regions on the African continent. Just recently, a devastating drought swept across southern and south-eastern Ethiopia, northern and coastal Kenya, almost all of Somalia, south-eastern South Sudan and north-eastern Uganda.¹⁴ Droughts in the region have been increasing in severity and frequency, and aggravated by desertification, land degradation and climate change. And due to lack of effective coping mechanisms, there has been little to no recovery from multiple consecutive years of poor rains, dry spells and drought, particularly among those dependent on livestock for food and income. Drought fuels both internal and cross-border migration as pastoralists move in search of feed and water for their livestock. In the process, some pastoralists are encroaching marginal lands and protected forests and wildlife areas. Due to droughts, competition over limited arable land, pasture and water points are not only causing overgrazing, land degradation, and disease outbreaks, but also tensions and conflicts among the herders and farmers.

Being majorly agro-pastoralist, the region relies heavily on natural resources for sustenance and this has put arable land, rangelands, forests, wetlands and other critical ecosystems under severe pressures. These pressures continue to cause loss of biodiversity and land cover and destruction of catchments and aquifers which in turn are resulting in reduced water availability. Degradation of natural resource base, in particular land and vegetation, has led to increasing rainwater losses through runoff and fertile top soil through soil erosion, thereby exacerbating the impact of drought. The changes in the environment interact with the impacts of climate change and population pressures, adding further stresses to an already bad situation. The HoA is one of the regions of the world most negatively affected by climate change manifested in prolonged droughts, desertification, flash floods and land degradation.

The region hosts deeply patriarchal societies, with pervasive economic, social and political gender inequalities that tend to favour men over women. The inequalities are reflected in such spheres as access to education, information, employment and credit; land rights; and participation in policy and decision-making processes. For instance, the levels of women representation in different branches of government are generally low. Women in the region also have less access to and control over productive resources like land despite contributing 70-80 percent work-force on average. According to IGAD¹⁵, the few women who enjoy some form of land ownership/use rights do so jointly with men and this limits their decision-making power over such land. These discrepancies, compounded by women's traditional roles of providing food and taking care of the home and children, make women in the region to bear disproportionate burdens of calamities such as conflicts, droughts and floods.

¹³ Bereketeab, 2012

¹⁴ FAO, 2017

¹⁵ See supra note 7



Figure 1. Map of the Horn of Africa, Source: (United Nations 2012)

1.3. Limitations of the Study

This study has been conducted based on the best available data and information on disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and ecosystem management and restoration in the Horn of Africa. Notwithstanding the above, the following limitations should be recognized:

- The report majorly relied on desk-top literature review. While this went a long way in gathering information and identifying IRM-related strengths and weaknesses of the regional frameworks, face to face interactions or questionnaires with key implementers of the frameworks and selected stakeholders would have provided greater insights for the analysis, especially with regard to assessing the practice progress of the frameworks' implementation.
- Many of the frameworks have no structured way for countries or implementing entities to report on the respective framework implementation progress. As such, the study relies on public statements, conference and other meeting reports, press statements and other available literature to assess the frameworks' implementation progress.
- One of the frameworks – Agreement for the Nile Basin Cooperative Framework – is being analysed even though it has not formally come into force pending ratification of at least six countries.

1.4. Layout

The remainder of this study is divided into five main sections. Section 2 provides a brief overview of the methodology adopted in the study. In Section 3, a description of the Integrated Risk Management (IRM) approach is provided. Section 4 delves into a critical analysis of Horn of Africa regional frameworks relevant for IRM. This includes providing an overview of each of the identified frameworks, institutional arrangement for their implementation, strengths and gaps in relation to IRM and opportunities for engagement for the partners for Resilience (PfR). In Section 5, conclusions from the study are provided, followed by specific recommendations to PfR on how to strengthen its engagement to promote integrated risk management in the Horn of Africa.

2. METHODOLOGY

The methodology majorly consisted of desk-top literature review. Data and information were drawn from an extensive range of literature, mainly the Horn of Africa regional frameworks related to disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and ecosystem management and restoration. Specifically, the report analysed:

- Africa regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction;
- African Union Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP);
- Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa;
- IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI);
- Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 in Africa;
- Agreement on the Nile River Basin Cooperative Framework; and
- East African Community Climate Change Policy and East African Community Climate Change Master Plan.

In addition to these specific frameworks, other relevant literature including public statements, conference and other meeting reports and official press statements was also reviewed to assess the practice and implementation progress of the regional frameworks. A study report was generated addressing a range of issues relating to the regional frameworks and how they link to the concept of Integrated Risk Management (IRM), among them:

- The institutional arrangement under the different frameworks and the institutions' strengths and weaknesses;
- The identified strength and weakness of the different frameworks and the missing links with regard to both IRM and achieving the framework goal;
- How the identified strengths and weakness relate with the concept Integrated Risk Management (IRM) and PfR objectives; and
- Opportunities that exist for PfR to influence the framework implementation and contribute towards achieving IRM

An inception meeting between the Consultant and PfR Horn of Africa country leads was held in Nairobi on 9th March 2018, during which the Terms of Reference (ToR) were thoroughly reviewed. The inception meeting also helped the consultant and the PfR HoA country leads to clarify and agree on the study outline, timeframes and research questions. A Skype call between the Consultant and the PfR team lead for the study was held on 27th April for updates on the study progress. A draft gap analysis was submitted to PfR on 11th May 2018 followed by a second meeting between the Consultant and PfR Horn of Africa country leads in Nairobi on 11th May 2018 to discuss the draft study, discuss PfR country leads' recommendations and agree on timelines for the final study report. A final report was submitted by the Consultant on 25th June 2018.

3. THE INTEGRATED RISK MANAGEMENT APPROACH

Compounded by factors like ecosystem degradation, climate change, population pressure, rapid urbanization, poverty and economic underdevelopment of vulnerable areas, disaster risks are increasing in many countries especially in the Horn of Africa (HoA) region. The HoA is experiencing devastating effects of disasters such as floods and droughts on people's lives and livelihoods. Disasters differentially affect the poor and marginalized communities and can overstretch response capacities. To prevent hazards from turning into a disaster, to mitigate avoidable impacts and recover quickly when it happens, communities need to be resilient - strong and well-organized, with the ability to proactively manage disaster risks. By enhancing resilience, communities are enabled to anticipate the risks they face by building on existing capacities; and to respond when disaster strikes while maintaining basic structures and functions. Enhanced resilience also helps communities to adapt to changing risks; and to address underlying factors and root causes of risk.

The term disaster risk management (DRM) implies all the phases of disaster risk reduction. These include disaster prevention, reduction, mitigation, rehabilitation, reconstruction and relief, as well as the capacities, skills and institutions necessary for carrying out disaster risk reduction activities. Integrated Risk Management (IRM) is a systematic process DRM through actions that consider the effects of climate change and the role of ecosystems in sustaining livelihoods. It is thus an enhanced, holistic approach to increasing community resilience by integrating disaster risk reduction (DRR), climate change adaptation (CCA) and ecosystem management and restoration (EMR). IRM addresses the drivers of risk, the capacities and community assets and their enabling environment. The IRM approach bridges time and spatial scales. It integrates attention for changing risks due to changes in hazards, exposure and vulnerability. It focuses on ecosystem degradation, locally and in the wider landscape, as well as changes in hazards due to the impacts of climate change on communities that are marginalized and therefore most vulnerable, with special attention to women, youth, elderly and disabled persons.

IRM demands understanding of the role of ecosystems and climate change to move interventions beyond just disaster risk reduction. It acknowledges the characteristics of ecosystems and climate change, thus expanding and deepening the disaster risk reduction interventions. This is because the scope of climate change adaptation (CCA) and ecosystem management and restoration (EMR) are wide-ranging stretching well-beyond DRR-related issues. Integration is therefore only relevant to the extent that CCA and EMR elements contribute to DRR. IRM is relevant particularly in the overlapping areas, and through targeted efforts communities, CSOs and other stakeholders strive to seek maximum synergy, and thus to expand these areas as much as possible. The importance and thus the relevance for integration depends on specific context, and have different levels, depending on the capacities and context. The IRM approach increases these synergies by including more EMR and CCA elements, for example by developing a better understanding of the relationships between ecosystems, working across timescales and administrative boundaries, and including adaptation measures.

The PfR programme is pioneering IRM on the basis of eight key principles that combine issues that are specific to risk management with issues that pertain to sensible programming to achieve sustainable results. The eight key principles are local ownership; livelihoods; landscapes; ecosystems; timescales; global and local; integration; and partnerships.

i. Local ownership

Local ownership implies putting communities on the driving seat of their development by promoting community self-management and empowerment. To do this, local and traditional knowledge and resources should be acknowledged and supported. Such traditional knowledge and resources should be complemented with external resources, including scientific knowledge, to make interventions more effective and sustainable.

ii. Livelihoods

Disaster risk interventions should focus on protecting and strengthening livelihoods, both from a humanitarian and a development perspective. This calls for establishing robust mechanisms through which individuals, families and communities can withstand or recover from shocks and stresses. These include a combination of community interventions and targeted dialogues with stakeholders to make policies, investment decisions and practices risk-informed.

iii. Landscapes

Interventions should recognize the broader geographical scales (landscapes) on which the drivers of risk express themselves. By regarding risk in a wider landscape, the places where it originates and where it manifests itself, including geographically remote places, become clear.

iv. Ecosystems

Interventions should recognize the role of ecosystems for community safety and resilience. Degraded ecosystems can increase disaster risk, while healthy and well-managed ecosystems can function as a buffer for hazards and contribute to sustaining people's livelihoods.

v. Timescales

Risk management Interventions should encompass different time scales, thus enable their adaptation to changing risk situations in both short and long-term and ensure that early warning information can be translated into appropriate action.

vi. Global and local

Disaster management approaches should be context-specific and adapt to local realities. Interventions should be culturally sensitive especially in relation to gender and should avoid reinforcing or exacerbating inequalities. Such local realities should then inform global and regional policies and agreements for risk management, so that they effectively enable IRM initiatives. The accompanying systems and structures should in turn ensure that local communities benefit.

vii. Integration

Integration implies applying a holistic approach involving multiple sectoral interventions in dealing with disasters. This is because hazards and risks are not only manifold but also often mutually reinforcing. As such, single-sector focused interventions may not yield desired results.

viii. Partnerships

Stakeholders (communities, government agencies, private sector, knowledge institutes, and civil society) should collaborate to complement each other's expertise and resources in order to traverse different sectors and make interventions more effective.

Elements of IRM

IRM focuses on three main elements – risk drivers, capacities and assets; and enabling environment. As discussed below, addressing these three elements is critical to the IRM approach.

i. Risk drivers

IRM focuses on natural hazards, aggravated by climate change and degraded ecosystems in particular. Together these form the drivers of risk. A good understanding of the causes and effects of these drivers and being able to recognize the characteristics of potential hazards will help communities to be better prepared and prevent hazards from turning into disasters.

ii. Capacities and assets

The best way to increase community resilience is by enhancing their capacities and assets to deal with the shocks and stresses caused by the risk drivers. IRM identifies four types of capacities or actions that can reduce the likelihood or impact of hazard events. These are anticipation of the risks; response to disasters; adaptation to changing risks; and addressing underlying factors and root causes of risk. It is also important to enhance the human potential, social capital, economic resources, physical capital and natural resources for both individuals and communities.

iii. Enabling environment

The surrounding human and physical environments determine the extent to which people can progress out of risk into safety and achieve increased wellbeing. If communities act alone and do not receive support from other actors in their environment (civil society organizations, the private sector, government, media, academia, and other actors) significant lasting change cannot occur. Thus, ensuring all relevant stakeholders are aware, involved and not harmed in the process, is an essential part of the landscape approach.

4. A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF HORN OF AFRICA REGIONAL FRAMEWORKS RELEVANT FOR INTEGRATED RISK MANAGEMENT

4.1. Introduction

This section comprises a critical analysis of some seven regional frameworks relevant for integrated risk management in the Horn of Africa (HoA). Although “regional” is used in this report to refer to the region occupied by the eight Horn of Africa countries, it is important to note that some of the frameworks discussed here have application beyond the HoA borders. These include policies developed by the African Union (AU) which have continent-wide application, as well as those developed by other Regional Economic Commissions (RECs) and bodies such as the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), the East African Community (EAC) and the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI). The analysis focuses mainly on identifying the gaps and opportunities that the frameworks present, how these relate with integrated risk management (IRM), and opportunities and possible entry points for the Partners of Resilience (PfR) to influence policy direction towards achieving the IRM approach to risk management in the HoA. The identified regional frameworks are: African Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (ARSDRR); African Union Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP); Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa; IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI); Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa; Agreement on the Nile River Basin Cooperative Framework; and East African Community Climate Change Policy, Strategy and Master Plan.

4.2. Africa regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction

4.2.1. Overview

The Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (ARSDRR)¹⁶ was adopted by African Ministers at the 10th Meeting of the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN) from 26-30 June 2004. It was submitted to the African Union Assembly Summit the same year for adoption by Heads of State at the 3rd Ordinary Session of the Assembly in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, with a call to develop a Programme of Action for its implementation. The Strategy and its Programme of Action are the main guiding instruments for the mainstreaming and implementation of disaster risk reduction in Africa. The development of the Strategy emerged out of the recognition that disaster impacts were an impediment to sustainable development in Africa. A baseline study carried out to establish the status of disaster risk reduction in Africa identified gaps in institutional frameworks, risk identification, knowledge management, governance, and emergency response.¹⁷ The aim of the Strategy is to contribute to the attainment of sustainable development and poverty eradication by facilitating the integration of disaster risk reduction into development efforts. To this end, it articulates six strategic objectives: to increase political commitment to disaster risk reduction; improve identification and assessment of disaster risks; enhance knowledge management for disaster risk reduction; increase public awareness of disaster risk reduction; improve governance of disaster risk reduction institutions; and integrate of disaster risk reduction in emergency response management. The Strategy details strategic actions required to achieve each of its strategic objectives and also defines the roles and responsibilities of the various actors and stakeholders.

A Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (2005-2010) was adopted at the 1st African Ministerial Conference on DRR in Addis Ababa

¹⁶ African Union, 2004

¹⁷ African Union Commission and NEPAD, 2004

in 2005¹⁸. The Programme of Action defines a number of priority programmes, specifically advocacy and public awareness, and knowledge management and capacity development, to be implemented to help achieve its goal - a substantial reduction of social, economic and environmental impacts of disasters on African people and economies. The Programme of Action is complemented by the Declaration of the Second African Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (2010), which identified a set of 18 specific actions that various stakeholders need to undertake. These include the mobilization of political commitment, increased investment in disaster risk reduction, the creation of African Risk Capacity¹⁹, a financing pool, and the reconstitution of the Africa Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction. These actions have informed some of the concrete achievements in the implementation of disaster risk reduction in Africa.

The Programme of Action was revised in 2010 into the Extended Programme of Action (2006-2015)²⁰ in order to align it with the Hyogo Framework for Action, with the additional objectives added, such as integration of climate change²¹. The objectives of the extended programme of action include to: integrate risk reduction and climate change adaptation into sustainable development initiatives; strengthen regional and sub-regional resilience capacities; and strengthen regional and sub-regional coordination to support the implementation of ARSDRR and the Extended Programme of Action. Others are to strengthen legislative frameworks and capacities at national levels for mainstreaming and implementing disaster risk reduction strategies and programmes.

4.2.2. Institutional arrangement for Implementation

I. African Union Commission (AUC)

AUC is the primary actor at the continental level with regard to the implementation of the African Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (ARSDRR) and its extended Programme of Action as well as the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa.²² AUC has the overall responsibility for coordination, strategic guidance, advocacy and promoting the implementation of these disaster risk reduction strategies across the continent through the Africa Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction (AWG). AUC's focus is on strategic guidance, facilitating, promoting the implementation of the Strategy, and seeking support from development partners and coordination at the regional level.

II. Africa Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction (AWGDRR)

Africa Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction (AWGDRR) is a continental advisory group charged with facilitating the mainstreaming and integration of DRR in all phases of sustainable development in Africa. It was established by AU/NEPAD on the recommendation of the UN Inter-Agency Task Force on Disaster Reduction (UN-IATF). Chaired by the AU, its membership comprises the AU Commission, the NEPAD Secretariat and the Regional Economic Communities (RECs). AWGDRR's goal is to deploy efforts and support those of national governments to advance disaster risk reduction and facilitate the mainstreaming and integration of disaster risk reduction into all phases of

¹⁸ ISDR, 2010

¹⁹ The AU, in June 2012, established an African Risk Capacity Secretariat—a specialized agency of the AU to assist the development of a legal agreement on a pooled risk insurance facility for the effects of droughts, floods, earthquakes and cyclones.

²⁰ African Union, 2016a

²¹ EX.CL/Dec.607 (XVIII)

²² See section 4.6 for a detailed discussion on the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa.

development in Africa to help achieve NEPAD's objectives. It provides coordination and technical support to the RECs, member States and all stakeholders on mainstreaming and integration of disaster risk reduction into all phases of development and implementation of ARSDRR, its Programme of Action and the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa. The Africa office of the United Nations Office of Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR Africa) provides support to the Group.

There are two categories of the AWGDRR – the core group and the extended group. The Core Group comprise: AUC/NPCA, AfDB, eight Regional Economic Communities (RECs), one Member State Expert from each of the region (designated by RECs), UNISDR, World Bank GFDRR, one Representative of Regional Specialized Entities (ACMAD), one Representative of the Civil Society, and one Representative of Academia and Research Institutes (PERIU). The Extended Group is composed of: all members of the Core Group; all relevant United Nations Agencies; representatives from sub-regional Inter Agency Working Groups; and representatives of the UN Regional Coordination Mechanism. Other extended group members are: representatives of Regional Specialized entities – (ICPAC, ACMAD, SADC CSC, RDMCOE, AGRHYMET etc); Civil Society/IFRC/NEPARC/IAWG etc; Pan-African Parliamentarians (PAP); African Mayors and Local Governments; Gender Organizations; Youth Organizations; Media; Donors; and Academia and Research Institutions. AWGDRR meets biannually wherein the Core Group and Extended Group meet alternatively.

III. Regional Economic Communities (RECs)

At the regional level, the primary actors are the RECs, their organs and other specialized agencies and institutions, such as Regional Implementation Centres (RICs). REC's focus on interpreting strategic guidance for their Member States, facilitating the implementation of the strategy and related initiatives such as the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework, within their sub-regions. RECs also promote coordination, particularly in respect of inter-State initiatives. They are to implement the above through establishing sub-regional disaster risk reduction platforms and focal points, and through preparation of programmes for resource mobilization to support national and sub-regional efforts. They are also responsible for knowledge dissemination; convening DRR platforms at the REC level; and across borders DRR interventions.

IV. National Governments

National Governments ensure the establishment of enabling environments, including adopting enabling legislation and setting up the relevant national mechanisms and platforms to engage all stakeholders. They take the necessary steps to empower the relevant RECs to establish regional disaster risk reduction platforms and focal points to coordinate sub-regional approaches to disaster risk reduction. Countries are at different stages in the development of policy and institutional frameworks for comprehensive disaster risk reduction because some embraced the need earlier, others are yet to understand the implications, while others lack the capacity to design them²³.

e) National Platforms for DRR

National Platforms for DRR are nationally-owned and led forums or committees of multi-stakeholders whose goal is to contribute to the building of the respective country's resilience to disasters for the sake of sustainable development. The National Platforms for DRR have three objectives. First, they serve as a coordination mechanism to enhance multi-stakeholder collaboration and coordination for the sustainability of DRR activities. Secondly, they foster an

²³ See the HFA National Progress Reports <https://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/reports/>

enabling environment for developing a culture of prevention, through advocacy of and awareness-raising on DRR. Thirdly, they facilitate the integration of DRR into national policies, planning and programmes in various national, bilateral and international development policies and programmes.

e) Major Groups

Civil society organizations, the private sector and other major groups collaborate with disaster risk reduction authorities by participating in the development and implementation of the Strategy. This is done within the context of national participatory processes that National Governments develop in collaboration with them.

f) International Development Partners

All the above institutions and groups work together to provide guidance to the international development and humanitarian community on the provision of assistance and resources for disaster risk reduction. The development partners' assistance is targeted mainly towards support for risk identification, information management and communications, training, research and emergency management.

g) United Nations

The United Nations and its programmes and specialized agencies should include objectives of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction in all their programmes by developing action in this regard and by reporting annually on the impact of these actions. The Africa office of the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) has particularly been playing an active role in supporting the AU through the AWGDRR to coordinate the implementation of ARSDRR and its extended Programme of Action. UNISDR was established in 1999 as a dedicated secretariat to facilitate the implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR). It serves as the focal point in the United Nations system for the coordination of disaster reduction and to ensure synergies among the disaster reduction activities of the United Nations system and regional organizations and activities in socio-economic and humanitarian fields. It is an organisational unit of the UN Secretariat and is led by the UN Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction (SRSG).²⁴ UNISDR has regional offices around the world including regional offices for Africa, Americas, Arab States, Asia & Pacific, and Europe. UNISDR Africa is headquartered at the United Nations Complex in Gigiri, Nairobi in Kenya. Its key role is to maintain and strengthen partnerships and collaborations to reduce disaster risks in Africa by building durable institutional and regional capacities for the implementation of risk reduction strategies in Africa. These include the ARSDRR and its extended Programme of Action, as well as the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa.²⁵ The African Union Commission (AUC) is UNISDR's main partner. Other key UNISDR Africa partners regional and sub-regional intergovernmental organizations.

4.2.3. Implementation Progress

Great strides have been made in the implementation of the ARSDRR. At the continental level, considerable progress has been made in following the 18 recommendations made at the 2nd African

²⁴ See UNISDR website: <https://www.unisdr.org/who-we-are>. Last accessed June 13th, 2018

²⁵ The Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa is discussed in section 4.6

Ministerial Conference on DRR²⁶. AWGDRR was established in 2011. UNISDR has facilitated DRR expertise to the AUC and has received and analyzed the reports from different African countries since 2005²⁷. With support of UNISDR, the African Union has held 6 Africa Regional Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction (ARPDOR), with the 7th ARPDOR planned for October 2018 in Tunis, Tunisia.²⁸

Several Regional Economic Communities (RECs) including EAC have made institutional advances in DRR including establishing DRR units. The EAC Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Unit is based at the EAC Secretariat under the Direct Supervision of the Secretary General. The Unit reports to the Council of Ministers through the Secretary General. The EAC DRR unit is however faced with shortage of resources to fully operationalize. No less than five RECs including Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and the East African Community (EAC) have developed DRR policies and/or defined DRR strategies. Other recent achievements include the passage of the East African Community Disaster Risk Reduction Act, 2016 at the 4th Session of the 5th EAC Assembly held in Arusha on 10th March, 2016. The Act paves the way for the region to take necessary disaster preparedness, management, and protection and mitigation measures as well as in handling disasters in a more co-ordinated manner.

A number of specialized regional institutions are responding to major global and regional challenges through enhanced services for DRR and climate change adaptation (CCA). These include IGAD Climate Prediction and Applications Centre (ICPAC), the Southern African Development Community's Drought Monitoring Centre (SADC DMC), the Regional Centre for Agro-Meteorology and Operational Hydrology (AGRHYMET) and the African Centre of Meteorological Application for Development (ACMAD). In another related initiative, COMESA, SADC and EAC joined forces to implement a five-year Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation program that seeks to harmonize the Corporate Council on Africa practice by the three RECs and to increase investments in climate resilience²⁹.

At the national level, there is a positive trend across the Horn of Africa in terms of efforts to achieve the objects of the ARSDOR and its Programme of Action. Ethiopia has undertaken major risk assessments to produce risk profiles at the lowest administrative units in order to inform DRR planning and early warning mechanisms. Kenya has prepared a draft National DRM Policy and Bill and established the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) in 2013. The unit sits within the Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government. Uganda developed the National Policy for Disaster Preparedness and Management (NPDOR)³⁰ in 2008 and launched it 2010 under the custodianship of the Department of Disaster Preparedness and Management (DDOR) in the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM). Ethiopia developed the National policy and strategy on disaster risk management in 2013. The policy provides for a comprehensive framework of disaster risk management (DRN) measures. South Sudan has set up the Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Management that deal with issues of disaster management. The Country has developed a

²⁶ Ministerial Declaration Adopted at the Second African Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction Nairobi, Kenya, 14-16 April 2010

²⁷ Status Report on Implementation of Africa Regional Strategy and Hyogo Framework for Action

²⁸ Regional Platforms on Disaster Risk Reduction are multi-stakeholder forums established under UNISDR to reflect the commitment of governments to improve coordination and implementation of disaster risk reduction activities while linking to international and national efforts. They provide a forum for all those engaged in disaster risk reduction to showcase practical applications for disaster risk reduction, exchange experience and develop joint statements, strategies and action plans, which guide decision makers and practitioners.

²⁹ Supra, Note 6

³⁰ Republic of Uganda, 2010.

draft National Disaster Risk Management (DRM) Policy with focus on saving lives and livelihoods, restoring dignity and sustaining hope for the vulnerable³¹.

A number of countries have established their National Platforms on DRR. For instance, Kenya with support from the UN, established its National DRR Platform to support the Government in coordinating disaster issues at the national level. The platform has been holding an annual National Symposium on Disaster Risk Reduction since 2013. The symposium is organized back to back with the International Day for Disaster Reduction (IDDR). The fifth edition of the National symposium was held in November 2017 in Diani, Kwale County. Ethiopia established the National Disaster and Risk Management Committee in 2015, which the AU lauded as a positive step towards the commitment to manage and reduce the impact of disasters on the social and economic growth of the country³².

4.2.4. Strengths and gaps in relation to Integrated Risk Management

Key IRM-related strengths of the strategy include its recognition of vulnerable groups including women and youth; role of partnerships. The strategy, through the extended Africa Working Group (AWG) offers a good opportunity for participation of stakeholders including women and youth. Among other key stakeholder groups, the extended group comprises gender and youth organizations. The group that meets once every year provides an opportunity for women and youth voices to be heard in the consultations, decision making, implementation and monitoring of the strategy.

The strategy's institutional arrangement offers one of the best examples of using partnerships to achieve the common goal of integrating disaster risk reduction into development. The arrangement prescribes roles and coordination among the African Union Commission (AUC), the Africa Working Group (AWG) on Disaster Risk Reduction, Regional Economic Communities (RECs), National Governments: Major Groups³³, International Development Partners, and United Nations. The AWG which provides coordination and technical support for the implementation of the ARSDRR goes even further to deliberately incorporate representatives of these stakeholders in its very composition, through its two categories of membership – the smaller core group³⁴ and the Extended Group³⁵. UNISDR has further strengthened these partnership and collaboration efforts by supporting the RECs and other major groups in delivering their objectives.

Major gaps identified in the strategy includes inadequate integration of climate change adaptation and ecosystem management, lack of human, technical and financial resources, and and weak monitoring and reporting arrangement.

³¹ Official Statement of the Republic of South Sudan at United Nations Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction Sendai, Japan, 14th -18th March 2015 Delivered by H.E. James Wani Igga, Vice-President, Government of the Republic of South Sudan

³² African Union, 2017

³³ Includes civil society organizations, the private sector and other major groups

³⁴ The Core Group comprise: AUC/NPCA, AfDB, eight Regional Economic Communities (RECs), one Member State Expert from each of the region (designated by RECs), UNISDR, World Bank GFDRR, one Representative of Regional Specialized Entities (ACMAD), one Representative of the Civil Society, and one Representative of Academia and Research Institutes (PERIU).

³⁵ The Extended Group is composed of: all members of the Core Group; all relevant United Nations Agencies (UNECA, UNDP, FAO, UNEP, UNHABITAT, WMO, OCHA, UNICEF, WFP, WHO, UNESCO etc.); representatives from sub-regional Inter Agency Working Groups; representative of the UN Regional Coordination Mechanism; representatives of Regional Specialized entities – (ICPAC, ACMAD, SADC CSC, RDMCOE, AGRHYMET etc); Civil Society/IFRC/NEPARC/IAWG etc; Pan-African Parliamentarians (PAP); African Mayors and Local Governments; Gender Organizations; Youth Organizations; Media; Donors; and Academia and Research Institutions.

- **Inadequate integration of climate change adaptation and ecosystem management**

Despite recognizing the link between DRR and climate change ecosystem management, the strategy's main focus is DRR and none of its strategic directions addresses neither climate change adaptation nor ecosystem management. While such sectoral approaches may contribute to the achievement of framework objectives or specific framework goals, they are not sufficient in achieving the integrated risk management (IRM) envisaged in this report.

- **Lack of human, technical and financial resources**

Implementation of the ARSDRR is resource-intensive. Substantial amount of technical and financial resources is required to support not only the operationalization of the EAC DRR Unit but also to implement key functions like: integration of DRR into education curriculum; development of regional emergency response plans; and strengthening and harmonizing regional early warning systems. However, both the AU and the ARSDRR institutions face inadequate technical and financial resources due to limited budget allocation to disaster risk issues both at regional and national levels. Moreover, the African Union Commission Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture (AUC-DREA) is responsible for coordinating the implementation of the Strategy and Programme of Action. However, AUC-DREA is fairly lean in terms of staffing and resources, considering its extremely broad mandate and the initiatives that it presides over.³⁶ The department has no designated unit for disaster risk reduction, and has so far relied on technical assistance from UNISDR Africa for co-ordination and implementation at the regional level.

- **Weak monitoring and reporting arrangement**

Despite the clear roles and responsibilities for monitoring implementation of the Strategy, there is no systematic mechanism for monitoring and its implementation. Reviews only take place in preparation for Africa Regional Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction and Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. However, the reviews are ad hoc and uncoordinated. Moreover, these reviews are undertaken mainly with support from UNISDR. AWGDRR, as the main coordinating mechanism, has been tasked to perform the monitoring role, but is hindered by a lack of resources and institutional capacity.

4.2.5. Engagement opportunities for the Partners for Resilience (PFR)

At the continental level, PFR can lobby AUC-DREA to establish or at least assign a unit or desk to deal with risk management issues. The PFR Regional Program team can also influence the implementation of the AU Strategy on DRR through the Platforms established in the Strategy. The most relevant are the National Platforms for DRR which are nationally-owned and nationally-led forums or committees of multi-stakeholders whose goal is to contribute to the building of the respective country's resilience to disasters for the sake of sustainable development. Also relevant are the DRR Units

³⁶ AUC-DREA's mandate is to boost AU Member States' rural economy development and agricultural productivity by supporting the adoption of measures, strategies, policies and programmes on agriculture. It works closely with the Regional Economic Communities (RECs) and other partners. Key tasks include to: develop programmes ensuring food security; promote rural communities' initiatives and transfer of technologies; coordinate efforts to eradicate poverty and combat desertification and drought; promote agricultural products by small-scale producers; support the harmonisation of policies and strategies between the RECs; and initiate research on climate change, water and sanitation management. The Department has three divisions: Agriculture and Food Security; Environment, Climate Change, Water, Land and Natural Resources; and Rural Economy.

established by RECs.³⁷ The RECs with less visible DRR structures have also conducted efforts such as developing guidelines or programs with Member States in order to support both regional and sub-regional DRR interventions. Specifically, PfR should consider opportunities for capacity building for the ARSDRR institutions to coordinate and systematically monitor the implementation of the Strategy and Programme of Action.

4.3. Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP)

4.3.1. Overview

The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) is an agriculture programme of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), established in 2003. It is Africa's continental policy framework for agricultural transformation, wealth creation, food security and nutrition, economic growth and prosperity for all in Africa's largely farming based economies. CAADP's overall goal is to eliminate hunger and reduce poverty through agriculture. It seeks to achieve an annual growth rate of at least 6% in agricultural gross domestic product in every country involved through investment of at least 10% of annual national budgets in the agricultural sector. CAADP is organised around four primary Pillars. The first pillar focuses on extending the area under sustainable land management and reliable water control systems while the second aims at increasing market access through improved rural infrastructure and other trade related interventions. The third pillar involves increasing food supply and reducing hunger across the region by increasing smallholder productivity and improving responses to food emergencies. The final pillar focuses on improving agricultural research and systems to disseminate appropriate new technologies and increasing the support given to help farmers adopt them. A fifth pillar, sometimes referred to as CAADP 2, was added on the recommendation of the African Union (AU) Heads of State in July 2003 to address the development of livestock, fisheries, and forestry resources.

In 2012-2013, the "Sustaining CAADP Momentum to Spur Agricultural Transformation" exercise was undertaken in order to review the 10 years of CAADP implementation and draw on the lessons learnt. This resulted in the adoption of the Malabo Declaration on "Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods" by the African Union in 2014. Through the Malabo declaration, the Heads of State recommitted themselves to the CAADP principles and goals and defined a set of supplementary targets. The Malabo Declaration launched the second generation of 10 years of CAADP by adopting seven key commitments. The seven key commitments include: recommitment to the principles and values of the CAADP process; enhancing investment finance in agriculture; ending hunger in Africa by 2025; and halving poverty by the year 2025, through inclusive agricultural growth and transformation. Others are: boosting intra-African trade in agricultural commodities and services; enhancing resilience of livelihoods and production systems to climate variability and other related risks; and mutual accountability to actions and results. These commitments go beyond the 2003 CAADP areas encompassing infrastructure, natural resources, land tenure, trade and nutrition and emphasise the need of a sound mutual accountability system. Although the Malabo Declaration is wider, its predecessor, CAADP, is the main vehicle for implementation of its commitments.

³⁷ The AU recognizes the following RECs: Arab Maghreb Union, Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa, Community of Sahel-Saharan States, East African Community, Economic Community of Central African States, Economic Community of West African States, Indian Ocean Commission, Inter-Governmental Authority on Development, Southern Africa Development Community.

The Malabo CAADP Agenda introduced a number of key changes to the CAADP. First, over and above the focus on the agriculture sector, it requires CAADP to take account of related sectors that are required for agriculture growth. Secondly, it requires more inter-sectoral cooperation and coordination. Thirdly, it prescribes enhanced role of central government agencies in CAADP country implementation. Fourthly, it requires the development and implementation of other related frameworks to compliment the National Agriculture Investment Plans (NAIPs). Fifthly, it emphasizes implementation to ensure that it delivers on Malabo targets as well as against other national development targets.

4.3.2. Institutional Arrangement for implementation

(a) AU Commission on Rural Economy and Agriculture (AUC-DREA)

AUC-DREA is responsible for the policy framework and strategic guidance of CAADP. CAADP is a flagship “programme” within DREA which is administered by a team linked to the three Divisions: Agriculture and Food Security, Rural Economy, Environment and Natural Resources. AUC-DREA also works to garner political endorsement and international support for CAADP.

(b) NEPAD Planning and Coordination Agency (NPCA)

NPCA is the technical arm of AU coordinates the implementation of CAADP. It promotes the exchange of information regarding “good practices” between countries. Like the RECs, NPCA conducts monitoring and evaluation studies and reviews. It also identifies areas where additional funding is necessary and creates partnerships with donors to secure such funding.

(c) Regional Economic Communities (RECs)

The RECs play the role of setting and promoting a specific regional agenda and supporting the country level implementation. RECs interact with and address the needs of member states participating in the CAADP process. In particular, they have monitoring and evaluation roles, in which they conduct reviews of CAADP’s streamlining of member states’ policy processes. They raise awareness of the programme and encourage political leadership to engage. Most importantly, the RECS sign regional compacts and set up Regional Agricultural Investment Plans (RAIP). RAIPs aim to enhance regionally adapted agricultural development and trade issues. A CAADP resource group within a REC is responsible for the facilitation, support and capacity development of the country teams.

(d) CAADP country teams

CAADP Country Teams takes the lead in managing and coordinating the country-level process. Its membership is appointed by respective national governments. The membership typically comprises five to eight individuals, who may be affiliated with the ministry of agriculture, the private sector, NGOs, etc. The team is tasked with garnering political support for CAADP, collecting information for the “stock-taking” aspect of the process, encouraging the engagement of a broad spectrum of stakeholders, disseminating information on the process, etc. The elaboration and implementation of the National Agricultural Investment Plans is the central process, which guides national CAADP implementation. CAADP implementation Guidelines structure the process of NAIP elaboration and revision.

(e) Regional level pillar institutions

At regional level, the following four “pillar institutions” (one for each pillar) support the country-level process by providing expertise and technical guidance in the form of economic analysis, reviews of current public expenditure or studies of options policymakers have on any given decision.

- The University of Zambia, and particularly its department of soil science, and the Comité permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte contre la Secheresse dans le Sahel (CILSS), a research organisation that combats food insecurity in the Sahel, leads Pillar 1, providing CAADP stakeholders with guidance on sustainable land and water management.
- The Conference of Ministers of Agriculture of West and Central Africa—a collection of ministers from 20 African countries—leads Pillar 2 and its initiatives relating to market access through improved rural infrastructure and other trade-related interventions.
- The University of KwaZulu Natal, and particularly the School of Agriculture, Earth and Environmental Sciences, as well as CILSS lead Pillar 3: issues relating to food security, smallholder productivity and responses to food emergencies.
- The Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa, an umbrella body of regional agricultural research organisations, leads Pillar 4 on agricultural research.

Performing similar roles of these institutions are other supporting organisations including the Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (ReSAKSS) and the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). ReSAKSS is located throughout Africa, with particular centres of operation in West, Southern, and Central/East Africa. This group produces high-level technical assistance for CAADP implementers, including its Annual Trends and Outlook Report, which examines rates of agricultural growth across the continent, supporting efforts to achieve CAADP goals and objectives.

(a) CAADP Non-state Actors Coalition

The CNC is a Pan-African coalition of non-state actors engaged in agriculture. It comprises food producers, pastoralists and fisherfolks organizations, civil society, private sector, women, smallholders, youth, media and academic organizations. Through CNC, non-state actors coordinate support for CAADP agenda. The Secretariat of CNC is hosted at ACORD in Nairobi.

4.3.3. Implementation Progress

The first decade of CAADP (2003 -2013) was largely characterised by providing countries and regions with a clear set of steps to embark on through the CAADP Round Table process for establishing country teams³⁸, signing CAADP Compacts³⁹, developing national or regional agriculture investment plans (NAIPs or RAIPs), and holding CAADP business meetings. In the Horn of Africa, Kenya signed the CAADP Compact on 23 -24 July 2010. The country reviewed its NAIP and held the first Business Meeting in September 2010. Uganda signed the CAADP Compact on 30 - 31 March 2010 and organised its independent technical review for the 2–10 September the same year. A business

³⁸ To date 23 countries - Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cape Verde, Cote d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda and Zambia - have completed the CAADP Roundtable process and signed their CAADP ‘compacts’. ECOWAS has also signed a regional compact. Several other countries are still at various stages of the Roundtable process.

³⁹ CAADP Compact refers to an agreement on priority areas for investment signed by key partners after assessing the realities of their own particular situation and developing a road map for going forward, during CAADP county round-tables.

meeting was held from 16-17 September 2010. Ethiopia signed a CAADP Compact in September 2009 and prepared its Policy and Investment Framework (PIF) – a roadmap for Ethiopia's agriculture and rural development over the next decade. South Sudan received technical support from the NEPAD Agency to develop its draft CAADP Compact and has advanced in the development of the Agriculture Investment Plan.⁴⁰

With CAADP now in its second decade, countries and regions are developing the second generation or new National Agriculture Invest Plans (NAIPs) or Regional Agriculture Investment Plans (RAIPs). As of August 2017, 42 of 55 AU member states had signed CAADP compacts and 33 had developed, reviewed, and validated related NAIPs. The NAIPs provide detailed implementation plans for achieving CAADP/Malabo goals and targets. Following the signing of the compact and the development of a NAIP, countries hold a business meeting to discuss financing modalities for the plan. By August 2017, 28 countries had held business meetings. To help countries finance the gaps in their NAIPs and achieve their targeted outcomes, the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) was created in 2010. To date, 17 countries in Africa have been approved for GAFSP funding totalling US\$611.5 million. In 2016, the AU and NPCA and relevant RECs organised Malabo domestication events in various countries to launch the NAIP formulation process and ensure its alignment with Malabo commitments. To date, domestication events have been held in eight countries⁴¹. Technical support from ReSAKSS and IFPRI led to the production of a Malabo Status Assessment and Profile that evaluates the current situation in a country, and a Malabo Goals and Milestones Report that analyses requirements for achieving Malabo targets. By August 2017, Malabo Status Assessments and Profiles had been completed for 13 countries and Malabo Goals and Milestone Reports had been completed for 4 countries.

To strengthen mutual accountability, ReSAKSS, at the request of AUC and NPCA and in collaboration with Africa Lead, has to date initiated agricultural Joint Sector Review (JSR) assessments in 30 countries. These assessments are aimed at evaluating the institutional and policy landscape as well as the quality of current agricultural review processes and identifying areas that need strengthening in order to help countries develop JSR processes that are regular, comprehensive, and inclusive. Out of 30 country-level JSR assessments that have been initiated, 7 were completed in 2014 and 11 were completed between 2015 and 2016, bringing the total number of countries with completed assessments to 18.

The experiences and lessons from the assessments were used in preparing for the inaugural CAADP Biennial Review (BR) report that was presented at the AU summit in January 2018. The BR process involves evaluating the progress made by individual member states on the Malabo Declaration Commitments using balanced scorecard methods, to come up with an African Agricultural Transformation Scorecard (AATS). An inaugural continental BR report and scorecard was produced in presented at the January 2018. A second round of the BR is scheduled for 2020, with the preparation process expected to start in 2018. According to the AU Biennial Report, 2017⁴², only 20 of the 47 Member States that reported progress in implementing the Malabo Declaration are on track towards achieving the commitments set out in the Declaration by 2025. Rwanda has the highest score (6.1) on AATS and is the 2017 best performing country in implementing the seven (7) commitments of the Malabo Declaration, followed by Mali (5.6), Morocco (5.5), Ethiopia (5.3), Togo (4.9), Malawi (4.9), Kenya (4.8), Mauritania (4.8), Burundi (4.7), and Uganda (4.5) respectively. Regionally, East Africa performed best with a score of 4.2, followed by Southern Africa with a score

⁴⁰ NEPAD, 2015

⁴¹ Burundi, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda

⁴² NEPAD, 2017

of 4.0. The average score for the whole Africa, based on the 47 country reports, indicates the African Union is not on-track in meeting the CAADP/Malabo commitments when assessed against the benchmark for 2017.

Under the joint coordination of EAC, IGAD, and COMESA, eight (8) countries namely Burundi, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda, submitted their national BRs to the AU Assembly. The overall average score indicates that the region is on-track in meeting the Malabo commitments when assessed against the benchmark for 2017. Among the 8 countries, five (5) are on-track in meeting Malabo commitments and these include: Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda. The other three (3) countries: Djibouti, Sudan and Tanzania are not on-track. Out of the seven commitment areas of Malabo assessed in the BR, the Eastern and Horn of Africa region is on track in four commitment areas.⁴³ Although the region has performed well, both by being on track to meet the CAADP/Malabo commitments and implementing the BR process, the fact that eight countries did not complete the process and submit their reports on schedule is a matter of concern.

Overall, CAADP has led to more specific, purposeful and incentive-oriented agricultural policies; improved donor coordination, harmonization, alignment to country priorities; helped identify targeted programmes that have the highest potential to generate returns on investments; increased regional cooperation; and facilitated the establishment of monitoring and evaluation, peer review, dialogue and accountability mechanisms.

4.3.4. Strengths and gaps in relation to Integrated Risk Management

Key IRM-related strengths identified include efforts to integrate climate change adaptation and ecosystem management; focus on supporting livelihoods and partnerships. Considerable efforts have been made to integrate climate change adaptation (CCA) and ecosystem restoration and management (ERM) within the CAADP. In fact, CAADP's first pillar is centred on ERM as it aims at extending the area under sustainable land management. The commitments made under the Malabo declaration offered further impetus to CAADP's commitment to integrate CCA in its interventions. One of the seven Malabo commitments is - enhancing resilience of livelihoods and production systems to climate variability and other related risks. CAADP also underscores the heightened vulnerability of the African continent (farmers, processors, and consumers) to weather uncertainty, risks, and shocks associated with Climate Change. To address this, the CAADP Partnership Platform proposed a set of goals including integrating and emphasising climate change adaptation and risk management and strategies meaningfully in the current and second generation of National Agriculture Investment Plans (NAIPS).

The CAADP also integrates livelihood-support, a key principle in IRM. It has livelihoods-related provisions includes its key pillars such as: increasing market access through rural infrastructure and other trade related interventions; increasing food supply and reducing hunger. Even the Malabo commitments such as: ending hunger in Africa by 2025; halving poverty by the year 2025 are critical to enhancing livelihoods. Further, the CAADP underscore the importance of partnerships and collaboration, especially through the changes introduced by the Malabo CAADP Agenda, specifically, the call for more inter-sectoral cooperation and coordination. In fact, CAADP document is itself a product of a partnership between NEPAD and the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and other partners. As stated, CAADP relies on a diverse partnership architecture comprising

⁴³ The four commitment areas are: re-commitment to CAADP process; halving poverty through agriculture by 2025; boosting intra-African trade in agriculture commodities; and enhancing Mutual accountability for actions and results

development partners, private sector entities, non- state actors, farmers’ organizations and research. The CAADP Partnership Platform is particularly an important forum for collaboration and information and knowledge sharing. Another key strength of the CAADP is its demonstration of great progress with regard to implementation monitoring and reporting by clearly presenting country implementation status.

Despite these strengths, the CAADP has had some challenges which have perhaps informed Africa’s slow pace towards meeting the CAADP/Malabo commitments. According to Dr. Washington Ochola⁴⁴, projections show that under current production levels, only 13 per cent of what Africa needs would be produced in 2050, a. Crop yield levels are stagnant and low while vulnerable and disadvantaged populations are not included. Hunger and malnutrition is still prevalent and most of the production is under subsistence farming. Despite Africa having an extremely strong economic growth, it was still the most food insecure continent. The challenges with regard to CAADP implementation include weak multi-sectoral collaboration among African governments and institutions.

- **Weak multi-sectoral collaboration among African governments and institutions**

Weak multi-sectoral collaboration among African governments and institutions is hindering the progress of countries on the path of higher economic growth through agriculture-led development. At the national level, collaboration between ministries, departments and agencies on the implementation of CAADP is also weak. Various government institutions work in isolation, which is retarding progress on the implementation of CAADP programmes.

- **Inadequate financial allocation to agriculture**

According to the inaugural Biennial Review (BR) the HoA region allocated only 7.7% of public expenditure to agriculture on average. This is way too low considering that agriculture is the mainstay of the region’s economies. The BR further indicates that the region underperformed in increasing the value of intra-African Trade for agricultural goods and services which decreased by 3.0%.

4.3.5. Engagement opportunities for the Partners for Resilience (PfR)

As the team responsible for garnering political support for CAADP, the CAADP country teams are key for PfR engagement. PfR country teams could work with the respective CAADP country teams to lobby the respective national governments to implement effective policy measures, harmonize their operations and ensure stronger partnerships for the implementation of programs under the CAADP. The PfR should also specifically lobby the governments to mobilize and allocate adequate national resources to discharge the CAADP agenda, and to enhance stronger inter-sectoral collaboration.

The inaugural BR recommendations form another useful entry point for PfR. Specifically, BR recommends fast-tracking of the review and implementation of CAADP Malabo Regional Agricultural Investment Plans and setting up adequate regional policies to deliver the regional level Malabo Targets. These includes policies on trade, regional value chain development and Resilience to climate change. It also recommends the need for IGAD, COMESA and EAC to empathise their support to NAIPs effective implementation and Member States to increase resources to improve data systems for improved evidence-based planning and adequate reporting on all CAADP/Malabo indicators.

⁴⁴ Dr. Ochola is a Policy and Capacity Building Specialist/Advisor at Africa Lead II. He was speaking when he gave a presentation on behalf of the Africa Union on “Overview of CAADP and Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods”.

At country level, the BR recommends the need for Kenya to increase funding to agriculture to meet the CAADP target of 10 percent and ensure full allocation of all the budget lines on social protection. The country should increase investments in resilience building to climate variability and strengthen systems for collection of data on Malabo indicators to fill data gaps. For Uganda, the Report recommends increasing funding to the agricultural sector to meet the CAADP Malabo target of 10% and invest in nutrition interventions to reduce undernourishment. The country should also establish and facilitate implementation of measures to boost agricultural productivity. Lastly, the country should put in place policies that promote intra-African trade in agricultural commodities and services. Recommendations for Ethiopia include: investing in nutrition interventions to reduce malnutrition among children under 5 years old; implementation of measures aimed at doubling agricultural productivity to meet the related Malabo target; and facilitating access to financial and agricultural advisory services.

4.4. Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa: Securing, Protecting and Improving the Lives, Livelihoods and Rights of Pastoralist Communities

4.4.1. Overview

The Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa: Securing, Protecting and Improving the Lives, Livelihoods and Rights of Pastoralist Communities⁴⁵ is the first continent-wide policy initiative which aims to secure, protect and improve the lives, livelihoods and rights of African pastoralists. The policy framework was approved by the Executive Council of the African Union⁴⁶ following its adoption by the Conference of African Ministers of Agriculture, held from 25 to 29 October 2010 in Lilongwe, Malawi. The policy framework is premised on the recognition that African pastoralists are among the most politically and economically marginalized and vulnerable communities. This is reflected in decreasing access to the natural resources on which pastoralists' livelihoods depend; limited access to basic socio-economic services and infrastructure; and conflicts. Other manifestations of African pastoralists' vulnerability are poverty, environmental degradation, marked rainfall variability and disease. These challenges are exacerbated by inappropriate development policies, ineffective institutional settings, unfair market relationships and increased pressure on pastoral ecosystems.⁴⁷ With this background, the policy framework aims to mobilize and coordinate political commitment to pastoral development in the continent. It emphasizes the involvement of pastoralists in the national and regional pastoralist development processes, and harmonization of pastoral policies across Africa's Regional Economic Communities (RECs) and member states.

The policy framework is structured around three main entities: a set of guiding and cross-cutting principles; two main objectives; and strategies against each of the objectives. The first of the framework's two main objectives is to "secure and protect the lives, livelihoods and rights of pastoral peoples and ensure continent-wide commitment to political, social and economic development of pastoral communities and pastoral areas".⁴⁸ The core focus of this objective is policy and institutional strengthening processes, and support to good governance in relation to pastoralist issues. The strategies around this objective revolves around promoting greater recognition of the role of pastoralism in development; better policy and related budgetary support; and full integration of pastoral issues into decision-making processes. Other objective 1 strategy areas are recognition of traditional pastoral institutions; the roles and rights of women in pastoral communities; and

⁴⁵ African Union 2010a

⁴⁶ African Union 2010b

⁴⁷ pp. 9-10

⁴⁸ p. 10

mainstreaming pastoral issues in poverty reduction programmes. The second objective, which mainly deals with improvement of pastoral resource governance, is to “reinforce the contribution of pastoral livestock to national, regional and continent-wide economies”. The strategies under this objective include: strengthening pastoralist access to their rangelands; supporting policies aimed at enabling pastoral mobility; and securing livelihoods and rights of pastoralist communities. Other objective 2 strategies include preventing avoidable losses of livestock assets; supporting the marketing of pastoral livestock and livestock products; and supporting further development of credit and financial services for pastoralists.

The policy framework’s guiding principles include: recognition of the rights of pastoralists; participation and inclusion of pastoralist in political and policy processes; recognition of pastoralism as a way of life and as a production system; and support to pastoral strategic mobility. Others are: promoting regional approaches; risk management; acknowledging and building on existing policy processes; and periodically updating the policy framework.

4.4.2. Institutional Arrangement for Implementation

The Policy framework recognizes that its implementation requires active collaboration of different institutions with specific but complementary roles. It also recognizes that it is to be implemented through development, implementation and tracking of country pastoralism policies. In terms of institutional arrangement therefore, it envisages establishment of national steering committees and strong national inter-disciplinary support team of experts to develop national policies on pastoralism. According to the policy framework, the national steering committee is responsible for providing guidance and supervision at each stage of the national pastoral policy development process. The committees may comprise representatives of key sector institutions, such as ministry in charge of agriculture, livestock, environment, water, territorial administration, local development, health, education, agricultural research, pastoralist organisations/associations/councils, civil society organization, and development partners. The national support team of experts may comprise experts from livestock, justice, land, finance/economy, universities/research systems, etc., who have experiences in local pastoral issues. The teams’ main responsibility is to develop national pastoral policies and strategies and follow up its implementation after its adoption.

4.4.3. Implementation Progress

A number of national initiatives relevant to the policy framework have been implemented in the region. For instance, individual countries in the region have initiated or strengthened a range of policies and/or laws that impact on pastoral livelihoods. These include policies on governance, policies on land and natural resource management, policies on economic development and policies on peace-building, disaster management and security. With regard to governance, progress mainly involve building on constitutional recognition of the right of pastoralists and decentralization policies. Specifically, the Ethiopian Constitution guarantees the right to grazing land for pastoralists and the right not to be displaced from their lands. Decentralisation policies in Kenya (devolution) Uganda and Ethiopia also provide opportunities for pastoralists to influence decisions at the local level. Countries in the region have also initiated policies on land and natural resource management that can support productive and sustainable pastoralism. For instance, Kenya through the National Land Policy, the Constitution and the Community Land Act has recognized and elevated communal ownership of land as a tenure system that is equal in stature to the private and public tenure which were hitherto given preferential treatment by successive regimes. Uganda has also recognised the issues of land tenure security through the provisions on community land in the 1998 Land Act and in

the Land Sector Strategic Plan of 2002. Ethiopia has recognised pastoral land rights in the constitution at federal government level, although statutory provisions such as the Rural Land Administration and Land Use Proclamation seem to undermine opportunities for communal land-holding.

Buoyed by these provisions, countries have gone ahead to develop specific instruments to promote pastoralism. Kenya launched the National Policy for the Sustainable Development of Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands in February 2013. Through the policy, the government of Kenya committed to recognize pastoralism as a legitimate form of land use and development and to incorporate the value of dryland goods and services within national economic planning. In 2016, Kenya enacted the Community Land Act which if implemented, will go a long way in offering clear protection for community lands.

At the regional level, although not explicitly attributed to the policy framework, a number of continental and regional level projects or programmes relevant to the Policy Framework's objectives have been initiated. These include the IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI)⁴⁹, IGAD Centre for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development (ICPALD), and the Regional Pastoral Resilience Project (RPLRP). ICPALD's was established in 2012 to compliment IGAD member states' efforts to sustainably generate wealth and employment through livestock and complementary livelihood resources development in arid and semi-arid areas of the IGAD region.

Pastoralism policy has also received global support particularly through the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). At its second session held from 23–27 May 2016 at UNEP in Nairobi, Kenya, the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA) adopted a resolution on Combating Desertification, Land Degradation and Drought and Promoting Sustainable Pastoralism and Rangelands.⁵⁰ This was in recognition of pastoralism's ability to promote healthy ecosystems in the face of climate change. Among other important provisions for pastoralism, the resolution urges UN Member States to build the capacity of and continue or increase investment in the pastoral livestock sector in order to improve productivity, contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and maintain and enhance biodiversity. This includes through sustainable land management practices, improved and/or restored ecosystems, access to markets, and livestock health and breeding, and enhanced livestock extension services. The resolution also encourages continental and regional intergovernmental bodies to support joint and cross-border development programmes for neighbouring pastoralist and other communities in order to increase the level of mutual trust and confidence, as well as to mitigate conflicts.

4.4.4. Strengths and gaps in relation to Integrated Risk Management

The Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa has a number of opportunities that can be built on to achieve Integrated Risk Management (IRM). These opportunities include: recognition of landscape and ecosystem restoration and management (ERM) as a critical cog of risk management. Others are: recognition of local communities, women, youth and other vulnerable groups in policy and decision-making; focus on livelihood support systems; and partnerships. With regard to ERM, the policy framework addresses issues such as pastoral rangeland governance and protection of genetic resources. The policy framework also stands out with regard to recognition of vulnerable groups which is a key principle of IRM. Indeed, the policy framework's development was in itself in

⁴⁹ The IDDRSI is discussed in detail in Section 5.5

⁵⁰ United Nations, 2016

recognition of a vulnerable group - pastoralists. Among other things, the policy framework aims to secure and protect the lives, livelihoods and rights of pastoralists and ensure continent-wide commitment to the development of pastoral communities. The policy framework further specifically recognizes the role of women within the pastoral systems by including the roles and rights of women in pastoral communities among the policy framework's key strategy areas. This is particularly important because pastoral communities are widely characterised by gender inequalities that favour men over women. That the policy framework seeks to support strengthening of pastoral livelihoods is another score with regard to IRM. Its very title – 'Securing, Protecting and Improving the Lives, Livelihoods and Rights of Pastoralist Communities...' indeed recognizes the importance of supporting livelihood systems. To actualize this, a number of the policy framework's key strategies have potential to support and enhance pastoralists' livelihoods. These include securing livelihoods and rights of pastoralist communities; preventing avoidable losses of livestock assets; supporting the marketing of pastoral livestock and livestock products; and supporting the development of credit and financial services for pastoralists.

The policy framework underscores partnerships, another key element of IRM. It envisages collaboration of key sector institutions under national steering committees. These institutions include ministries in charge of agriculture, livestock, environment, water, territorial administration, local development, health, education, and agricultural research; and pastoralist organisations/associations/councils, civil society organization, and development partners. It also envisages collaboration with national inter-disciplinary support team of experts which may comprise experts from livestock, justice, land, finance/economy, universities/research systems, etc. This is in addition to its requirement for a regional level network of relevant institutions to facilitate the sharing of experiences in pastoral-related participatory monitoring and evaluation systems, among other requirements.

Despite these good IRM-related provisions, the analysis has also identified a number of gaps. These include: non-integration of climate change adaptation; lack of a clear in-built institution or department for coordination; weakness in monitoring and reporting; and inadequate oversight by civil society and grassroot organizations.

- **Non-integration of Climate Change Adaptation (CCA)**

The policy framework clearly recognizes the threats and opportunities that climate change portends for pastoralists. It however seems to emphasize the adaptability of pastoralism to climate change at the expense of promoting adaptation strategies for pastoralists. In fact, beyond recommending policy that support research and understanding on role of pastoral rangelands in carbon sequestration and carbon trading, none of the policy framework strategies directly addresses climate change adaptation. Pastoralism responds to climate change by making best use of patchy vegetation, erratic rainfalls and coping with increasing droughts. However, it should be noted that pastoralism is also highly sensitive to climate change. Pastoralism is increasingly threatened by loss of livestock and livelihoods to droughts and floods; loss of traditional knowledge and information systems due to loss of biodiversity; food insecurity; disruptions to families and increasing poverty. Declining livestock is also causing reduction in number of marriages, etc. It is thus clear that interventions to promote pastoralism in Africa may not be sufficient if they don't address adaptation of pastoralists to climate change. The policy framework for pastoralism in Africa falls short of doing this and in this regard fails in terms of achieving the IRM approach to risk management.

- **Lack of a clear in-built institution or department for coordination and monitoring**

The policy framework envisages African Union Member States (MS) to develop, implement and track country pastoralism policies. However, this needs an in-built continental institution to coordinate, monitor and report on MS' progress with regard to the policy framework's implementation. Indeed, the AU Decision⁵¹ that approved the resolution on the policy framework requested AUC and the RECs to strengthen and/or establish such a coordinating institution. Despite, these requirements, no coordinating and/or monitoring institution has been established or assigned. The African Union Commission Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture (AUC-DREA) is responsible for coordinating and monitoring the policy framework's implementation. The challenge with this is that AUC-DREA is fairly lean in staffing and is also poorly resourced.⁵² As a result, the policy framework's implementation seems to largely be at the discretion of member states with no strict requirements for reporting.

- **Weakness in monitoring and reporting**

Despite recognition of the need for effective monitoring of progress in the policy and elaborate provisions on monitoring and evaluation, there is scarce literature on monitoring, evaluation or learning reports on the policy framework. In fact, a number of continental, regional and national level projects or programmes that are of relevance to the Policy Framework's objectives have been initiated and implemented but are not in any way attributed to the policy framework. This makes it extremely difficult to gauge the policy framework's implementation progress. The weakness in monitoring and reported is attributable in part to lack of a central continental coordinating institution for the policy framework.

- **Inadequate oversight by civil society and grassroots organizations**

Implementation of the policy framework is further hindered by lack of representative and effective pastoral civil society movements capable of articulating the development concerns of their members and following up on policy implementation. Even in countries like Kenya which have strong pastoral civil societies, articulating a common national pastoralist position remains a big challenge. Ability of pastoralists to organize is hindered by factors like lack of information, inadequate resources and growing ethnic intolerance and violence related to competition for resources. Such movements also lack effective advocacy skills. They more often than not involve in protests rather than to positive engagement as the first line of advocacy. Moreover, in some cases, pastoralists organizations and movements' activities are influenced more by the government(s) rather than the pastoralists themselves.

- **Sedentarization Policies**

Certain national level policies seem to be at variance with the need to recognize pastoralism as a way of life. In Ethiopia for instance, policies concerned with development of pastoral areas generally advocate for voluntary settlement of the pastoralists and diversification into agriculture and other non-livestock livelihoods. A good example is the Ministry of Federal Affairs' 2008 Draft Policy Statement for the Sustainable Development of Pastoral and Agro-Pastoral Areas of Ethiopia which encourages sedentarization, especially along perennial riverbanks. The government commits in the policy to provide support for the expansion of irrigation through household rainwater harvesting and construction of multi-purpose dams to support irrigation, which will enable pastoral and agro-pastoral people to pursue a sedentary life with a diversified and sustainable income. Ethiopia's 2001 Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper also encourages settlement by facilitating water supply to

⁵¹ African Union 2010b

⁵² See section 4.2.4

settled/semi-settled pastoralists. In the Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty, the government pledges technical support to encourage pastoralists to practice agricultural activities side by side with their regular activities, through the introduction of small-scale irrigation. The document fails to recognise that mobility is an important strategy in pastoralism and that restricting pastoral mobility disrupts livelihoods in pastoral areas.

4.4.5. Engagement opportunities for the Partners for Resilience (PfR)

At the continental level, the African Union Commission Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture (AUC-DREA) provide a good entry point for PfR engagement. Specifically, PfR can lobby AUC-DREA to establish or at least assign a unit or desk to deal with pastoral issues. The unit/desk so established should handle all pastoral and related issues in an integrated way that takes into account climate change, ecosystem management and disaster risks reduction. The unit should particularly pay close attention to the coordination, monitoring and reporting on the Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa. Due to the broadness of AUC-DREA's mandate and the multiplicity of initiatives it presides over, the proposed coordination unit may not necessarily be strictly concerned with pastoral issues. The important thing is that there should be a unit that is clearly charged with the role of coordinating, monitoring and reporting on the policy framework, even if the unit's role covers other related initiatives.

At the national level, the proposed national level platforms - national steering committees and national inter-disciplinary support team of experts – are good entry points for PfR. The committees in fact have provisions for representation of civil society organizations and development partners. It is not clear from the available information whether the national steering committees and national inter-disciplinary support team of experts have been constituted in any of the HoA countries. A good starting point for PfR country teams would be to reach out to the respective governments to find out the position regarding these platforms. Where they have not been constituted, PfR country teams can work with the respective government agencies, development partners, pastoralist organizations and other relevant stakeholders to establish them.

Capacity building is another important role that PfR can play in order to ensure effective implementation of the policy framework. Capacity gaps have particularly been identified in the areas of monitoring and reporting as well as oversight. In the interim, PfR can explore opportunities to work with AUC-DREA to sensitize it on the AU decision on African Pastoralism and the policy framework's requirements for as well as the need and importance of effective and continuous monitoring and reporting. If or once the pastoral unit proposed above and the country platforms are established, PfR can also explore opportunities to enhance the institutions' capacities particularly in programming, coordination, monitoring and reporting, as well as effective liaison with partners. PfR country teams can also identify and support national pastoralist organizations and movements to enhance their advocacy strategies and engagement especially on national level pastoralism policies and the Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa. The capacity building efforts should also aim to sensitize both the continental level institutions and the country teams on the importance of mainstreaming climate change adaptation while implementing the policy.

The PfR Ethiopia country team should initiate policy advocacy efforts aimed at promoting greater recognition of economic viability of pastoralism and the need to support this livelihood system.

Specifically, the advocacy should aim to convince the government through its relevant ministries and agencies that sedentarization is likely to worsen the challenges facing pastoral livelihoods.

4.5. IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI)

4.5.1. Overview

The IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI)⁵³ was endorsed in February 2013 at an IGAD General Assembly meeting. This was as a result of the decision to end drought emergencies taken by IGAD and East African Community (EAC) Heads of State and Government at the first Resilience Summit convened in Nairobi on 9th September 2011. This followed the severe drought that devastated the region in 2010/2011. IDDRSI is a comprehensive plan, aimed at combating chronic food and nutrition insecurity and addressing poverty and environmental degradation to build the resilience of communities and households to the effects of recurrent droughts and other shocks in the IGAD region. This is to be realised through innovative sustainable development strategies, policies and programs at Member States' and regional levels. The IDDRSI approach is pro-active, combining both relief with development interventions in dealing with drought and related emergencies in the Horn of Africa.

The Strategy identifies seven Priority Intervention Areas (PIAs) that cut across the four pillars of IGAD's overall strategy. PIA 1 is about ensuring equitable access and sustainable use of natural resources, while improving environmental management. PIA 2 is on enhancing market access, facilitating trade and availing versatile financial services. PIA 3 is about providing equitable access to livelihood support and basic social services. PIA 4 seeks to improve disaster risk management capabilities and preparedness for effective response. PIA 5 is enhancing the generation and use of research, knowledge, technology and innovations in the IGAD region. PIA 6 is promoting conflict prevention and resolution and peace building. Finally, PIA 7 is on strengthening coordination mechanisms and institutional arrangements for more organised, collaborative and synergistic action, as well as improving partnerships to increase the commitment and support necessary to execute the objectives of the initiative.

The Strategy serves as a common framework for developing national and regional programmes designed to enhance drought resilience through building sustainability in the IGAD region. It guides and informs the process of implementing the drought resilience initiative at the national, regional and international levels united and harmonised under the overall coordination and leadership of the IGAD Secretariat. The strategy, by design, recognises that while drought-prone communities face common challenges and are often interconnected through shared natural resources and regional trade and trans-boundary human and animal movements, individual IGAD member states may have their own specificities and areas of emphasis.

4.5.2. Institutional Arrangement

a) IGAD Regional Drought Resilience and Sustainability Platform

The IGAD Regional Drought Resilience and Sustainability Platform provides coordination mechanisms for implementation of IDDRSI. Under the Platform, the region's priorities and possibilities for interventions aimed at achieving the objectives of IDDRSI are collectively discussed by affected countries and development partners. It brings together the Member States, IGAD Secretariat,

⁵³ IGAD, 2013

Development Partners, the AU, other RECs, UN agencies, Civil Society and specialised research and training institutions. The Platform is made up of the General Assembly, Platform Steering Committee, IGAD Secretariat/Platform Coordination Unit and Project Steering Committee.

b) General Assembly

The General Assembly provides overall strategic guidance and makes decisions on investment plans and proposals. The General Assembly reviews the IDDRSI Platform reports and provides guidance and policy direction for the operations of the Platform, including leadership in the mobilisation of resources. The current membership of the General Assembly consists of ministers from IGAD Member States leading IDDRSI implementation in the respective countries; and similar level representatives of Development and implementing partners. The membership of the General Assembly from the IGAD Member States should be ministers in charge of cross-cutting ministries, such as coordination, finance and planning, especially those that are directly concerned with the implementation of IDDRSI to ensure optimum representation of all the sectors and stakeholders and enhance coordination of IDDRSI service delivery.

c) Platform Steering Committee

The platform Steering Committee comprises members at senior policy level and national experts and guides the Regional Platform on policy issues and oversees the implementation of the drought resilience initiative;

d) Platform Coordination Unit

The Platform Coordination Unit is the executive arm of the platform with the mandate to coordinate the implementation of IDDRSI strategy at national and regional levels. This Unit is embedded within the IGAD Secretariat charged with the responsibility to lead, promote, manage and coordinate the activities in the implementation of IDDRSI.

e) Resilience Analysis Unit

The Resilience Analysis Unit was set up by the IGAD Secretariat as a technical arm of the IDDRSI Platform that focuses on understanding vulnerability, resilience analysis and measurement. This is crucial to assess the impact of resilience investment within the framework of IDDRSI, to determine whether or not the intended objectives of the investment are achieved.

f) IGAD Specialised Units and Divisions

All divisions of IGAD secretariat and other IGAD Specialised institutions are designed to support the identification, development, implementation and monitoring of IDDRSI PIAs. IGAD division of Agriculture and Environment is the focal point for Pillar 1 and 3, while IGAD Centre for Pastoral and Livestock Development (ICPALD) provide technical support to this division and focal point for Pillar 3 (Livelihoods support and basic social services). Division for Economic Cooperation and Social Development is focal point on Pillar 2 (Market access, trade and financial services). Division for Peace and security is focal point for Pillar 6 (conflict prevention, resolution and peace building). As such, the IGAD Climate Predictions and Applications Centre (ICPAC) was to support and be the focal point for Pillar 4 (Disaster Risk Management, preparedness and effective response).

Other institutions which are not directly linked to but are relevant to IDDRSI objectives include the IGAD NGOs/CSOs Forum. The IGAD NGOs/CSOs Forum was established by IGAD to promote enhanced collaboration among and between NGOs/CSOs in the region.

4.5.3. Implementation Progress

Implementation of IDDRSI is guided by its strategy, which identifies the 7 PIAs that highlight and prioritise the region's food security and other development challenges in relation to the objective of achieving drought resilience. Since its inception in 2012/2013, considerable progress has been made on various fronts in the implementation of IDDRSI throughout the IGAD region. Key achievements include the establishment and operationalisation of the IDDRSI Regional Platform and the development of the IDDRSI Strategy and its subsequent interpretation into Country Programming Papers (CPPs) and Regional Programming Paper (RPP). The translation of the CPPs and RPP into investments plans and project proposals for resource mobilization is lauded as a further progress. There is also the establishment and operationalisation of national IDDRSI Platform coordination structures and of the IDDRSI Platform Coordination Unit (PCU).

Specific regional interventions under the IDDRSI framework include the the Regional Pastoral Livelihoods Resilience Project (RPLRP) which is being undertaken in three IGAD member states (Kenya, Ethiopia and Uganda), with IGAD as the overall coordinator. The project seeks to enhance livelihood resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in cross-border drought prone areas of selected countries and improve their capacity to respond promptly and effectively to an eligible crisis or emergency. RPLRP has five main components across the three countries and IGAD: natural resources management; market Access and trade; livelihood support; pastoral risk management; and project management and institutional support. The IGAD component of RPLRP focuses on harmonizing regional policies, scaling up good practices and facilitating discussions on issues related to cross-border activities.⁵⁴ Among other things, RPLRP completed three reports related to pastoral areas disaster risk management (DRM) as part of support to policy harmonization in the three project countries. The reports are: assessment of the early warning system; assessment of risk profiling approaches; and review of contingency planning approaches.

At the national level, individual HoA countries have made significant progress. Kenya established a secretariat at its National Drought Management Authority (NDMA)⁵⁵ to lead and coordinate the implementation of the CPP. The secretariat is supported by the IGAD National IDDRSI Coordinator. The country's CPP has been converted into an implementation framework called Ending Drought Emergencies (EDE) with 6 pillars which integrates all the IDDRSI pillars. The EDE pillars are: peace and human security; humanitarian preparedness; climate-proofed infrastructure development; building human capital; sustainable livelihoods in a context of climate change; and institutions and coordination. The EDE framework was integrated into the government of Kenya Vision 2030 through a Medium-Term Plan 2. A total of USD 2,404,770,696 has been committed for the implementation of the EDE framework. In Uganda, the National Disaster Risk Reduction Platform⁵⁶ leads and coordinates the implementation of the CPP. IDDRSI is not only aligned to the Uganda Strategic Investment Framework for Sustainable Land Management but is also harmonised with the National Development Plan (2016 – 2020) and was allocated a total budget of USD 64,966,430⁵⁷

In Ethiopia, the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries with support from the IGAD National IDDRSI Coordinator coordinates the implementation of the CPP. A total of USD 248,504,991 has been mobilised for the implementation of the CPP out of which USD\$ 192 Million was mobilised as soft loans and grants from the World Bank, IDC, BMZ and the African Development. However, the

⁵⁴ African Union 2016b

⁵⁵ See section 4.2.3

⁵⁶ Ibid

⁵⁷ See the Mid-Term Review (MTR) Report of the 1st Phase, 2013 – 2017, of the Implementation of IDDRSI

absorption rate of the latter funds is presently low at 8%. South Sudan adopted the IDDRSI Strategy through a comprehensive CPP in 2012 to achieve drought resilience. However, since December 2013, the Country has faced numerous challenges of insecurity, which has compromised effective implementation of the CPP. Under a temporary arrangement, the Ministry of Environment, supported by the IGAD National IDDRSI Coordinator for South Sudan, coordinates the implementation of its CPP. Owing to the on-going insecurity in the country, most investments are humanitarian and emergency response in nature. A proposal is underway for the establishment of the CPP national coordination mechanism under the Ministry of Environment as the Chair of the National IDDRSI Coordination framework, with the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Cooperatives, and Rural Development as the co-chair.

Despite the progress however, based on country scores in the IDDRSI progress dashboard, all the PIAs planned actions for HoA countries as outlined in the IDDRSI Strategy, IDDRSI regional Platform, MS CPP and IGAD RPP, have not started.⁵⁸ At IGAD regional level, it was evident that the planned actions have been initiated and preliminary programme activities started on all the PIAs except PIA 6 on Conflict Resolution and Peace Building.⁵⁹

4.5.4. Strengths and gaps in relation to Integrated Risk Management

The seven identified PIAs under IDDRSI are critical to IRM as they focus on building resilience through reducing the vulnerability of target communities to climatic shocks in the HoA region. IDDRSI's focus and approach on disaster management with the objective to promote equitable and significant disaster risk management, preparedness and effective response in the IGAD region⁶⁰ is similar to what is advocated for by the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015 – 2030). Strategy PIA 1 (Natural Resources and Environment Management) aims to promote sustainable ecosystem rehabilitation and management, and equitable access to environmental resources including water, pasture, range and land. This is to be achieved through strategies such as: sustainable water resource management and regional cooperation in water management in the ASALs; and supporting sustainable ecosystem rehabilitation, biodiversity, conservation and management. The strategies also include supporting research and human capital development in ecological restoration, ecosystem management, environment and natural resources among others. IDDRSI thus clearly integrates reduction of environmental degradation in its approaches specifically through innovative sustainable development strategies, policies and programs.

The IDDRSI's approach also has a significant focus on livelihoods especially through Priority Intervention Area number three (PIA 3). PIA 3 aims to strengthen and support equitable and safe access to livelihoods and basic social services through among other strategies, enhancing equitable access to resources, organized markets and social services (including pasture, range, land, energy, water, sanitation, health, education and pro-poor financial services. Further, the IDDRSI acknowledges the key role of partnership and collaboration. One of IDDRSI PIAs focuses on 'strengthening coordination mechanisms and institutional arrangements for more organized, collaborative and synergistic action as well as improving partnerships to increase the commitment and support necessary to execute the objectives of the initiative.'

Despite the above strengths, there are also a number of gaps that stand on the way of effective delivery of IDDRSI's objectives. It is particularly concerning that all the PIAs planned actions for HoA

⁵⁸ See the IDDRSI progress dashboard

⁵⁹ *Ibid*

⁶⁰ <http://resilience.igad.int/index.php/about-iddrsi/pias/10-pias/13-pia-4-disaster-risk-management-preparedness-and-effective-response> Accessed on 23th April 2018

countries have not started. Gaps identified in the IDDRSI include weak coordination of member states actors; insufficient technical skills and capacity in programming; and weakness in monitoring and reporting.

- **Weak sectoral and institutional coordination**

While the IDDRSI Platform Steering Committee (PSC) coordinates actors at regional level, coordination of actors at member states level remains weak. Indeed, the IDDRSI Mid-Term Review (MTR) points to persistent absence of the representatives from EAC and COMESA from the PSC meetings as an indicator of weak coordination. This has led to irregular policy meetings and delayed contributions of Member States, causing IGAD to act with insufficient policy direction and financial support. The IDDRSI MTR further notes that the functional linkage between PSC and the coordination forums that deliberate on PSC recommendations is still poor. This has led to member states failing to act on many of the PSC recommendations. Similar concerns have been raised about the IDDRSI Platform Coordination Unit (PCU). The European Union (EU) in one of its Action Fiches describes the PCU as lacking in authority and found its contact with other IGAD Divisions and specialised institutions relatively weak.

Another glaring coordination weakness is the fact that the IGAD Summit does not have a direct mandate or function in the formal leadership and governance of the IDDRSI. This is in spite of the fact that two previous IGAD summits on drought resilience, including IDDRSI launch in Nairobi in 2011 and the one in Kampala in 2014 re-affirmed the region's commitment to ending drought emergencies. The IGAD Summit of the Heads of State and Government is a major body for harnessing political goodwill, generating commitment and mobilizing support among the Member States. Since IDDRSI was launched in response to the decision of the Nairobi Summit of September 2011, the plans, progress and challenges in the implementation of IDDRSI should routinely be brought to the attention of the Summit. A formal reporting arrangement between the IDDRSI Platform and the IGAD Summit will result in strong regional institutional coordination and effective inter-governmental leadership to deliver the IDDRSI objectives. Difficulty in harmonization, alignment and coordination of different sectors and donor funded projects constitute a further weakness. Different development partners or projects are carried out based on different log frames or results frameworks, thereby making it difficult to monitor progress of the IDDRSI holistically.

- **Limited geographical coverage**

The analysis also noted that while the IDDRSI has a regional approach, current investments do not cover the whole arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs) in the region. This is attributable in part to lack of a functional Resilience Investment mapping to identify gaps in the geographic coverage and PIAs coverage of the IDDRSI-related investments for the ASALs of IGAD.

- **Insufficient technical skills and capacity in programming**

The IDDRSI Medium-Term Review Team observed that a number of key projects under the initiative were initiated and formulated by the Development Partners that funded them.⁶¹ This is directly attributable to insufficient technical skills and capacity in programming at the IGAD institutions particularly the Platform Coordination Unit (PCU) and Platform Steering Committee (PSC). While donor funding and technical support is not bad in itself, over-reliance on donors is associated with the risk of the frameworks or initiatives being donor-driven rather than region or country-driven and

⁶¹ IGAD, 2016

hinders the active control and involvement of the primary stakeholders in programming activities. Moreover, powerful donors may use such opportunities to push their own agenda on policies, priorities and strategies. There is also the inadvertent risk of donor-funding slowing the change from humanitarian aid to long term development to address the poverty-vulnerability nexus. The IDDRSI institutions also suffer financial constraints in the implementation of framework activities. For instance, financial constraints saw the IGAD summit held in Nairobi in 2011 pass a resolution to establish a Multi-donor Trust Fund to support activities in the implementation of IDDRSI. However, as noted in the IDDRSI MTR, no action has been reported regarding that important resolution.

4.5.5. Engagement Opportunities for the Partners for Resilience (PfR)

The PfR Regional Programme team can engage through the various Platforms established under IDDRSI Strategy. At the Regional Platform General Assembly, non-state actors are represented by the regional IGAD NGO/CSO Forum and the IGAD Business Forum. PfR can participate in the IGAD NGOs/CSOs Forum and use the opportunity to push for greater CSO participation in the IDDRSI activities as well as to promote CSO oversight of the implementation of IDDRSI. PfR can also engage the PSC and PCU with the aim of strengthening PCU's capacity on programming as well as on continuous monitoring and tracking of IDDRSI implementation. PfR should also sensitize the PSC on the need to conduct a resilience investment mapping to identify gaps in the geographic coverage and PIAs coverage of the IDDRSI-related investments for the ASALs of IGAD. This is meant to increase the geographical coverage of the IDDRSI activities and PIAs across the ASALs in the IGAD region. The PSC meets twice a year to coordinate between Member States, development and implementing partners. At the national level, PfR country teams can target supporting National IDDRSI Coordination Platforms to improve their coordination role.⁶²

Another opportunity could be through the Multi-Donor Trust Fund whose establishment was recommended by the IGAD Summit to support IDDRSI implementation. The MDTF is particularly important in light of the fact that donor dynamics have shaped the food security and resilience agendas in the HoA region very strongly. PfR can lobby the IDDRSI Platform coordination Unit, partner states and development partners to establish and support the fund.

4.6. Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 in Africa

4.6.1. The Sendai framework and its Africa Programme of Action

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030 (The Sendai Framework)⁶³ was adopted at the third United Nations World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, held in Sendai, Miyagi, Japan from 14 to 18 March 2015. It succeeded the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA)⁶⁴ which was in effect from 2005-2015. The Sendai Framework recognizes that some progress in building resilience and reducing losses and damages were achieved under the HFA. It however calls for perseverance and persistence; greater focus on people, their health and livelihoods; and regular follow-up. The overall objective of the Sendai Framework is to achieve *“the substantial reduction of disaster risk and losses in lives, livelihoods and health and in the economic, physical, social, cultural*

⁶² The next meeting of the IDDRSI Platform meetings is planned to be held in Entebbe, Uganda, on 9 – 11 May 2018. The Steering committee will be held on 10 May 2018 and will be preceded by the meeting of the IDDRSI Forum on 9 May 2018. This will be followed by the meeting of the IDDRSI Platform General Assembly on 11 May 2018.

⁶³ United Nations, 2015b

⁶⁴ See supra note 4

and environmental assets of persons, businesses, communities and countries".⁶⁵ Specifically, it seeks to "prevent new and reduce existing disaster risk through the implementation of integrated and inclusive economic, structural, legal, social, health, cultural, educational, environmental, technological, political and institutional measures that prevent and reduce hazard exposure and vulnerability to disaster, increase preparedness for response and recovery, and thus strengthen resilience".⁶⁶ It details priorities for action within and across sectors by states at local, national, regional and global levels. It also lays down a monitoring and evaluation mechanism by setting seven global targets to be achieved by 2030 in accordance with the framework's guiding principles.

The Sendai Framework is particularly critical for the Horn of Africa as it recognizes the disproportionate needs of least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and African countries. Specifically, it calls for enhancement of the implementation capacity and capability of such vulnerable countries, including "the mobilization of support through international cooperation for the provision of means of implementation in accordance with their national priorities".⁶⁷ Indeed, AU Heads of State and Government viewed the Sendai Framework as a good opportunity and means to sustain the momentum generated by the extended Programme of Action for the Implementation of the ARSDRR⁶⁸. To show their commitment to the implementation of the Sendai Framework, and given that the extended Programme of Action was expiring by end of 2015, the Member States of the AU undertook to review the extended Programme of Action to align it with the post 2015 disaster risk management framework. Thus, Africa became one of the first regions to adopt a position on the post-2015 framework on disaster risk reduction in 2014. Within one month of the endorsement of the Sendai Framework by the UN General Assembly, the African Ministers responsible for disaster risk reduction met in Yaoundé, Cameroon, to develop a roadmap for the implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa. A series of consultations, monitored by the Africa Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction, culminated in the Sixth Africa Regional Platform and Fifth High Level Meeting on Disaster Risk Reduction in Mauritius in November 2016. Two key outcome documents were adopted at the meeting - the Programme of Action for the implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa and the Mauritius Declaration which calls for implementation of the PoA and the allocation of budgetary support to disaster risk reduction⁶⁹.

The Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 in Africa⁷⁰ (PoA) seeks to achieve the outcome of the Sendai Framework - substantial reduction of disaster risk and losses in lives, livelihoods and health and in the economic, physical, social, cultural and environmental assets of persons, businesses, communities and countries - in Africa. To achieve this, the PoA's overall objective is to "guide multi-hazard reduction and management of disaster risk in development processes at all levels as well as within and across all sectors in Africa, in line with the Sendai Framework". The PoA has five specific objectives. First, it seeks to strengthen coherence and integration between disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and mitigation, ecosystem management, conflict and fragility, and other development imperatives. Secondly, it seeks to strengthen continental level long-term capacities and coordination mechanisms to support the implementation of the ARSDRR and the Sendai Framework. The third objective of the PoA is to strengthen mechanisms, frameworks and capacities at national and sub-national/local levels for mainstreaming, implementing and coordinating gender-sensitive disaster risk reduction strategies and programmes. Fourthly, the PoA seeks to embed a holistic approach to systematically incorporate risk reduction measures into design and implementation of disaster

⁶⁵ Par. 16

⁶⁶ Par. 17

⁶⁷ Par. 17

⁶⁸ AU & ISDR, 2010

⁶⁹ African Union Commission, 2017

⁷⁰ African Union, 2016a

preparedness, response and recovery programmes. Finally, it seeks to develop practical tools and mobilize resources to contribute to the implementation of DRR programmes and projects.

The PoA has six targets for 2030, based on the Sendai Framework targets tweaked to suit the African context. They include: substantially reduce continental disaster mortality; substantially reduce the number of affected people in Africa; and reduce direct disaster economic loss in relation to continental gross domestic product (GDP). Others are: substantially reduce disaster damage to critical infrastructure and disruption of basic services; and substantially increase the number of countries with national and sub-national/local disaster risk reduction strategies (2020). The other two targets are: substantially enhance international cooperation to African countries; and substantially increase the availability of and access to multi-hazard early warning systems and disaster risk information and assessments to people.

4.6.2. Institutional arrangement for Implementation

The Programme of Action (PoA) for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa document provides a detailed institutional arrangement for its implementation, complete with key responsible stakeholders at global, continental, regional, national and sub-national levels. While specifying the respective roles of the different identified stakeholders, the PoA stresses the need for an integrated approach while undertaking the said roles. Key institutions for the PoA's implementation include the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction Regional Office for Africa (UNISDR Africa), African Union Commission (AUC), Africa Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction (AWGDRR) and Regional Economic Communities (RECs). Other important institutions for the PoA's implementation include: specialized agencies and institutions; national governments and statutory agencies; Sub-National/Local governments and their agencies; civil society organizations; and United Nations entities.⁷¹

4.6.3. Implementation Progress

The African Union has so far shown considerable commitment buoyed by an increased level of interest at government level, towards implementing the Africa Programme of Action. In addition to the seven PoA targets adapted from the Sendai Framework, the African Union adopted five additional targets of its own to augment action on disaster risk reduction. The additional targets include: integration of DRR in school curricula; making DRR part of sustainable development planning; increasing domestic spending on DRR; and expanding the number of countries testing their preparedness plans; and increasing the number of partnerships for knowledge management. Consequently, the African Union Commission embarked on developing indicators for the 5 additional targets of the Programme of Action. Like the seven original targets of the Sendai framework, the additional targets are expected to work as indicative national targets for African Member States and Regional Economic Communities.

Progress in implementing the PoA is also seen in the collaborative spirit including the extension of the Africa Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction to include a wide range of stakeholders working on disaster risk reduction on the continent. The reconstituted AWG has been playing an important role in providing technical support to the AUC, RECs, Member States and partners for the coordination and implementation of the Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction and its Programme of Action. The Group has so far held twelve meetings. According to UNISDR, key

⁷¹ The role of these institutions with regard to the ARSRR and the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa is discussed in section 4.2.2.

milestones have been recorded following these sessions. For instance, since the tenth session held on 7-8 March 2017 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, key milestone achievements include: broad and at the highest-level participation of Africa in the 2017 Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, 22-26 May 2017, Cancun, Mexico; and endorsement of and presentation of the Common African Position to the 2017 Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction.

The 11th session of the AWG held in Mombasa Kenya from 26-27 Sep 2017 identified concrete follow-up actions for the implementation of the Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction and the extended Programme of Action. The session also identified priority activities from the Matrix of the Programme of Action for the Implementation of Sendai Framework in Africa to enable AUC to prepare a work plan for implementing the PoA during 2017/18-2020. Additionally, the session among other things, reviewed regional progress in disaster risk reduction as well as Africa's participation in and contribution to the Global Platform. The AUC has also developed a monitoring and reporting system to track progress the continent is making in implementing the PoA and Sendai Framework. The 12th Session of the AWG held in Ethiopia from 13-14 Mar 2018 reviewed the progress of the implementation of agreed action points from the 11th Session; evaluated regional progress in disaster risk reduction in the context of the Sendai Framework and the PoA; and familiarized the AWGDRR with the PoA monitoring framework developed by AUC; among other issues.

In its Common African Position to the 2017 Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction held from 22 – 26 May in Cancun, Mexico, the African Union Commission reaffirmed its commitment to implement the Sendai Framework, including through the Africa Programme of Action. Among other things, the AU committed to: facilitate the alignment, implementation, monitoring and review of the Sendai Framework and the Africa Programme of Action across the continent, and to promote the development and implementation of national and local disaster risk reduction strategies in line with the Sendai Framework. AU also committed to strengthen partnerships with civil society, and in particular the youth and local actors, and the private sector, and to increase domestic resource allocation for disaster risk reduction and investments in climate services. Other AU commitments to the Global Platform were to include to integrate disaster risk reduction concepts and practices in educational curricula from primary to tertiary levels, and to promote innovative sharing of early warning information and strengthen preparedness and early response mechanisms.

Other than the PoA and AWGDRR meetings and activities, other parallel initiatives to implement disaster risk reduction on the continent have also been undertaken. These include the African, Caribbean and Pacific region - European Commission (ACP-EU) disaster risk reduction programme to build resilience of African regions, countries and communities. The programme is implemented by the African Union, Regional Economic Communities (RECS), African Development Bank, United Nation Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), World Bank and Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction (GFDRR). The Program has supported African countries and RECs in a wide spectrum of disaster risk management (DRM) areas including projects in the Horn of Africa such as: Risk assessments in Ethiopia and Enhancing the DRR capacity of IGAD⁷².

Other regional level interventions include the development of the EAC Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act, 2016 which was adopted at an EAC meeting in Kigali, Rwanda in March 2017.

⁷² GFDRR 2017

Parliamentarians from the EAC have also made efforts to support implementation of the Sendai framework and the PoA. For instance, with support of the World Bank and UNISDR, the East African Disaster Risk Reduction Parliamentarian Platform was launched in June 2015. More than 40 parliamentarians from the five EAC Member States have joined the Platform. The platform held its second meeting in Mombasa, Kenya from 26-27th April 2017, where they vowed to step up a drive to implement the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction in their region⁷³. The meeting also requested the EAC Secretariat to establish linkages between national parliaments and the East Africa Legislative Assembly to create synergies and ensure regular and adequate interaction of parliamentarians with technocrats to create knowledge on crucial climate change and disaster risk management activities. The EAC was also tasked with following up with governments on the ratification of important regional legislation such as the 2015 Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act, the 2016 EAC Forest Management and Conservation Bill, the 2010 EAC Trans boundary Ecosystem Management and Conservation Bill (2010), and the 2006 Protocol on Environment and Natural Resources. Additionally, the legislators urged the EAC Secretariat to pioneer projects on urban planning aimed at reducing urban risks associated with disasters and climate change.

Some individual countries have also initiated country-level efforts aimed at implementing the Sendai framework and the PoA. These include adoption of policies aimed at supporting disaster risk reduction and establishment of national coordinating institutions to support the implementation of ARSDRR and the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa.⁷⁴ At the subnational level, a number of HoA cities are participating in the ‘Making Cities Resilient’ campaign, a UNISDR-led campaign that addresses issues of local governance and urban risk. According to UNISDR⁷⁵, since its launch in May 2010 up to 2015 the Campaign strengthened local level leadership and increased political will for disaster risk reduction. The 2016-2020 phase is dedicated to implementation through ensuring that the commitments made by governments are integrated into the local context. Since 2012, the number of African cities participating in the campaign have tripled to 145. This number includes at least eight HoA countries – Nairobi, Narok and Kisumu in Kenya; Mbarara, Mbale, Entebe and Kampala in Uganda; and Addis Ababa in Ethiopia.

4.6.4. Strengths and gaps in relation to Integrated Risk Management

The PoA has made significant and laudable attempts to recognize and address climate change adaptation (CCA) and ecosystem restoration and management (ERM) as critical cogs of disaster risk management. It recognizes that climate change and unsustainable land use not only exacerbate hazards but also reduce the coping capacity and resilience of communities. The PoA has specific objectives to address this. These include strengthening coherence and integration between disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and mitigation, ecosystem management, conflict and fragility, and other development imperatives. In another ERM-smart objective, the PoA seeks to support gender-sensitive disaster risk reduction strategies and programmes that also address climate change and variability and environmental degradation among other risk drivers such as poverty; public health; poorly managed urbanisation; and conflict and migration. Further, the second additional target developed by the PoA - Increase integration of DRR in regional and national sustainable development, and climate change adaptation frameworks, mechanisms and processes –

⁷³ UNISDR, 2017

⁷⁴ Some examples of these institutions are discussed in section 4.2.3

⁷⁵ UNISDR, 2015

has a significant imperative for CCA. Other efforts to mainstream CCA in disaster risk management in the PoA include the commitment of the African Union Commission (AUC) to increase investments in climate services, and to ensure climate change adaptation into development sectors vertically and horizontally.⁷⁶

The PoA is also very progressive with regard to the integration of vulnerable groups in decision-making. For instance, it lays emphasis on the most vulnerable groups in its objective on strengthening capacities to support the implementation of the ARSDRR and the Sendai Framework. Its recognition of vulnerable groups is also reflected in its second guiding principle - DRR requires coordinated involvement of all segments and institutions of society. In recommending coordinated involvement of all stakeholders, the PoA specifically calls for special attention to be paid to people disproportionately affected by disasters, especially the most vulnerable and marginalised. It further requires gender, age, disability and culture to be integrated in all policies and practices, and women and youth leadership to be promoted. As a tool to aid the achievement of the Sendai Framework, the PoA is very critical to supporting livelihood systems, a key principle of IRM. The PoA recognizes that DRR is about protecting life, health, assets, livelihoods and rights. Among other things, the PoA requires implementing agencies at the national and sub-national levels to promote integration of DRR in community infrastructure and livelihood investments. IRM is also about partnerships and of the reviewed frameworks, the PoA, alongside the African Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (ARSDRR), presents one of the best examples of the important role of partnerships and collaborations. The institutional arrangement for the PoA appreciates the role of a diverse range of stakeholders and assigns them role in achieving the common goal of integrating disaster risk reduction into development.

The main gaps identified in the PoA with regard to fully being IRM-sensitive are lack of a clear in-built institution or department for coordination and monitoring; and weaknesses in the monitoring and reporting framework.

- **Lack of a clear in-built institution or department for coordination and monitoring**

As discussed in Section 4.4.4, the African Union Commission Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture (AUC-DREA) is responsible for coordination and monitoring most of the continental level frameworks related to agriculture, environment and natural resources and rural economy. This include responsibility for initiatives such as ARSDRR, CAADP, Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa, and the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa. AUC-DREA is impeded in this enormous role by inadequate capacity and resources. The department has no designated units for any of these issues. With regard to coordinating and monitoring implementation of the PoA and ARSDRR, the department heavily relies on the Africa Regional Office of the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR Africa) through the Africa Regional Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (ARPD RR), for advice and technical support. UNISDR has taken a leading role in key functions under the PoA such as receiving and analyzing country reports, a role that should ordinarily be performed by AUC-DREA. This portends the risk of the initiative being externally driven rather than driven by Africa for Africans.

- **Weakness in monitoring and reporting**

Alongside the ARSDRR, the PoA has made some strides with regard to monitoring, evaluation and reporting. While announcing the 12th Session of AWGDRR core group which was held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia in March 2018, UNISDR noted that regularly tracking progress in the implementation

⁷⁶ See section 4.6.5

of the PoA has been and remains top of the agenda of the AWGDRR.⁷⁷ The AUC has developed a monitoring and reporting system to track progress the continent is making in implementing the PoA and Sendai Framework. There is however scarce information on the implementation of the monitoring and reporting system. Nonetheless, some sort of review on the progress of the PoA and ARSDRR takes place during the forums of the ARSDRR, preparations of regional reports to the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, and during meetings of the Africa Working Group (AWG) on Disaster Risk Reduction. However, much of this review is rather ad hoc, unguided and uncoordinated.

4.6.5. Engagement opportunities for the Partners for Resilience (PfR)

The African Union Commission Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture (AUC-DREA) provide a good entry point for PfR to engage on the PoA. Specifically, PfR can lobby AUC-DREA to establish or at least assign a unit or desk to deal with disaster risk issues. The unit should particularly pay close attention to the coordination, monitoring and reporting on the PoA and ARSDRR. As stated, this analysis is cognizant of the broadness of AUC-DREA's mandate and the multiplicity of its initiatives. As such a coordination unit that is clearly mandated to oversee the risk issues is welcome even if its role extends to other related initiatives.

The African Union commitments⁷⁸ made under the Common African Position to the 2017 Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction held from 22 – 26 May in Cancun, Mexico are good opportunities for PfR to engage. First, Africa committed to facilitate the alignment, implementation, monitoring and review of the Sendai Framework and the Africa Programme of Action across the continent. On this regard, PfR can explore opportunities to support the AUC in implementing the AU monitoring and reporting system to help track progress the continent is making in implementing the PoA and Sendai Framework. Specific initiatives could include PfR country teams building capacities of the responsible national government agencies on monitoring and reporting and offering financial and/or technical support in the process.

The AU also committed to promote the development and implementation of national and local disaster risk reduction strategies in line with the Sendai Framework. PfR country teams can support national government technically and/or financially to develop and implement national and local disaster risk reduction strategies including legislations and policies as per the individual countries' needs. For countries that have developed or are in the process of developing the tools, the focus of such PfR support should be in fast-tracking the completion and promoting implementation. Examples include Kenya which has a draft National DRM Policy and Bill and established the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) and Uganda which developed the National Policy for Disaster Preparedness and Management (NPDPM). Other examples are Ethiopia which developed the National policy and strategy on disaster risk management; and South Sudan which set up the Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Management and developed a draft National Disaster Risk Management (DRM) Policy.

PfR country teams can also contribute to implementation of the PoA by strengthening the National Platforms on DRR. Further, PfR should work with the National Platforms and the AWGDRR to lobby respective national governments to work towards the realization of the 2017 AU commitments to

⁷⁷ See UNISDR website: <https://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/events/57383>. Last accessed June 13th, 2018.

⁷⁸ See Section 4.6.3

the Global Platform on DRR. Specifically, PfR could lobby for: increased political commitment to proactive risk management, and to increase domestic resource allocation for IRM-smart risk management. Other advocacy areas that PfR can explore are the integration of disaster risk reduction concepts and practices in educational curricula from primary to tertiary levels, and the promotion of innovative sharing of early warning information and strengthen preparedness and early response mechanisms.

The DRR Units and RECs are the other important engagement points for PfR. PfR should consider working with the RECs to strengthen the capacities of their DRR units to support both regional and sub-regional DRR interventions in line with the PoA and the ARSDRR objectives.

4.7. Agreement on the Nile River Basin Cooperative Framework

4.7.1. Overview

The Agreement on the Nile River Basin Cooperative Framework⁷⁹ is an agreement governing the relations of the Nile Basin States with regard to the Nile River Basin. The Nile Basin states i.e. states in whose territory part of the Nile River Basin is situated, comprise Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda. The treaty intends to establish a framework to "*promote integrated management, sustainable development, and harmonious utilization of the water resources of the Basin, as well as their conservation and protection for the benefit of present and future generations*". The agreement starts by detailing well established principles of international environmental law to guide countries on how to implement the agreement, and how to protect, use, conserve and develop the Nile basin system in a sustainable manner. The principles include inter-state cooperation; sustainable development; subsidiarity; equitable and reasonable utilization; prevention of harm; and the right of Nile Basin States to use water within their territories. Others are protection and conservation; exchange of data and information; community of interest; environmental impact assessment and audits; peaceful resolution of disputes; water as a finite and vulnerable resource; economic value of water; and water security.

The agreement also details specific rights and obligations of State Parties regarding utilization of the water resources of the Nile River System. These include obligations to regularly exchange data and information; to notify planned measures; and to observe the subsidiarity principle in development and protection of the Nile. It also envisages state parties to be bound by requirements of mandatory environmental impact assessments and audits for planned measures that may have significant adverse effect on the basin system. The agreement outlines the procedures by which disputes that might arise from its implementation and application would be settled, as well as procedures for its amendments, ratification and entry into force.

The treaty has however not formally entered into force because only three countries - Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Rwanda have ratified it. This falls short of the six countries that are required to ratify or accede to the treaty for it to enter into force as per the treaty's detailed procedure for ratification.⁸⁰ Part of the challenge in the treaty's ratification process is that despite extensive discussions, to date, an agreement has not been reached on two issues in the treaty - 'water

⁷⁹ NBI, 2010)

⁸⁰ The treaty will enter into force at least 60 days after six countries have ratified or acceded to the document and deposited their ratification instruments with the African Union.

security’ and the concept of ‘notification’. The question of ‘water security’ is introduced by Article 14 of the draft agreement which read:

Having due regard for the provision of Articles 4 and 5, Nile Basin states recognize the vital importance of water security to each of them. The States also recognize that cooperative management and development of the waters of the Nile River System will facilitate achievement of water security and other benefits. Nile Basin states therefore agree, in a spirit of cooperation:

- (a) to work together to ensure that all States achieve and sustain water security
- (b) not to significantly affect the water security of any other Nile Basin State.

Egypt and Sudan had strong reservations about the section, calling for the replacement of sub-article (b) to instead obligate states ‘not to adversely affect the water security and current uses and rights of any other Nile Basin State’. This led the negotiations to a deadlock as the other states rejected the Egyptian-Sudanese proposed amendment to Article 14(b). Consequently, the Nile-COM adopted the text of Article 14 agreed upon by all the other riparian states together with the proposed amendment. The outstanding ‘water security’ issue was referred for resolution by the Heads of State and Governments of the riparian countries.

The draft was discussed again at the sixteenth Nile-COM meeting held in July 2008 in Kinshasa, the DRC. However, even this meeting failed to resolve the ‘water security’ issue. The Nile-COM decided to adopt sections of the CFA, and annexed the contentious Article 14(b) on water security, to be taken up and resolved by the Nile River Basin Commission. The agreement was open for signature from 14th May 2010 to 13th May 2011, even though the reservations by Egypt and Sudan persisted⁸¹. Nonetheless, six countries - Ethiopia, Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda, Kenya, and Burundi have signed the agreement, while three - Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Rwanda have ratified it. Democratic Republic of Congo has not signed the agreement despite accepting it earlier. This means three additional countries must ratify the agreement for it to enter into force. According to Eastern Nile Technical Regional Office (ENTRO) Director-General, Fek-Ahmed Negash, four countries - South Sudan, Burundi, Kenya and Uganda - are in the process of ratifying the agreement.⁸²

The second major difference related to the concept of notification. Egypt and Sudan demanded that decisions regarding the use of the River Nile be based on consensus, and that they must be notified prior to any project being done on the Nile. This position was rejected by the upper riparian countries, which saw it as a means for Egypt and Sudan to invoke the colonial treaties and their claim of veto power.⁸³ The last Nile Basin Heads of States Summit which was held in Entebbe Uganda in June 2017 aimed to ensure that all Nile riparian states sign and ratify the CFA. However, only three heads of states – Presidents Yoweri Museveni of Uganda, Haile Mariam Desalegn of Ethiopia and Egypt’s Abdel Fattah el-Sisi attended with the other heads of states sending representatives, and the meeting failed to resolve the two contentious issues.

4.7.2. Institutional arrangement for implementation

a) Nile River Basin Commission (NRBC)

⁸¹ Mekonnen, 2010

⁸² ENA, 2017

⁸³ Salman, 2017

To achieve its goal, the agreement envisaged the establishment of the Nile River Basin Commission (NRBC) to promote and facilitate its implementation. The commission would comprise: Conference of Heads of State and Government, the Council of Ministers, the Technical Advisory Committee, Sectoral Advisory Committees, and the Secretariat. However, to date, the NRBC has not been established because the parent agreement/treaty has not formally entered into force.

b) The Nile Council of Ministers

The Nile Council of Ministers (Nile-COM) is the highest political and decision-making body of the Nile basin Initiative. Nile-COM comprises of Ministers in charge of Water Affairs in the Member States. Among the Nile-COM's roles and responsibilities are: approving annual work plan and budget; ensuring smooth implementation of NBI's activities; and ensuring contribution of member states as well as external support agencies and NGOs. Others are taking policy and political decisions of the organization; hiring and terminating the executive director of the Nile Technical Advisory Committee (Nile-TAC); and approving the filling of other senior posts by the Nile-TAC.

c) The Nile Technical Advisory Committee

The Nile Technical Advisory Committee (Nile-TAC), comprises 20 senior government officials, two from each of the Member States. Nile-TAC provides technical support and advice to the Nile-COM on matters related to the management and development of the Nile waters. It also acts as an interface between the Nile-COM and development partners, and between Nile-COM and the Secretariat, programmes and projects of the NBI. Nile-TAC also provides oversight for NBI programmatic activities. The committee convenes twice a year in regular session, and in special session if and as the Council, through its Chair, so requests. Unless otherwise decided, the venue for sessions is headquarters of the Commission. The Agreement allows Nile-Tac to establish specialized Working Groups to deal with matters within its competence.

d) The Nile Basin Secretariat

The Nile Basin Initiative Secretariat (Nile-SEC) is the executive arm of the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI). The Nile-SEC was established in November 2002 by the Nile-COM and is based in Entebbe, Uganda. It is led by an Executive Director and is structured in three major departments - Strategic Planning and Management, Water Resources Management and Finance and Administration. The Secretariat's work is organised around two main programmes: basin cooperation programme and water resources management programme. The basin cooperation programme aims to facilitate open discussion and understanding of the interests, positions and expectations of the Basin States in matters concerning the management and utilization of the shared Nile Basin water and related resources. The platform is also vital for sharing information and responding to shared challenges in the basin. The water resources management programme seeks to strengthen Member States' institutional and technical capacities. Further, it seeks to provide shared knowledge bases to support decision making and action at local levels.

4.7.3. Progress in implementing the Agreement on the Nile River Basin Cooperative Framework

Despite the impasse over the CFA and the fact that it has not formally entered into force, some progress has been made regarding sustainable and cooperative use of the resources of the Nile Basin. Following a bitter dispute between Ethiopia on the one hand, and Egypt and Sudan on the other, over the development of the Grand Renaissance Dam (GERD) by Ethiopia in 2011, a series of negotiations that followed resulted in Egypt, Sudan and Ethiopia concluding in March 2015, the

Agreement on Declaration of Principles on the GERD (DoP).⁸⁴ Among key provisions of the DoP are: the requirement for equitable and reasonable utilization; the obligation not to cause significant harm; and peaceful settlement of disputes. The DoP also contains explicit provisions on cooperation on filling its reservoir, as well as its safety. The DoP was signed by the three countries of the Khartoum Document in December 2015 at their 4th tripartite meeting. Through the DoP, Egypt and Sudan in essence accepted, the GERD, as well as “the significance of the River Nile as a source of livelihood and the significant resource to the development of the people of Egypt, Ethiopia and Sudan.” Further, the three countries agreed “to cooperate based on common understanding, mutual benefit, good faith, win-win, and the principles of international law, and in understanding upstream and downstream needs in its various aspects.”

According to some pundits⁸⁵, the DoP not only negated Egypt’s and Sudan’s positions on ‘water security’ and “prior consent’, but also confirmed their acceptance of the basic and cardinal principle of international water law of equitable and reasonable utilization. Salman⁸⁶ for instance posits that the logical step now is for Egypt and Sudan to drop their demands on the CFA, arguing that the whole section of the CFA on water security is no longer needed, given that the CFA includes the same provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses⁸⁷. As a compromise, he suggests that in return for Egypt and Sudan agreeing to drop their demand on ‘water security’, the upper riparian countries should in return accept to include provisions in the CFA similar to those of the UNWC on notification. He argues that this should cause no alarm to the upper riparian countries since the basis of Egypt and Sudan of their veto power in case of notification – the colonial treaties – is no longer on the table since the two countries have accepted the principle of equality of all the riparian countries.

The Nile Basin Secretariat is also implementing/has implemented a number of specific projects aimed at contributing to delivering the expected institutional results of NBI.⁸⁸ Recent NBI projects include the Nile Cooperation for Results project whose aim is to facilitate cooperative water resource management and development in the Nile Basin. The US\$ 1.5 million project was funded by the World Bank through the Cooperation in International Waters in Africa (CIWA) program and ran from January 2016 to December 2017. NBI also implemented the Transboundary Water Cooperation in the Nile Basin project (Phase 4) project from September 2013 to June 2016. This €3 million project funded by the Government of German through GIZ aimed at supporting NBI Member countries in the sustainable and cooperative management and development of water resources in the Nile River Basin. Currently, the NBI secretariat is implementing the Biodiversity conservation and utilization of ecosystems in the Nile Basin Wetlands of Transnational Relevance Project. Funded by the Government of German through GIZ to the tune of €6 million the project seeks to fill the knowledge gap and strengthen the capacity of the NBI and the riparian states for the management of wetlands of trans-boundary relevance.

The secretariat also implemented the Shared Vision Program (SVP) between 2004 and 2009. The SVP comprised seven thematic projects spread across the Basin and coordinated by the Shared Vision Program Coordination (SVP-C) Project. Interventions of the SVP ranged from institutional and human resources capacities, stakeholder networks and dialogue, knowledge creation, and integrated

⁸⁴ Horn Affairs, 2015

⁸⁵ See for example, Salman, 2017

⁸⁶ Ibid

⁸⁷ United Nations, 2014

⁸⁸ Information available on NBI website: <http://nilesec.nilebasin.org/index.php/our-projects>

management and development of the shared Nile Basin water resources. The SVP was funded to the tune of USD 136 million from NBI Member States contributions and Development Partners.

The Nile Council of Ministers (Nile-COM) approved the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) Strategy 2017-2027⁸⁹ in the last quarter of 2017. The strategy's effective implementation commenced in 2018. The Strategy outlines NBI's ambitions for the period 2017-2027 and provides the strategic direction for NBI, defines the goals the institution will work towards and expounds on its contribution. It also elaborates how NBI will be strengthened to efficiently and effectively deliver on its mandate. The Strategy highlights six goals: increasing hydropower development, interconnectivity of electric grids and power trade; improving food security basin-wide; protecting and restoring water-related ecosystems across the Basin; improving basin resilience to climate change impact; and strengthening governance and last but not least, enhancing availability and sustainable management of trans-boundary water resources of the Nile Basin. According to NBI Secretariat, the 10-year Strategy will be realized through 5-year programs implemented by the three NBI Centres namely the Secretariat in Entebbe, the Eastern Nile Technical Regional Office (ENTRO) in Addis Ababa and the Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Program Coordination Unit (NELSAP-CU) in Kigali, together with the Member States.

4.7.4. Strengths and Gaps in Relation to Integrated Risk Management

In terms of integrating the IRM principles and elements, the Agreement on the Nile River Basin Cooperative Framework has some key strengths. Although the agreement makes no reference to climate change and disaster risk reduction beyond reference to sustainable development and prevention of harm, the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) Strategy 2017-2027⁹⁰ recognizes the importance of integrating CCA in the Framework's approach. The Strategy includes 'improving basin resilience to climate change impact' as one of its five goals. The strategy goes further to detail concrete strategies for achieving the goal. These include: establishing and maintaining an NBI climate information service; supporting joint analysis, planning and implementation of climate resilient interventions; improving and promoting regional CCA policy and planning frameworks; improving preparedness of basin countries to flood and drought risk; and strengthening capacity to prepare bankable projects in the Nile Basin in order to tap into available climate finance opportunities.

The agreement also scores well in terms of promoting partnerships which is key in achieving the IRM approach as it is in fact founded on partnership. Its primary objective can be interpreted to mean the promotion of partnership in management and utilization of the water resources of the Nile Basin. The disagreements on the 'water security' and the requirement for notification are however posing a threat to this partnership. It is hoped that the Declaration of Principles on the GERD will help restore and sustain the spirit of partnership envisaged by the framework.

In terms of IRM-related gaps, the scale of operation of the CFA, delays in conflict resolution, weakness in monitoring and reporting; and delays in the decision-making stand out.

- **Scale of operation**

It is important to note that the wider Nile Basin is made up of many smaller water sheds along the basin. However, the Nile Basin Initiative seems to be operating on the higher international level, with little attention being given to the smaller watersheds. This is clearly manifested in the working committees of the NBI which are operational at international level, without any presence at the local

⁸⁹ NBI Secretariat, 2017

⁹⁰ Ibid

level. This is particularly important because the ultimate beneficiaries of the Nile Basin resources are the majority rural poor at the local level. This segment of the population should be targeted for greater participation in decision making concerning the utilization of the basin's resources. This would help improve how the CFA initiatives respond to local needs and have wide environmental and social considerations. Moreover, focusing at the international at the expense of the basin level portends the risk of non or slow response to problems that are encountered in the smaller river watersheds such as deforestation, water resources mismanagement, and use of illegal fishing gears.

- **Delays in Conflict Resolution**

The delay in resolving the conflict between upstream (Sudan and Egypt) and downstream countries over the contentious clauses on water security and requirement of notification has severely affected the implementation of the CFA. Due to this delay, key implementation requirements such as the formation of the Nile Basin Commission has not been affected to date. Furthermore, the NBI seem to have concentrated on the higher scale conflict between upstream and downstream countries, without taking into consideration the political conflicts for riparian states, as well as community conflicts as a result of poverty, high population growth, and competition for natural resources.

- **Weakness in monitoring and reporting**

Although a monitoring strategy for the Nile Basin Cooperative Framework was developed by the NBI and approved by NBI governance in 2012, implementation of the strategy on the ground is scarce. Moreover, most indicators used in the first State of the Nile Basin Report are based on publications of international agencies, such as the FAO, WHO, indicating that these indicators are not directly calculated and analysed based on data collected by the NBI in the basin. As such, the NBI does not currently monitor the progress at the basin level.

- **Delayed decision-making process**

Although the Nile Council of Ministers (Nile-COM) meets annually, delays in decision-making are commonly encountered. These delays arise from frequent changes of these ministers by their respective national governments. Furthermore, these recurrent changes of ministers do not allow for continuity in the deliberations and resolutions of the Nile basin Initiative. Related to this, there are discrepancies in water policies and other legal and institutional frameworks across the region. Water policies and statutes in some countries in the region have recently been reviewed and updated to modern management approaches. For example, Kenya revised its main water law to the new Water Act 2016, while the government of Ethiopia made the Proclamation No. 197/2000 Ethiopian Water Resources Management Proclamation in 200. Uganda has the Water Statute (1995), the Water Resources Regulations (1998), and Waste Water Discharge Regulation (1998). However, this is not the case with some Nile Basin countries such as the DRC which still relies on outdated water policies. The country promulgated a new water act in 1952 and enforced it in February 1953. To this day, the same Act is still used, but ministries are in the process of drafting a new water act. This poses a set back to the joint management of the basin's water resources and exacerbates delays of the Nile-COM decision-making process.

4.7.5. Engagement opportunities for the Partners for Resilience (PFR)

The Nile Technical Advisory Committee (Nile-Tac) and the Nile secretariat (Nile-Sec) are good entry points for PFR engagement. The gaps identified in the CFA are all important issues for engagement points. For instance, PFR can lobby the Nile Technical Advisory Committee (Nile-Tac) and the Nile secretariat (Nile-Sec) to focus more on initiatives, programmes and projects at the national and

watersheds level. Such initiatives should include and/or deliberate initiatives to anticipate and resolve conflicts between riparian states, as well as community conflicts as a result of poverty, high population growth, and competition for natural resources. Alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, including customary methods should be encouraged where they are appropriate. Promoting lower level initiatives should include PfR lobbying the Nile-Tac and the Nile-Sec to scale down its organs to at least the national level for effective implementation of the local level watershed initiatives.

Success of framework implementation depend to a great extent on effective tracking and monitoring. PfR should explore ways to support Nile-Sec to implement the CFA monitoring strategy. But success also depends on the effectiveness of the monitoring strategy itself. As such, PfR should support the Nile-Sec financially or technically to review the strategy to enhance its effectiveness, paying attention particularly to the base line data and indicators. Further, PfR should consider leveraging resources to enhance the capacity of Nile-Sec particularly in programming and monitoring. A strong effective Nile-Sec is particularly key to ensure continuity, institutional memory and sustainability in programming in light of the frequent disruptions and uncertainties caused by changes in the ministers by successive country governments. PfR country teams should also review the country water policy, legislative and institutional frameworks to assess the extent to which they encourage conservation of cross border water resources especially the Nile basin. Countries that have out-dated or water policies that are out of touch with modern realities would be obvious opportunities for PfR to advocate and/or support their review.

4.8. East African Community Climate Change Policy and East African Community Climate Change Master Plan.

4.8.1. Overview

The two documents - East African Community Climate Change Policy⁹¹ and East African Community Climate Change Master Plan⁹² - were developed in response to increasing threats of climate change to national and regional development targets and goals within the EAC region. The EAC Climate Change Policy expresses recognition of climate change as a serious problem and states commitment to address the problem through specified actions. Its overall objective is *“to guide EAC member states and other stakeholders on preparation and implementation of collective measures to address climate change while assuring sustainable development”*. The EAC Climate Change Master Plan encompasses a long-term view of challenges, opportunities and priority actions to combat climate change, including giving estimates of all the resources needed in order for the EAC to be climate resilient.

Under the broad objective stated above, the East African Community Climate Change Policy (EACCCP) has seven specific objectives. These include: to establish a regional framework to guide the harmonization, coordination and implementation of climate change initiatives amongst Partner States; and to identify priority adaptation and mitigation action areas and roles of Partner States and other stakeholders. Other specific objectives of the policy include: to promote public awareness and capacity building on climate change; and to promote climate change research and observations through monitoring, detection, attribution and model prediction. Finally, the policy seeks to support the integration of climate change into regional planning and development processes; and to facilitate resource mobilization for the implementation of regional climate change response frameworks.

⁹¹ EAC, 2011a

⁹² EAC, 2011b

In terms of scope, the policy focuses on three core areas: adaptation; mitigation; and research and observations including monitoring, detection, attribution and prediction. It however places greater emphasis on adaptation which it considers a primary priority given the region's high vulnerability to the impacts of climate change, and the emerging associated challenges key among them being food insecurity. To support the priority areas, the policy prescribes capacity building in areas of technology development and transfer; finance; education and training; and public awareness, information and knowledge management systems. The policy also emphasizes consideration of gender and minority groups in its implementation. The policy prescribes statements and actions to guide action by the partner states in each of the three focus areas. The policy reiterates its conformity to relevant standard guiding principles including the fundamental and operational principles of the EAC and principles of international environmental law. In addition, the policy details three guiding principles and concepts. The first one is recognition of the importance of mainstreaming climate change issues in socio-economic planning and development processes. The second one is partnership, collaboration and synergies among stakeholders. The other guiding principle is acting in accordance with environmental impact assessment (EIA).

The overall objective of the EAC Climate Change Master Plan is to strengthen regional cooperation to address climate change issues that concern regionally shared resources. The Master Plan has five specific objectives. The first one is to provide an effective and integrated response to regional climate change adaptation. Secondly, it seeks to enhance the mitigation potential of member states in the energy, infrastructure, agriculture and forestry sectors. Thirdly, it seeks to streamline and harmonise existing and on-going trans-boundary mitigation and adaptation projects or activities. Fourthly, it seeks to foster strong international cooperation to address issues related to climate change including enhancing the negotiating ability of the member states in the African Union and other forums. Lastly, the Master Plan seeks to mobilise financial and other resources to implement the other four objectives. To achieve these objectives, the Master Plan calls for prioritization and implementation of eight key pillars: adaptation; mitigation; research, technology development and transfer; capacity building; education, training and public awareness; gender, youth and marginalized groups; climate risk management and disaster risk reduction; and climate finance.

The EAC Climate Change Strategy 2011/2012-2015/2016 guides the implementation of the EAC Climate Change Policy. The Strategy sets out a range of measures, taking into account those already in place in the Partner States, to ensure effective implementation of the Climate Change Policy at all levels. The Strategy gives the direction and scope of implementation of the Policy over a shorter time-frame, defining all the necessary actions and resources needed in order to achieve its goal. It is based on six broad objectives to address the priority areas identified by the EAC Climate Change Policy. These include objective which seeks to ensure a sustainable financing mechanism for climate change.

4.8.2. Institutional arrangement for implementation

a) The Sectoral Council of Ministers

The Sectoral Council of Ministers for Environment and Natural Resources is the highest decision-making body on all matters regarding to climate change as per the EAC Treaty. The sectoral council comprises of Ministers in charge of environment and natural resources and/or climate change. Among the council's roles and responsibilities with regard to the EAC Climate Change Policy are: ensuring smooth implementation of the policy initiatives; and taking policy and political decisions.

b) The EAC Secretariat

The EAC Secretariat is the executive Organ of the EAC. As the guardian of the treaty establishing the EAC, it ensures that regulations and directives adopted by the Council are properly implemented. The secretariat comprises the Secretary-General, 4 Deputy Secretaries-General, the Counsel to the Community and hundreds of EAC staff members who carry out the day-to-day work of the EAC as mandated by the Council. With regard to the EAC Climate Change Policy, the EAC Secretariat is charged with the responsibility for the implementation of the Policy. Among other duties, the Secretariat is mandated to develop various implementation instruments including an elaborate Climate Change Strategy and Master Plan. The policy requires the EAC Secretariat to work jointly with relevant government agencies in Partner States, EAC organs and institutions including Lake Victoria Basin Commission (LVBC), Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO), Inter-University Council of East Africa (IUCEA) and any other institutions that may be established by relevant Sectoral and Coordination Committees.

c) Partner States

EAC partner States are responsible for developing country specific policies, strategies, plans of action, legislation as well as establishing necessary institutional arrangements. They are required to work closely with the EAC secretariat and other EAC organs and institutions in the execution of regional programmes, projects and activities emanating from the Policy.

d) East African Community (EAC) Climate Change Coordination Unit (CCCU)

The EAC Climate Change Policy mandated partner states to establish a regional Climate Change Coordination Unit (CCCU) at the EAC Secretariat. As prescribed in the policy, the role of the CCCU are *inter alia*, designing climate change policies, strategies and plans; designing relevant projects; promoting the introduction of climate change in education curriculum; and building the capacity of research institutions involved in climate change related issues. Accordingly, the East African Community (EAC) Climate Change Coordination Unit (CCCU) has been established although its work is hindered by lack of resources.

e) EAC Climate Change Fund (CCF)

The EAC climate change policy stipulates that “Partner States will establish an EAC Climate Change Fund with the aim of mobilizing financial resources for the implementation of the Policy and instruments of implementing the Policy including the EAC Climate Change Strategy and Master Plan. The CCF is yet to be established.

f) EAC Climate Change Technical Working Group (CCTWG)

The CCTWG was established to provide technical guidance in the design and implementation of climate change adaptation and mitigation projects and programs.

4.8.3. Progress in implementation

At the regional level, implementation of the EAC Climate Change Policy and the EAC Climate Action has widely been through projects supported by multilateral donors. One key such projects is the Planning for Resilience in East Africa through Policy, Adaptation, Research, and Economic Development (PREPARED) program. With support of USAID, PREPARED is implemented by six regional partners including the EAC, Lake Victoria Basin Commission (LVBC), IGAD, Climate Prediction and Application Centre (ICPAC), Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWSNET), Regional Centre for Mapping of Resources for Development (RCMRD) and Tetra Tech ARD. The overall objective of the program is to mainstream climate-resilient development planning and program implementation

into regional and national planning and development. According to USAID and the EAC Secretariat, PREPARED has supported the EAC to use participatory tools to plan and implement community adaptation projects. Particularly, the EAC has been able to identify climate change “hot-spots” at community-level, their risks and adaptation strategies. This has helped the EAC to work with communities to develop adaptation options and projects and support community-level small scale pilot climate change adaptation projects in at least 17 communities across the region.⁹³

Another key project that has contributed to the EAC Climate Change Policy and Master Plan is the Programme on Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation in the COMESA-EAC-SADC. The programme was implemented by three Regional Economic Communities (RECs) – Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), East African Community (EAC), and Southern African Development Community (SADC) – and is funded by Norway, DFID and the European Union. The programme seeks to build successful adaptation and mitigation actions across the three RECs. Although, launched in 2010 before the EAC Climate Change Policy and Master Plan were adopted, the programme has clear links with the objectives of the Policy and Master Plan. It mainly targets smallholder farmers in the region, with interventions around scaling-up and mainstreaming climate-smart agriculture and sustainable land management practices. According to Global Climate Change Alliance⁹⁴, the project registered a number of key achievements in the areas of: mainstreaming climate change in national planning; access to climate financing for adaptation; adoption of climate-smart/conservation agriculture; and mitigation solutions.

At the national level, the EAC countries have passed legislations or developed policies on climate change. Kenya developed its National Climate Change Response Strategy in 2010. The strategy aims to strengthen nationwide focused action towards adapting to and mitigating against climate change. To operationalize the strategy, the country also developed a National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP) 2013-2017 which has effectively expired. The NCCAP is currently being reviewed and already there is a draft National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP) 2018-2022. Kenya also enacted the Climate Change Act and adopted the National Climate Change Framework Policy in 2016, and National Policy on Climate Change Finance 2015. Uganda adopted a National Climate Change Policy in April 2015 to provide guidance and directions in addressing the problem of climate change while enabling the country to adapt and mitigate the effects of climate change. The country also developed an Implementation Strategy to operationalize the National Climate Change Policy, in addition to establishing a Climate Change Coordination Unit at the Ministry of Water and Environment.

Being parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), EAC countries have developed their National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAS)⁹⁵ or National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)⁹⁶. Uganda and South Sudan launched their NAPAs in 2007 and 2017 respectively, making them eligible to acquire funding for implementation of their climate change

⁹³ EAC Secretariat, 2017

⁹⁴ GCCA, 2012

⁹⁵ NAPA is a plan submitted to UNFCCC by Least Developed Countries, to describe the country's perception of its most urgent and immediate needs to adapt to climate change. Completing a NAPA made the least developed countries eligible to apply for NAPA project funding under the Global Environment Facility's [Least Developed Countries Fund](#).

⁹⁶ NAP process helps countries conduct comprehensive medium- and long-term climate adaptation planning building on each country's existing adaptation activities to help integrate climate change into national decision-making. The NAP process is not linked directly to a funding source all developing countries, not just the least developed, are invited to undertake NAPs.

programs. In addition to the NAPAs, Kenya launched its fifteen-year National Adaptation Plan (NAP) in July 2016.

All the EAC countries signed the UNFCCC-led Paris Agreement, thereby committing to a long-term global goal to increase the ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change and foster to climate resilience and low greenhouse gas emissions development. As of June 2017, all the EAC countries except South Sudan had ratified the agreement, effectively becoming parties to it. Beyond the ratifications, a key requirement in the agreement is for each party to prepare, communicate and maintain successive nationally determined contributions (NDCs) that it intends to achieve. Parties are required to pursue domestic mitigation measures, with the aim of achieving the objectives of such contributions. All the EAC countries have submitted their NDCs to the UNFCCC, further affirming their commitment to the Paris Climate Change Agreement. The NDCs largely indicate plans to prioritize climate proofing development activities, especially in economic sectors such as agriculture and energy.⁹⁷ The EAC Secretariat has also developed a road map to implement key resolutions of the Paris Agreement. Key elements of the roadmap include: showing how to approach the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) implementation; translation of the Paris Agreement into concrete steps for the Partner States; and how to take the work forward.

4.8.4. Strengths and Gaps in Relation to Integrated Risk Management

The EAC Climate Change Policy has taken significant steps to integrate some of the IRM elements and principles. The policy recognizes that recurrent extreme weather and climatic events, particularly floods and droughts in the region, are posing a big challenge to, and prescribes a raft of measures to address disaster risk management (DRM). For instance, the policy requires partner states to *inter alia*, support development and implementation of climate related disaster risk reduction and management; and promote climatic risk assessment and monitoring. It also requires partner states to: enhance disaster risk preparedness; and promote management of cross-border natural resource-based conflict. The policy also specifically requires partner states to promote the implementation of the Africa Regional DRR Strategy and Programme of Action.

The policy is also conscious to ecosystem management and restoration (EMR). It proposes actions on ecosystem-related areas such as water resources, biodiversity, forests, wildlife, wetlands, coastal and marine ecosystems, land use and soil protection. Among other interventions to manage and restore ecosystems, the policy requires states to: enhance adaptive capacities of fragile ecosystems; support management of transboundary lake and river basins; restore and sustain aquatic ecosystems; preserve the integrity of critical wildlife habitats and endangered species; and establish, promote, and/or protect wildlife migration corridors. The policy further requires states to: promote Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM); control coastal erosion; and establish coastal ecosystem monitoring and surveillance systems. States are also required to undertake measures for conservation and restoration of forests, wetlands and other critical ecosystems. Some of the focus areas of the EAC Climate Change Master Plan, particularly water, biodiversity and ecosystems services are also critical to ERM.

The policy also recognizes the differentiated impacts of climate change on women, youth and other vulnerable groups, and emphasises the roles of women in addressing climate change, and the fact that climate change can contribute to increased inequalities. It includes gender dimensions as one of three cross-cutting issues that need to be considered to ensure that the Policy goal and objectives

⁹⁷ All NDCs are available on the UNFCCC website:
<http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/indc/Submission%20Pages/submissions.aspx>

are achieved with efficiency and consistency, in an effort to respond to the needs of the region and service provision.⁹⁸ It consequently requires partner states to integrate gender dimensions in assessing vulnerability, impacts and risks of climate change at local, national and regional levels. The partner states are also required to promote involvement of women in climate change monitoring, adaptation and decision-making processes. The policy also requires the partner states to promote social protection programmes for vulnerable communities, households and individuals including women, children, youth and others. Other than gender as a cross-cutting issue, one of the stated objectives of the policy is to support the integration of climate change into regional development and planning processes, including gender development. The policy also declares that it takes cognizance of gender among other existing national development policies, strategies and plans.

The policy is also alive to the spirit of partnership. For instance, it requires the EAC Secretariat and Partner States to work closely with other relevant EAC organs and institutions and Partner States institutions in the execution of regional programmes, projects and activities emanating from the Policy. Some examples of collaborative projects have been cited in this analysis. These include the Planning for Resilience in East Africa through Policy, Adaptation, Research, and Economic Development (PREPARED); and the Programme on Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation in the COMESA-EAC-SADC implemented by COMESA, EAC SADC.

Some of the gaps identified in the policy are: out-dated climate change strategy; inadequate financial resources; weaknesses in policy implementation coordination and monitoring; and capacity gaps.

- **Out-dated East Africa Community (EAC) Climate Change Strategy**

As stated, the EAC Climate Change Strategy covers the period 2011/2012-2015/2016 as such has effectively expired. This puts implementation of the EAC Climate Change Policy to great risk since the strategy is the principle document that guides the implementation of the policy. In the absence of an up-to-date strategy, it is difficult to roll out the key activities and initiatives in a deliberate, regular and coordinated manner. Moreover, since most initiatives identified in the EAC Climate Change Policy require substantial amount of resources, mobilising resources to implement such initiatives is likely to be impeded by the absence of an implementation strategy. It is also worth noting that the EAC Climate Change Policy and Climate Master Plan were adopted before the Paris Agreement on Climate Change which has a far-reaching consequence on some of the provisions of the policy and master plan. It would therefore be good to also review the two documents to mainstream the 2016 Paris Agreement on Climate Change.

- **Inadequate Financial Resources**

New, adequate, predictable and sustainable financial resources are required to support the mitigation and adaptation initiatives/programmes. In appreciation of this, the policy envisaged that partner states would establish an EAC Climate Change Fund to mobilize financial resources from the development partners including multilateral agencies, bilateral partners and intergovernmental agencies and the private sector. However, to date, the CCF is yet to be established and implementation depends on meagre periodic voluntary donor funding. This not only poses the risk not only of donors driving the policy implementation initiatives but also raises serious questions

⁹⁸ The other two cross-cutting issues are: Education, training and public awareness; and Information and knowledge management systems.

about the sustainability of the initiatives. The policy also envisaged partner states providing supplementary resources although this has not been coming through. Even at the country level, partner states are grappling with lack of sufficient funding to implement not only the EAC and domestic climate change policy initiatives, but also commitments to the UNFCCC through the NDCs.

- **Weaknesses in policy implementation coordination and monitoring**

The EAC secretariat through the EAC Climate Change Coordination Unit (CCCU) is responsible for coordination and monitoring of the policy's implementation. However, as stated, the CCCU is severely poorly resourced in terms of both human and financial resources. This has put a heavy burden on the EAC secretariat which has to oversee the policy implementation in addition to a wide array of other initiatives.

- **Insufficient synergies, cooperation and collaboration**

Effective synergies, cooperation and collaboration is critical to the success of any policy implementation. This is particularly true for policies dealing with cross-cutting, cross border issues like climate change. While this analysis has identified some great examples of synergy, cooperation and collaboration between Regional Economic Communities (RECs) like EAC, COMESA, SADC and IGAD, a similar spirit of partnership seems be lacking with the EAC itself. It is important to note that the EAC Climate Change Policy requires the EAC Secretariat and Partners States to work closely with other relevant EAC organs and institutions and Partner States institutions in the execution of regional programmes, projects and activities emanating from the Policy.

- **Capacity gaps**

Implementing the EAC Climate Change Policy requires strong technical capacities both at the EAC institutions and at the partner states level. In fact, while prescribing their establishment, the policy acknowledges that the institutional framework will require a comprehensive capacity building strategy to enhance efficiency in implementing the policy, strategy and master plan. However, the institutions established to aid implementation of the policy are not only weak in terms of financial resources but also with regard to technical capacity in programming and project implementation. This is attributable in part to the fact that these institutions are fairly new. They include the East African Community (EAC) Climate Change Coordination Unit (CCCU), East African Community (EAC) Climate Change Fund (CCF), and East African Community (EAC) Climate Change Technical Working Group (CCTWG).

4.8.5. Engagement Opportunities for the Partners for Resilience (PfR)

There are a number of opportunities that the PfR can leverage on to influence effective implementation of the EAC Climate Change Policy. First, PfR can lobby and support the EAC Secretariat and EAC Climate Change Coordination Unit (EACCCCU) to fast-track the review of the EAC Climate Change Strategy. In addition, PfR should also lobby and support the EAC Secretariat and EACCCCU to review the EAC Climate Change Policy and The EAC Climate Change Master Plan to mainstream the 2016 Paris Agreement on Climate Change. One of the key things PfR should promote while lobbying for and/or supporting the review of the three EAC climate change documents is to promote synergies, cooperation and collaboration among partner states and programmes within the region. For instance, PfR can encourage the EACCCCU to work with partner states to identify common actions across NDCs and develop NDC Implementation Plans.

To address the problem of inadequate financial resources to implement the policy, PfR can lobby EAC partner states through the country climate change coordination units to establish and capitalize the EAC Climate Change Fund as provided for in the policy. The fund would help to mobilize financial resources from the development partners, as well as mobilize and coordinate supplementary funding from member states. At the country level, PfR country teams can lobby for sufficient budgetary allocations for domestic climate change initiatives, including NDCs initiatives.

PfR can also consider designing and implementing capacity building initiatives for the institutions established to aid implementation of the policy i.e. East African Community (EAC) Climate Change Coordination Unit (CCCU), East African Community (EAC) Climate Change Fund (CCF), and East African Community (EAC) Climate Change Technical Working Group (CCTWG). Among the most important issues that such capacity building initiatives should focus on include programming, coordination and policy monitoring and reporting.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PFR HORN OF AFRICA REGIONAL PROGRAMME

5.1. Conclusion

The analysis in the preceding section has identified a number of opportunities with regard to integrating the integrated Risk Management (IRM) elements and principles. Some of the opportunities cut across two or more of the frameworks while others are specific to individual frameworks. The opportunities offer critical lessons that can be adopted in the implementation and/or review of the other frameworks in efforts to achieve the IRM approach to risk management. The opportunities include: recognition of climate change adaptation (CCA) and ecosystem restoration and management as critical cogs of disaster risk management; recognition of local communities, women, youth and other vulnerable groups in policy and decision-making; deliberate focus on livelihood support systems; and promotion of partnerships in the efforts to achieve framework goals.

- **Recognition of climate change adaptation (CCA) and ecosystem restoration and management (ERM)**

Some of the frameworks have made laudable efforts towards integrating CCA and EMR in their disaster risk management approaches. For instance, there is significant integration of both CCA and ERM in the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), the IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI), the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa (PoA) and the Nile Basin Cooperative Framework (NBCF) and the EAC Climate Change Policy (EACCCP).

- **Promotion of partnerships and collaboration**

The ARSDRR and the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai framework in Africa (PoA) offer good examples on the role of partnerships in frameworks design and implementation. These frameworks prescribe roles and coordination among a broad range of actors spread across the AU, Regional Economic Communities (RECs), National Governments, and other major groups. They acknowledge that true progress can only be achieved through sustained and structured institutional collaboration and consultations. The CAADP, the Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa, the IDDRSI, the Agreement on the Nile Basin Cooperative Framework and the EAC Climate Change Policy also underscores the importance of partnerships and collaboration.

- **Focus on livelihoods**

Focus on supporting peoples livelihoods is a key element of IRM. Other than the Agreement on the Nile Basin Cooperative Framework whose operation appears to be more at the macro-level, the rest of the frameworks have significantly mainstreamed livelihoods and inclusion of women, youth and other vulnerable groups in their approaches.

Despite these progressive provisions, a number of gaps stand on the way of the frameworks in relation to being fully IRM-smart. The gaps include inadequate integration of climate change and ecosystem management, institutional weaknesses including inadequate capacity and resources, insufficient technical skills; non-integration of all the IRM elements and principles;

- **Inadequate integration of climate change and ecosystem management**

Some frameworks' strategies are fairly narrowly focused and fail to integrate the broader aspect of risk management that includes targeted actions on DRR, CCA and ERM. For instance, despite recognizing the link between DRR and climate change ecosystem management, the African Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (ARSDRR)'s main focus is DRR and its strategic directions addresses neither CCA nor ERM. Another example in this regard is the Policy Framework for pastoralism in Africa which falls short of prescribing clear strategies to deal with climate change despite recognizing the link between climate change and vulnerability of pastoral systems. Although such narrowly focused approaches may contribute to the achievement of specific framework objectives, a more holistic approach is need to achieve the IRM.

- **Institutional weaknesses**

Institutional weaknesses came out strongly as a key impediment not only to the realization of IRM but also to the achievement of individual frameworks' goals. A good example is the African Union Commission Department of Rural Economy and agriculture (AUC-DREA). The department has an extremely broad mandate which includes coordination and monitoring of most of the continental level frameworks relevant for risk management. These include ARSDRR, CAADP, Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa, and the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa. Yet, the department is fairly lean in terms of staffing and resources, considering such a broad mandate. Moreover, the department has no designated units for any of the issues under the different frameworks and has relied mostly on external technical assistance to support the coordination of the different frameworks implementation. Other than the overall coordination role, inbuilt institutional framework for implementation is also critical for framework implementation success. Yet this is lacking in frameworks like the Policy framework for Pastoralism in Africa, leaving implementation to be at the discretion of member states with no strict requirements for reporting and reference to the policy framework.

- **Insufficient technical skills and capacity in programming**

Insufficient technical skills and capacity in programming is a gap in some of the frameworks. For example, a number of key IDDRSI projects have been formulated by the Development Partners that funded them due to lack of sufficient technical skills within the IDDRSI institutions, as well as due to financial constraints. This portends the risk of the initiatives being donor-driven and hinders the active control and involvement of the primary stakeholders in programming activities.

- **Weak sectoral and institutional coordination**

The analysis has noted for instance that weak coordination has led to persistent absence of the representatives from EAC and COMESA from the IDDRSI Platform Steering Committee (PSC) meetings, and to failure of member states to act on PSC recommendations. There are also coordination weaknesses in terms of the key sectors or initiatives. For instance, a number of the reviewed frameworks have components on disaster risk reduction, ecosystem management or climate change adaptation. However, different coordinating agencies, implementing partners, development partners and even specific projects are following different log frames or results frameworks. The risk of this is duplication and spreading the efforts too thin for meaningful impacts.

- **Weaknesses in monitoring and reporting**

Being regional/sub-regional, the success of the frameworks depends to a large extent, on effective monitoring and reporting to assess regional, national or subnational implementation progress. Some of the frameworks have no monitoring and evaluation mechanisms while some like CAADP and the

PoA have made great strides with regard to monitoring, evaluation and reporting. The analysis however identified some gaps in the IDDRSI monitoring and evaluation framework that made it difficult to assess the extent of the benefits of IDDRSI to the member countries. These include inadequate baseline data on the performance indicators used, as progress can on be gauged based on a baseline. Frameworks like ARSDRR and the PoA have no systematic mechanism for monitoring and reporting although some ad hoc review takes place in preparation for global meetings. For the Nile Basin Cooperative Framework, there is a monitoring strategy although implementation of the strategy seems to be weak as there is scarce literature on any monitoring reports.

- **Lack of adequate commitment by some member states**

Most of the reviewed frameworks are designed to be implemented by member states, with the main regional/continental level coordinating agency providing coordination and monitoring role. As such, success of the frameworks depends on the commitment of all the member states to the objectives of the framework. Non-commitment by some member states therefore portends a great risk to the framework implementation progress. This has clearly manifested in the Nile Basin Cooperative Framework where Sudan and Egypt have dragged their feet due to the contentious clauses on water security and requirement of notification. As a result, key implementation requirements such as the formation of the Nile Basin Commission has not been affected to date. Non-commitment of some member states is also seen in irregular policy meetings and delayed contributions of Member States to the IDDRSI, causing IGAD to act with insufficient policy direction and financial support.

5.2. Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the gap analysis of each of the regional frameworks and the conclusions made thereof. The recommendations are meant for the Partners for Resilience (PfR) Horn of Africa Regional Programme team to support its initiative to promote resilience-building in the Horn of Africa through Integrated Risk Management (IRM) approach.

(a) African Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (ARSDRR) and the Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework in Africa.

- i. PfR should explore opportunities to be represented in and participate in the extended Africa Working Group (AWG) on DRR in order to have a greater influence on critical decisions regarding the implementation of the ARSDRR and the Programme of Action.
- ii. Through the AWG or otherwise, the PfR Horn of Africa Regional Programme should lobby the African Union to establish or at least assign a unit or desk at the AUC-DREA to deal with risk management issues, particularly the overall coordination, monitoring and reporting on the PoA and ARSDRR and closely related initiatives.
- iii. In the meantime, the PfR Horn of Africa Regional Programme can explore opportunities to support the AUC-DREA in implementing the AU monitoring and reporting system to help track progress the continent is making in implementing the ARSDRR and the PoA. PfR can also lobby the AUC-DREA to promote and encourage better integration of climate change adaptation and Ecosystem restoration and management while implementing the ARSDRR and the PoA.
- iv. PfR Horn of Africa Regional Programme should reach out to and support the operationalization of the EAC DRR Unit especially through developing and and

implementing initiatives aimed at strengthening the institution's capacities on programming, coordination and systematic monitoring and reporting on the implementation of ARSDRR and the Programme of Action.

- v. Depending on the availability of resources, PfR Horn of Africa Regional programme should also consider supporting the EAC DRR unit on the implementation of specific important initiatives such as: integration of Disaster Risk Reduction into education curriculum; development of regional emergency response plans; development of web portal for depositing Disaster Risk Reduction and other related emergencies; and strengthening and harmonizing existing regional early warning systems.
- vi. PfR country teams should support the National DRR Platforms technically and/or financially to improve their capacities in terms of programming, monitoring and reporting. In addition, they should support the National DRR Platforms to develop and implement national and local disaster risk reduction strategies including legislations and policies as per the individual countries' needs.
- vii. PfR country teams should lobby respective national governments either directly or through the National DRR Platforms, to: increase political commitment to proactive risk management, and to increase domestic resource allocation for IRM-smart risk management. Other critical advocacy areas for the national governments are: integration of disaster risk reduction in educational curricula from primary to tertiary levels; and innovative early warning and response systems.

(b) African Union Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP)

- i. The PfR HoA Regional Programme should support initiatives aimed at fast-tracking the review and implementation of CAADP Malabo Regional Agricultural Investment Plans (RAIPs), and strengthening regional policies on trade, regional value chain development and Resilience to climate change as per the inaugural BR recommendation.
- ii. PfR country teams should seek opportunities to support effective implementation of NAIPs and to improve data systems for improved evidence-based planning and adequate reporting on all CAADP/Malabo indicators.
- iii. PfR country teams should also specifically lobby the governments to mobilize and allocate adequate national resources to discharge the CAADP agenda, and to enhance stronger inter-sectoral collaboration.
- iv. PfR Kenya and Uganda country teams should lobby the respective governments to increase funding to agriculture to meet the CAADP target of 10 percent as per the inaugural BR recommendation.
- v. PfR Ethiopia country team should lobby the Ethiopian government to implement measures aimed at doubling agricultural productivity to meet the related Malabo target; and facilitate access to financial and agricultural advisory services, as per the inaugural BR recommendation.

(c) The Policy Framework for pastoralism in Africa

- i. PfR country teams should establish the position with regard to the establishment and operationalization of the national steering committees and national inter-disciplinary support team of experts as required by the Policy framework. Where they have not been constituted, PfR country teams can work with the respective government agencies, development partners, pastoralist organizations and other relevant stakeholders to establish and strengthen them.
- ii. Where national steering committees and national inter-disciplinary support team of experts have been formed, PfR country teams should explore opportunities to strengthen their capacities particularly in areas of programming, coordination, monitoring and reporting, as well as effective liaison with partners, as well as on the importance of mainstreaming climate change adaptation while implementing the policy.
- iii. PfR country teams can also identify and support national pastoralist organizations and movements to enhance their advocacy strategies and engagement especially on national level pastoralism policies and the Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa.
- iv. The PfR Ethiopia country team should consider developing a policy advocacy programme or other efforts to promote greater recognition of economic viability of pastoralism and the need to support this livelihood system. Specifically, the advocacy should aim to convince the government through its relevant ministries and agencies that sedentarization is likely to worsen the challenges facing pastoral livelihoods and promote review of sedentarization policies in the country.

(d) The IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI)

- i. PfR should consider participating in the IGAD NGOs/CSOs Forum and use the opportunity to push for greater CSO participation in the IDDRSI activities as well as to promote CSO oversight of the implementation of IDDRSI.
- ii. PfR can also engage the IDDRSI Platform Steering Committee (PSC) and IDDRSI Platform Coordination Unit (PCU) with the aim of strengthening PCU's capacity on programming as well as on continuous monitoring and tracking of IDDRSI implementation.
- iii. PfR should also sensitize the PSC on the need to conduct a resilience investment mapping with the aim of increasing the geographical coverage of the IDDRSI activities and PIAs
- iv. PfR country teams should also consider supporting National IDDRSI Coordination Platforms to improve their coordination role.
- v. PfR should lobby PCU, partner states and development partners to establish, capitalize and support the IDDRSI Multi-donor Trust Fund (MDTF).

(e) The Agreement on the Nile basin Cooperative framework

- i. PfR HoA Regional Programme should lobby the Nile Technical Advisory Committee (Nile-Tac) and the Nile secretariat (Nile-Sec) to develop more national and water shed level initiatives, programmes and projects in addition to the wider basin-level initiatives. For effective implementation of such local or watershed-level initiatives, PfR should also lobby the Nile-Tac and the Nile-Sec to establish national level offices or focal points.

- ii. PfR HoA Regional Programme should explore opportunities to support the Nile-Sec to review the CFA monitoring strategy to enhance its effectiveness, paying attention particularly to the base line data and indicators, and to implement the strategy.
- iii. PfR should consider supporting the Nile-Sec to enhance its capacity in programming in order ensure continuity, institutional memory and sustainability in programming in light of the frequent disruptions and uncertainties caused by changes in the ministers by successive country governments.
- iv. PfR country teams should review respective countries' water policy, legislative and institutional frameworks to assess the extent to which they encourage conservation of cross border water resources especially along the Nile basin. In countries that have water policies or legislations that are out-dated or are out of touch with modern realities, the PfR country teams should seek opportunities to advocate for and/or support their review.

(f) East African Community (EAC) Climate Change Policy

- i. PfR HoA Regional Programme should lobby and support the EAC Secretariat and EAC Climate Change Coordination Unit (EACCCCU) to fast-track the review of the EAC Climate Change Strategy which has since expired.
- ii. PfR HoA Regional Programme should lobby and support the EAC Secretariat and EACCCCU to review the EAC Climate Change Policy and The EAC Climate Change Master Plan to mainstream the 2016 Paris Agreement on Climate Change.
- iii. PfR HoA Regional Programme should develop initiatives aimed at promoting synergies, cooperation and collaboration among partner states, including through identifying and developing implementing plans for common actions across the partner states NDCs.
- iv. PfR HoA regional programme should lobby EAC partner states through the country climate change coordination units to establish and promote capitalization of the EAC Climate Change Fund.
- v. PfR country teams should lobby respective national governments to allocate sufficient resources for domestic climate change initiatives, including the NDC activities.
- vi. PfR HoA Regional Programme should design and implement initiatives to enhance the capacity of the EAC Climate Change Coordination Unit (CCCU), especially on issues to do with programming, coordination and policy monitoring roles.

REFERENCES

- African Union. 2014. "Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction."
- AfDB. 1992. *Poverty Alleviation Strategy and Action Programme*. Abidjan: African Development Bank.
- African Union & UNISDR. 2009. *Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (2006--2015)*. "Second Africa Regional Platform on Disaster Risk Reduction, Nairobi, Kenya. May 5-7. African Union and United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction.
- African Union Commission. 2017. "Common African Position to the 2017 Global Platform on Disaster Risk Reduction." (UNISDR). Accessed April 10, 2018.
<https://www.unisdr.org/files/globalplatform/commonafricapositionto2017globalpla.pdf>.
- African Union Commission. 2013. "Report on Survey on Centres of Excellence for Disaster Risk Reduction in Africa submitted to the Fourth Africa Regional Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction."
- African Union. 2010b. *Decision on African Union Pastoralism, Doc. EX.CL/631 (XVIII)*. African Union Executive Council. Accessed March 23, 2018.
https://au.int/sites/default/files/documents/30237-doc-decision_on_pastoralism_english.pdf.
- African Union. 2010a. *Policy framework for pastoralism in Africa: Securing, protecting and improving the lives, livelihoods and rights of pastoralist communities*. Addis Ababa: African Union. Accessed March 23, 2018. <http://publications.cta.int/en/publications/publication/1735/>.
- African Union. 2016a. "Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 in Africa." Addis Ababa. Accessed March 28, 2018.
https://www.preventionweb.net/files/49455_poaforsendaiimplementationinafrica.pdf.
- African Union. 2017. "Statement By H.E. Ms. Amira Elfadil, Commissioner Social Affairs on the occasion of international day of for Disaster Reduction (IDRR) Commemoration."
- African Union. 2016b. "Summary Report on Proceedings of the Workshop on Policy Dialogue and strengthening of the Capacity of Pastoralists' networks and organizations held from 29th June to 1st July 2016 at Palm Beach Hotel Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso."
- African Union, UNISDR, and World Bank. 2008. *Status of Disaster Risk Reduction in the Sub-Saharan Africa Region, by Rakhi Bhavnani, Seth Vordzorgbe, Martin Owor, and Franck Bousquet*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Afun-Ogidan, D. 2012. "CAADP in a nutshell." *GREAT Insights* 1 (7).
- AU & ISDR. 2010. "Extended Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (2006 - 2015) and Declaration of the 2nd African Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction." Accessed March 28, 2018.
https://www.unisdr.org/files/19613_bookletpoaenglish.pdf.
- AU & NEPAD. 2004. "Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction."

- Benin, S., Kennedy, A., Lambert, M., and McBride, L. 2010. "Monitoring African agricultural development processes and performance: A comparative analysis. ReSAKSS Annual Trends and Outlook Report 2010." (International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)).
- Bereketeab, Redie. 2012. "Introduction." In *The Horn of Africa: Intra-State and Inter-State Conflicts and Security*, by Redie Bereketeab, 8. London: Pluto Press.
- Bwalya, Martin. 2012. "Martin Bwalya on CAADP progress. Institutional reforms vital for sustaining achievements." Bwalya, Martin. 2012. Martin Bwalya on CAADP progress. Institutional reforms vital for <http://www.donorplatform.org/caadp/interviews/671-martin-bwalya-on-caadp-progress.html> .
- CAADP website. n.d. "About CAADP." Accessed April 14, 2018. <http://www.nepad-caadp.net/about-caadp.php>.
- CRED & UNISDR. 2015. *The human cost of weather-related disasters 1995-2015*. Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED); United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR).
- CRED-UNISDR. 2016. *Poverty and Death: Disaster mortality 1996-2015*.
- EAC. 2011. *East African Community Climate Change Policy*. Arusha: East african Community Secretariat.
- EAC Secretariat. 2017. "Press Release: EAC show-cases regional climate change initiatives at the ongoing UNFCCC in Marrakech, Morocco." (East African Community). Accessed April 12, 2018. <https://www.eac.int/press-releases/612-1067-793-eac-show-cases-regional-climate-change-initiatives-at-the-ongoing-unfccc-in-marrakech-morocco>.
- EAC. 2011. *The East African Community Climate Change Master Plan*. Arusha: East African Community Secretariat.
- ENA. 2017. *Nile Basin Commission Will be Established upon Signing of CFA by Three Countries: ENTRO*. Ethiopian News Agency. Accessed March 26, 2018. <http://www.ena.gov.et/en/index.php/economy/item/3574-nile-basin-commission-will-be-established-upon-signing-of-cfa-by-three-countries-entro>.
- FAO. 2017. *Horn of Africa Cross Border Drought Action Plan 2017*. Food and Agriculture Organization.
- FFP. 2017. *Fragile States Index 2017*. Washington DC: The Fund for Peace. Accessed March 17, 2018. <http://fundforpeace.org/fsi/>.
- GCCA. 2012. "Programme on Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation in the COMESA-EAC-SADC Region." Accessed April 14, 2018. <http://www.gcca.eu/intra-acp/programme-on-climate-change-adaptation-and-mitigation-in-the>.
- GFDRR. 2017. "ACP-EU natural Disaster risk Reduction Programme Activity Report 2016-2017." (Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery). Accessed April 12, 2018. https://www.gfdr.org/sites/default/files/publication/ACP-EU%20NDRR%202016-17%20Activity%20Report%20-%20EN_1.pdf.
- HESPI. 2017. "Macroeconomic Performance of IGAD and the Implications of China's Economic Slow Down." The Horn Economic and Social Policy Institute, Addis Ababa. Accessed March 22,

2018. <https://www.africaportal.org/documents/18006/Macroeconomic-Performance-of-IGAD.pdf>.
- Horn Affairs. 2015. "Agreement on Declaration of Principles between the Arab Republic of Egypt, the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia and the Republic of the Sudan on the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam Project (GERDP)." Accessed April 12, 2018. <https://hornaffairs.com/2015/03/25/egypt-ethiopia-sudan-agreement-on-declaration-of-principles-full-text/>.
- HRW. 2018. *World Report 2018*. Human Rights Watch. Accessed March 18, 2018. <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2018/country-chapters/south-sudan>.
- IGAD. 2013. "IGAD Drought Resilience and Sustainability Initiative."
- IGAD. 2016. *IGAD State of the Region Report*. Djibouti: Information and documentation section, IGAD Secretariat.
- IGAD. 2016. "Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the 1st Phase, (2013-2017), of the Implementation of (IDDRSI) Strategy."
- J. Kileshye Onema, A.E Taigbenu, D. Twikirize. 2015. "Challenges to the Implementation of the Nile Basin Initiative in the Equatorial Region."
- Maru, Mehari Taddele. n.d. "The Political Economy of the IGAD." *Horn Affairs*. Accessed March 21, 2018. <https://hornaffairs.com/the-political-economy-of-igad/>.
- Mekonnen, Dereje Zeleke. 2010. "The Nile Basin Cooperative Framework Agreement Negotiations and the Adoption of a 'Water Security' Paradigm: Flight into Obscurity or a Logical Cul-de-sac?" *European Journal of International Law* Volume 21 (Issue 2): 421–440. Accessed March 30, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chq027> .
- Mengisteab, Kidane. 2012. "Relevance of Regional Integration in the Greater Horn Region." In *In Regional Integration, Identity and Citizenship in the Greater Horn of Africa*, by Boydell and Brewer, edited by Mengisteab Kidane and Bereketeb Redie, 3-24. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7722/j.ctt1x73f1.7>.
- Mesfin, Berouk. 2011. "The Horn of Africa Security Complex." In *Regional Security in the post-Cold war Horn of Africa*, edited by Roba Sharamo and Berouk Mesfi, 3. Institute for Security Studies (ISS).
- NBI. 2010. *Agreement on the Nile River Basin Cooperative Framework*. Entebbe: Nile Basin Initiative. Accessed March 26, 2018. <http://www.nilebasin.org/images/docs/CFA%20-%20English%20%20FrenchVersion.pdf>.
- NBI Secretariat. 2017. "NBI Strategy 2017 - 2027 Abridged Version." <http://www.nilebasin.org/images/docs/NBI-Strategy-2017---2027.pdf>.
- NEPAD. 2015. "Countries with Compacts /Investment."
- NEPAD. 2017. "Inaugural Biennial Review Report of the African Union Commission on the Implementation of the Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared prosperity and Improved Livelihoods." www.nepad.org/download/file/fid/7972%20 .

- Niang, I., O.C. Ruppel, M.A. Abdrabo, A. Essel, C. Lennard, J. Padgham, and P. Urquhart. 2014. "Africa." In *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part B: Regional Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by V.R., C.B. Field, D.J. Dokken, M.D. Mastrandrea, K.J. Mach, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White Barros, 1199-1265. Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, . Accessed March 21, 2018. https://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar5/wg2/WGIIAR5-Chap22_FINAL.pdf.
- Salman, Salman M.A. 2017. "The Nile Basin Cooperative Framework Agreement: The Impasse is Breakable!" (Sudan Now Magazine). Accessed April 12, 2018. <http://sudanow-magazine.net/page.php?mainId=&subId=27&Id=180>.
- The World Bank. 2010. "Report on the status of Disaster Risk Reduction in Sub-Saharan Africa."
- UNDP. 2016. *Human Development Report 2016*. New York: United Nations Development Programme. Accessed March 18, 2018. http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/2016_human_development_report.pdf.
- UNECA. 2015. *Assessment report on mainstreaming and implementing disaster risk reduction and management in Africa*. United Nations Economic Commission for Africa.
- UNEP. 2012. "Food Security in the Horn of Africa: The Implications of a Drier, Hotter and More Crowded Future."
- UNISDR. 2017. "East Africa backs Sendai Framework Implementation." (United Nations Office for Disaster Risk reduction). Accessed April 12, 2018. <https://www.unisdr.org/archive/53519>.
- UNISDR. 2010. *Inventory of National Coordination Mechanisms, Legal Frameworks and National Plans for Disaster Risk Reduction in Africa*. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction in Africa.
- UNISDR. 2015. "Making Cities Resilient: About The Campaign." Accessed April 12. <https://www.unisdr.org/campaign/resilientcities/home/about>.
- United Nations. 2014. Accessed April 12, 2018. http://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/8_3_1997.pdf.
- United Nations. 2016. *Combating desertification, land degradation and drought and promoting sustainable pastoralism and rangelands. UNEP/EA.2/L.28*. United Nations Environment Assembly of the United Nations Environment Programme.
- United Nations. 2005. *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters*, 22 January 2005, A/CONF.206/6. United Nations. Accessed March 23, 2018. <http://www.refworld.org/docid/42b98a704.html>.
- United Nations. 1989. *International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction, A/RES/44/236*. United Nations. Accessed March 23, 2018. <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/44/a44r236.htm>.
- United Nations. 2012. *Map No. 4188 Rev. 5, Horn of Africa*. Department of Field Support, Cartographic Section, United Nations, United Nations. Accessed March 14, 2018. <http://www.un.org/Depts/Cartographic/map/profile/horne.pdf>.

United Nations. 2015b. *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, A/RES/69/283*. United Nations. Accessed March 23, 2018.
https://www.unisdr.org/files/43291_sendaiframeworkfordrren.pdf.

United Nations. 2015a. *Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development A/RES/70/1*. United Nations. Accessed March 23, 2018. Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
<http://www.refworld.org/docid/57b6e3e44.html>.

United Nations. 1994. *Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World: Guidelines for Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation*. United Nations. Accessed March 23, 2018.
https://www.unisdr.org/files/8241_doc6841contenido1.pdf.