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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICN</td>
<td>In-Country Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAP</td>
<td>Humanitarian Accountability Partnership International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALNAP</td>
<td>Active Learning Network and Performance in Humanitarian Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSEA</td>
<td>Prevention from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Sexual Exploitation and Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoK</td>
<td>Government of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSG</td>
<td>District Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commission for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCT</td>
<td>United Nations Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSI</td>
<td>Joint Standards Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEWSNET</td>
<td>Famine Early Warning System Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRC</td>
<td>Kenya Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally displaced persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>Code of Conduct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section 1: Introduction

1.1 Joint Deployment to Kenya

Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) International, the Sphere Project and People In Aid, in a bid to work more closely together, made an agreement in July 2011 to collaborate for a joint deployment in response to the Horn of Africa drought. An initial assessment mission1 was undertaken in August 2011 in which various stakeholders such as national, international NGOs, UN agencies, inter-agency networks and donors were consulted. A joint deployment followed at the end of October 2011, under the banner of Joint Standards Initiative (JSI) with the aim to: support the humanitarian system in providing accountable programming that meets accepted standards of quality, both in the immediate humanitarian response, and in the development and implementation of organisational and operational strategies for short and long-term recovery and the prevention of future crises.

A central objective of the joint deployment was to ensure that the voices of those affected by disaster are amplified and brought centre stage to ensure greater action on accountability and quality. Under the objective of collaborating with and supporting existing networks, and building on the on-going processes, an interagency mapping exercise was conducted during the joint deployment in collaboration with the In-Country Network (ICN) on Protection from Sexual Abuse and Exploitation (PSEA)2.

The ICN has been set up under the auspices of the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) under the leadership of the Resident Coordinator. It has taken steps to ensure enhanced coordination and communication relating to the prevention of, and response to cases of abuse and exploitation by personnel working for the UN, its affiliated partners, international NGOs as well as other humanitarian assistance workers. In October 2011, the Network in an attempt to better understand and analyze the measures in place for the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse, initiated a nation-wide baseline study to identify the existing gaps and areas for further improvement (Annex 1). Previous studies and reviews on PSEA had been centered on Kenya refugee camps with significant work since 2003; however, this had not filtered across agencies or informed the work of other humanitarian and development aid.3

The commencement of the ICN of PSEA review coincided with the joint deployment to Kenya. The two teams agreed to collaborate and undertake the study in the drought affected areas of Lodwar and Kakuma. For the ICN, this exercise is part a larger nation-wide baseline, in which other contexts, as identified by the Network’s Steering Committee, will be examined independently by the ICN for a more comprehensive study on the overall state of PSEA in Kenya, the scope of which will include contexts such as:

a) Drought affected areas: Lodwar and Kakuma  
b) Post-election violence hotspots: Eldoret, Kitale, Kapenguria  
c) Cross border movements: Moyale / Garrisa  
d) Refugee Camps: Kakuma / Dadaab  
e) Urban settlements: Nairobi

While the In-Country Network concentrated on the current status of PSEA implementation, the joint deployment team focused on additional and other aspects of quality and accountability. This joint effort was seen as an opportunity to build capacity on quality & accountability, and PSEA with programme staff in the region and to gain a better understanding of the challenges and recommendations as perceived by programme site staff, GoK representatives and affected communities. This report consists of a collection of perceptions and recommendations from a variety of key stakeholders from the region. The findings of this mapping exercise provide a needs analysis from which organisation can learn, adapt and improve the quality and accountability of their interventions.

The mapping exercise was kindly hosted and facilitated by UNICEF in Lodwar and UNHCR in Kakuma.

---

1 Findings of this mission can be read at: http://hapinternational.org/pool/files/findings-of-horn-of-africa-assessment-mission-.pdf  
2 PSEA specifically refers to measure in places to prevent sexual abuse, exploitation and inappropriate sexual behaviour by humanitarian workers while engaging with affected communities. There are Minimum Operation Standards for use by UN, I/NGO and related personnel which is a compliance mechanism derived from guidelines in Statement of Commitment 2009, Secretary General’s Bulletin, General Assembly Resolution on Victim assistance and Minimum Operation Standards on PSEA.  
1.2 Context

A major food crisis hit the Horn of Africa, which affected millions of people in drought-stricken areas of Somalia, Kenya, Ethiopia and Djibouti in April 2011. The Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWSNET) stated that the food crisis developed because the impacts of severe drought in the region, were exacerbated by extremely high food prices, and a limited humanitarian response.  

Humanitarian actors were criticised for not responding quickly enough to the crisis. Despite early warnings in late 2010 and a U.N. appeal in November that year, humanitarian funding was only increased in June and July 2011.

In Kenya, food shortages reached critical levels and the government declared a national emergency and promised to increase cereal imports. In November 2011, an estimated 3.75 million people needed aid, according to FEWSNET. Hunger experts said pastoralists in the north and northeast were particularly vulnerable to food shortages.

The Kenyan Red Cross (KRC) warned of a looming humanitarian crisis in the northwestern Turkana region of Kenya, which borders South Sudan. According to KRC officials over three-fourths of the area’s population, were in need of food aid as malnutrition was soaring. About 385,000 children in these marginalized parts of Kenya were already malnourished, along with 90,000 pregnant and breast feeding women.

The region has experienced two hunger crises in the past 6 years. In 2006, an estimated 11 million people were hit hard by drought, and in 2008-2009, the number affected topped 20 million.

1.3 Overview and methodology

The aim of the mapping exercise was to:

- To understand the state of accountability and to find ways to address the existing challenges by understanding the strengths, identifying areas of improvement for action planning and identifying areas for future support
- Provide capacity building opportunity to programme site staff to increase their understanding and practice of accountability and PSEA issues
- Solicit recommendations and solutions from a variety of stakeholders especially staff and affected communities
- Facilitate a field based network for exchange of good practices and learning

As inter-agency effort:

- It was conducted by the Joint deployment team & the PSEA network which is composed of 25 I/NGOs
- 25 agencies were represented
- 36 staff members participated
- 109 affected community members were consulted from 10 stakeholder groups.

1.4 Limitations and scope:

- This exercise is not an exhaustive study, rather it is an attempt to bring the voices of affected communities to the centre of the decision making process and raise awareness on the accountability and quality related challenges they face. The recommendations made in Section 3 are those shared by the affected communities themselves and have not been modified.
- The purpose of the exercise was to create a snapshot of the key challenges, gather recommendations from affected communities and frontline staff and identify salient action points in sample locations and is limited to the Turkana Central & West regions.
- The exercise has been adapted to the circumstances, staff time availability, access to affected communities, location, and other contextual considerations.

---

[1] www.fews.net/Pages/default.aspx
[3] See Annex 1 for more details
[4] See Box 2 for more details
The exercise was limited to drought affected areas and focused on assistance and services provided since June 2011. In Kakuma, only the host communities were consulted since refugees operations were outside the scope of this exercise.

In the absence of participants with expertise on consulting children were not included as a stakeholder group.

Information about specific cases of sexual abuse and exploitation, or identities of such persons was not requested. This issue was dealt with in general terms.

To triangulate and identify trends further mapping exercises should be done in other locations in Kenya.

### Box 1: Overview of Methodology

**Planning:**
- Choice of location and hosting agency
- Nomination of a field focal point staff to for liaison

**Conducting the Exercise:**

**Inter-agency orientation/one day workshop:**
- Orientation open to other agencies working in the location
- Definitions of SEA, power differentials, differences in Gender bases Violence (GBV) and SEA and raising awareness on PSEA as per the Secretary Generals Bulletin 2003 (ST/SGB/2003/13).
- Entails raising awareness on the key and integrated messages from the three Standards of: People In Aid, HAP International and Sphere.
- Includes discussion on the key challenges and barriers with staff
- The focus group discussion questions developed from using the HAP 2010 Standard, People In Aid Code and Sphere Handbook.

**Plan and undertake on-site visits with the participants of the workshop:**
- The focus group discussions jointly undertaken by JSI and PSEA network team members and the participants of the workshop as an opportunity staff to engage in direct consultations, equip them to understand accountability in action, identify the challenges and gaps by and for themselves, and be a forum for peer learning and support.
- Consultations will be conducted with various stakeholders: disaggregated according to vulnerability, access, and relevance.
- After the field visits, the participants reconvene and share their findings and recommendations from affected communities.

**Outcomes and findings:**
1. Agencies interested in drafting action plans for their respective agencies will be encouraged to do so.
2. Draft findings will be presented to various stakeholders at Nairobi for their further action.
3. The findings will not be attributed to any individual agency but are for wider learning and awareness.

**Continual Improvement of Methodology:**
4. At the end of the exercise, the field staff evaluate the exercise
5. The methodology will be refined and drafted for a wider sharing and learning purposes.

### 1.5 Development of Methodology

This Inter-Agency Accountability and Quality Mapping Exercise is based on a combination methodologies. These include:

1. **Inter-Agency Accountability and Mapping Exercise conducted in Dadaab Refugee Operations in August 2010.** 13 agencies participated and 32 staff members participated in the actual exercise, while 126 refugees were consulted. “The methodology of this exercise was captured as a good practice for wider learning in “Collective efforts to improve humanitarian accountability and quality: the HAP deployment to Dadaab”, published by Humanitarian Exchange Magazine: [http://www.odihpn.org/report.asp?id=3202](http://www.odihpn.org/report.asp?id=3202)

2. **Humanitarian Accountability Report, which is an annual publication which outlines the state of accountability of the humanitarian sector and includes consultations with affected communities, which are reflected in a Chapter entitled: Voices of Disaster Survivors. A synthesis of the chapter was published in the Humanitarian exchange Magazine: [http://www.odihpn.org/report.asp?id=3254](http://www.odihpn.org/report.asp?id=3254)
1.6 How is PSEA a quality and accountability issue?

A central component of the recent revisions of Sphere Handbook and the HAP Standard has been an emphasis on enhancing the linkages and coherence between humanitarian quality and accountability counterparts. One aspect through which this increased coherence can be demonstrated, but is not limited to, is the commonalities on protection from sexual exploitation and abuse. Systems processes and recommendations cross-cut the 2011 Sphere Handbook, the HAP 2010 Standard of Quality and Accountability and People in Aid’s Code of Good Practice through which organisation can limit the risk of SEA within their organisations.

Being accountable to crisis affected people helps organisations to develop quality programmes that meet the people’s needs, and reduces the possibility of mistakes, abuse and corruption. Accountability with regards to PSEA focuses on establishing systems and processes that reduce the risk of potential of abuse and exploitation for the protection of affected communities. The standards of the Joint deployment provide guidance for the establishment of systems and processes for risk management and the protection of affected communities in relation to SEA. The processes are clearly laid out in certain sections of the respective organisations standards and provide guidance for organisation to appropriately manage the risk of SEA.
SECTION 2: SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Below are some key findings that emerged during the consultations with programme site staff, affected communities and representatives from the Government of Kenya (GoK). The recommendations presented below are those shared by the affected communities, programme site staff and district government officials. Findings and recommendations from the authors have not been added, to ensure that the voices of those affected by disaster remain unmodified and unaltered. These should be read in conjunction with the rich details presented in Section 3 to amplify understanding and analysis and identify further action.

Staff members from 25 agencies participating in the workshop undertook the focus group discussions (FGD) with the various stakeholder groups in Lodwar and Kakuma:

1. People with disability
2. Elderly community members
3. District Government officials
4. Women
5. Youth
6. Committees
7. Men
8. Internally displaced persons (IDPs)
9. Food Committees
10. Field Monitors (Cash programme)

2.1 Coordination

Coordination was highlighted as an area of weakness by affected communities and government officials. Affected communities urged organisations to have inter-linked and holistic programmes, to ensure sustainability and effectiveness. Duplication was highlighted as another issue of concern, as they felt that majority of organisations intervened in the same area without taking into account the programmes that had already been implemented. The district level government officials highlighted that organisations bypass the district government offices. They stated that this could be due to the level bureaucracy, the lack of awareness and/or the “lack of respect; “agencies come, intervene and leave without informing anyone.” They felt that the lack of an effective coordination mechanism contributed to this, and while the District Steering Group (DSG) existed it was perceived as a weak and unrepresentative forum. District officials in Lodwar and Kakuma stressed that the DSG “lacks teeth and necessary powers and regulations to enforce resolutions”. A high level district official commented that “There is a lot of “publicity” about the Turkana region and this has increased humanitarian activity, but the coordination is poor and needs a better approach. There has been too much duplication. There is no centre point so feedback can not be given, it is very scattered”

Recommendations and suggestions from affected communities and government officials:

- Ensure effective and robust coordination mechanisms that are created through consultation with the district and emerging county governments.
- Put in place/strengthen existing systems in order to have an effective structures that encourages systematic information sharing between the government and organisations and to affected communities.
- Make the district steering group effective through mandate and between representation of various stakeholders which include chiefs, relevant heads of district departments and NGOs and sector experts.
- Ensure the county governments are empowered and equipped with an understanding of PSEA and tools to address these issues.

2.2 Systems and policies:

Staff in consultations highlighted that overall policies, and specifically for the measures on prevention of sexual abuse and exploitation in place were not always accessible, too difficult to understand or seemed vague. As a result, they struggled to implement them in their daily work. Some staff highlighted that relevant policies were only shared once something had gone wrong. Several staff consulted highlighted that they felt that the policies were punitive, and staff needed protection against malicious or unfounded complaints too. In addition, there were no explicit set procedures to deal with which accountability and PSEA issues, which led to an ad hoc approach with little of no resource allocation.

Recommendations and suggestions from staff:

- Provide guidance to staff on what key information from their code of conduct and contact details need to be explained to affected communities and how to relay it.
- Staff recommended that the Code of Conduct needs to be legally binding to decrease issues of SEA
- Policies need to be simplified and explained to staff and should be made available to all staff.
- Staffs also need to be protected and this should be reflected in the policies that are in place.
- Establish systems and guidelines for PSEA and establish an inter-agency referral system for complaints.
- Better understand how community involvement can be increased through a baseline study.

2.3 Sharing timely and relevant information – “We wait and wait until we find out that the programme does not exist”

Lack of information on project details, timeframes and beneficiary selection processes were repeatedly highlighted. Community members strongly felt that they needed to know the timeframes of projects, so they would not wait in anticipation of the next food cycle or distribution. This they said was also important so they could find other ways of coping and continue with their activities. Organisations springing up and then disappearing suddenly was also highlighted by affected communities, “We wait and wait until we find out that the programme does not exist” (An elderly person with disabilities– Kakuma)

Vulnerable groups especially the disabled and elderly reported that it was difficult to access information, which reinforced their sense of exclusion and marginalisation; they perceived that no special efforts were made ensure that information reaches them. Information is usually shared through barazas or committees, however, these channels remain susceptible to distortion, and deliberate retention, “Information sharing is the monopoly of chiefs and leaders”. Changes in projects are not communicated, an example was given of a scholarship program that changed right before it was due to commence. In other examples, food mixes were distributed, however guidance on how to use these was not provided. For another project, the beneficiaries were told they had to pay for transport and accommodation at the last minute, which meant a majority of the selected beneficiaries, could not attend.

Recommendations and suggestions from affected communities:
- Community members asked for more timely information about the projects, entitlements, and timeframes through diverse channels.
- Staff need to be provided guidance on when and what information to share with affected communities across the project cycle and how special efforts to ensure vulnerable groups can access and receive this information.

2.4 Beneficiary selection criteria and process

The stakeholders consulted all echoed that beneficiary selection criteria is pre-determined and at times does not meet the realities on the ground. Selection is largely done by chiefs, community leaders or committees. Some groups viewed the selection process to be unfair and nepotistic, as leaders and chiefs selected people from their own community.

The food committee members in Lodwar highlighted that for the food cycle, the number of people in need was far greater than the number of people receiving of assistance. They stated that since the numbers and individuals on the distribution list were set, the community ended up sharing their food rations with those in need. The food committee raised concerns that the criteria or number of persons who would be provided assistance is pre-determined and at times did not meet the realities on the ground.

For pastoralist communities spread over large areas, accessing information and participating in barazas in which beneficiary selection criteria and process were explained can be problematic since they live at great distances from the central points where barazas are held and so can be missed out in the selection process and information about the programmes.

Recommendations and suggestions from affected community members:
- Information sharing, involvement and participation should be with community at large and not only with leaders.
- The target of how many people will be provided with assistance should match ground realities and needs. These are predetermined and many people are left out. If the needs cannot be met by a particular agency then the matter should be referred to be another organisation for timely action.
- The beneficiary selection criteria and process should be transparent and fair.
- Persons in far-flung areas, those with disabilities and other marginalised groups should have fair access and representation in the selection process.
2.5 Consultations and feedback into programme design and implementation—“We respond to journalist needs assessments”

A common trend that emerged amongst the various stakeholders interviewed was the lack of consultation with affected communities, which in their view resulted unsustainable and unsuitable projects with no real impact. This was also strongly echoed by the district level government officials who said that there was a lack of active and tangible involvement of district government in the assistance programmes and local capacities and expertise available were not adequately utilised. District level officials like agriculture experts, had not been consulted before the design of a programme and implementation. An example of seeds unsuitable for the climate distributed by some organisations was highlighted. District officials felt that organisations come to the government as last resort or as “fire-fighters” when they have problems with the communities due to ineffective/poorly received programmes. Poor information sharing and consultation with the district officials resulted in duplication and in some cases dumping of aid. Unequal distributions in relation to geographical areas and needs of the affected communities was cited and senior district government official shared that often it was a case of wherever the cameras could reach; the agencies would start programmes there without appropriate assessment, “we respond to journalist needs assessments”. Community members highlighted the lack of clear community consultation and involvement in project proposal, planning, design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation.

Staff members also highlighted how some projects had been donor driven with tight deadlines and pre-designed. This hindered the opportunities to conduct consultations with communities on their needs and led to pre-determined and donor driven projects.

Recommendations and suggestions from affected community members and government officials:

- Consult communities at all stages of the project cycle, from design to evaluation and measurement. (Women’s Group, Kakuma)
- Conduct integrated planning with the government officials, local leaders, and communities to develop joint community action plans. This will also serve to avoid duplication of projects. (Women’s Group, Kakuma)
- Consult communities as soon as a crisis settles, in order to deliver appropriate and needs-driven projects, although opportunities may be limited for broad consultations during the initial phases of an emergency.

2.6 Relief: dependency creation and non-sustainable approach—“Hit and Run projects”

The need to have sustainable, self-reliant and long term programmes which lead to community empowerment and ownership was strongly emphasised by every stakeholder group consulted in both locations. This was a recurrent issue in all discussions with the affected community and district level government officials alike. Concerns and dissatisfaction was expressed and the group of men consulted in Kakuma said that “hit and run projects” had been implemented which left little trace or impact. While the government officials lamented that “Dependency syndrome has been created by flooding of food aid in Turkana- a sack of maize is sold cheaper in Kakuma, than in Kitale (the bread basket of Kenya)” and recommended that there needs to be a shift from food aid to food security. “Relief is non-sustainable; we need to move towards more sustainable, dignified approach……. moving people away from it towards self-reliance will be increasingly difficult. The mindset of people has become dependent on a, ‘bring and deliver to us attitude’. " (GoK senior district official). Community members, especially those from marginalised groups stressed that “Self-reliance is the key to empowerment” and "we don’t want to be beggars- we want to work for the aid/assistance received”.

Recommendations and suggestions by community members:

- Implement long-term and sustainable projects, such as income generation or livelihood projects. These may include market stalls with semi-permanent structures for sale of products, micro-farming support, wheelchairs offering greater mobility for people with disabilities, re-stocking of livestock, irrigation farming, and the use river banks. (People with Disabilities Group)
- Increase access to priority services: education, medical services, and employment opportunities (People with Disabilities Group).
- Diversify assistance to include longer term income generation and livelihoods projects, as 'self reliance is the key to empowerment'. (IDP Group)
- Prioritise the distribution of resources based on needs and with greater community involvement, and conduct joint programming with the communities for sustainable projects (NGO staff).

2.7 Access to humanitarian Assistance of vulnerable groups—“even if we are disabled, we are still human beings”

People with disabilities and elderly highlighted issues of marginalisation and lack of special effort to ensure their representation in the ongoing project activities. They also highlighted concerns of accessing food distributions and difficulties in transporting it (snatching, stealing, and paying people to transport it by selling portion of their food). They
felt that they were “not handled with dignity during food distributions and this needs attention”. In addition lack of any specific projects that enabled them to use their skills and talents, and employment opportunities adversely affected their sense of dignity and empowerment. The elderly highlighted that they did not fall under any beneficiary category and were not included in the disabilities one either.

Recommendations and suggestions from community members:
- Representation in committee meetings and humanitarian organisation meetings is needed
- NGOs should be made aware and sensitised about the vulnerabilities of PWDs and the challenges they face
- Involve PWDs in programme design at all levels and provide support for project proposal writing so they can submit projects based on their needs.
- Food distributions points should be increased and made accessible
- Food rations should be reserved for PWDs and support with access, transport should be provided
- PWDs should be involved in trainings and capacity building workshops
- A comprehensive data base on the nature of disabilities in Turkana County should be created
- Representation of PWDs in existing committee structures should be increased

2.8 Role of committees and community leaders
Affected communities highlighted the over-reliance of organisations on the use of committees, or structures within the community to select beneficiaries, pass on information and provide feedback on programmes. Various groups consulted highlighted that they did not know the terms of reference or roles and responsibilities, or limits of power of the committees and community leaders. They had mixed views about the role of these structures; women groups said that while more women attended the baraza, the final decisions were made by men. Furthermore, persons with disabilities group said that they community leaders and committees were largely nepotistic, unfair and non-transparent and the committees did not have fair representation.

The committees shared that their roles and responsibilities were not clearly defined by the organisations and did not have a terms of reference and preformed arbitrary tasks when instructed by the I/NGO. The food committee highlighted that they were just called on the distribution day and asked to assist with the distribution, and beyond this there was no support of guidance provided by the I/NGOs to increase their learning. Programme changes, timeframes and other details were not shared nor were they given timely information of how to relay and respond the concerns and complaints of the community members.

Recommendations and suggestions by community members:
- Community leaders should take be better monitored so they deliver on their responsibilities in a fair and transparent way.
- Access to organisations should be made easier, so the affected community members can contact the organisation directly if needed.
- Increase representation of PWDs in existing committee/community structures
- NGO staff should be mandated to meet community to gather feedback which should be reflected in projects
- Participation needs to increase and this should be done through regular consultations, joint planning, updates and involvement in decision making process.
- Empower committees by providing them with: terms of reference/ roles and responsibilities of committee structures and community leaders; guidance on the projects of organisations; regular updates on programme changes; timely feedback on complaints; proper verbal and written schedules; distribution dates and criteria. Also the complaints process-how to register complaints, the time it will take to process the complaints etc so that the community can be informed should be clearly explained.

2.9 Complaints handling and prevention of sexual abuse and exploitation

By and large the community members highlighted that they were not aware about the process through which they could raise concerns and complaints safely with the organisations. Currently they approach staff, but “we talk, but there is no action”. There is a fear of being struck off the distribution lists repercussions on future assistance and examples of complaints that had not been received or handled well. This causes despondency and anger; the youth group said they would raise their concerns “through demonstrations as there is no avenue for dialogue”.

In reference to PSEA issues, there is limited awareness on the issues as well as reporting mechanisms. Some community members highlighted that they had their own monitoring mechanisms and prevented such incidents from occurring while other groups highlighted that these incidents had happened and reported but either not handled in a confidential way or were not sure of the outcomes. The government officials highlighted that cases of SEA had been reported with the highest numbers coming from within education and food distribution systems. Gender imbalance, the fear of retaliation, and stigmatisation, impede reporting of PSEA. At the policy level, protection issues in general are not highlighted or a part of the agenda of the DSG meetings
Recommendations and suggestions by community members and government officials:

- Organisations should have clear complaints handling policies and procedures in place.
- Communities should be sensitised on how to raise through the identified means and staff should be trained on how to handle complaints safely and effectively.
- Community members should be ensured that they have a right to complain, without fear of retaliation through identified channels.
- The Code of Conduct of organisations should be publically displayed and strictly enforced.
- Awareness about PSEA should be created and effective systems to address the issues put in place.
- Reporting especially through confidential and safe procedures, should be encouraged.
- Protection issues should be made a part of the DSG agenda and that there is adequate and fair representation of various stakeholders at the DSG.
- Gender parity at government offices should be ensured to increase ease of reporting.

2.10 Rights and empowerment “What are my rights- tell me”

The various groups consulted highlighted that they lacked an understanding of their rights and entitlements. They added stressed that they wanted to be made aware of these issues so they could feel empowered to hold organisations accountable.

Recommendations:

- Continuous empowerment of the community should be done through workshops, training and the strengthening of community based organisations. (committee members)
- Respect the views of the community (committee members)
- Make the communities aware of their rights and empower them through self-reliant and sustainable projects.
- Sensitize communities on their rights and entitlements.
3.1 Staff Questionnaire

To gather a greater understanding of the accountability challenges relating to good people management processes, a questionnaire was provided to staff participating in the mapping exercise. A total of 29 participants responded in both Kakuma and Lodwar. Nine of the participants were from the GoK and have not been included in the analysis, since the questionnaire was designed for I/NGO staff, which follow under specific codes of conducts, humanitarian principles and practices. The analysis is based on the 10 remaining I/NGO and agency staff from each location. The following is an overview of a selection of the findings from the questionnaires:

i. **Role Induction and Job descriptions**
   Apart from one individual, all respondents in both locations indicated that had received an induction to their organisation. In Lodwar 90% indicated they had been provided guidance during the current emergency, but in Kakuma, only 70% indicated that they had received guidance. Similarly, in Lodwar 90% perceived they had an up to date job description, whereas in Kakuma 40% of respondents perceived that their job description did not reflect the work they where currently doing. Therefore, 40% of respondents believed they were not currently performing activities in relation to their job description.

ii. **Code of Conduct (CoC)**
   All but one respondent had signed a CoC. Interestingly, the individual who had not signed a CoC had been to a refresher course. In both locations 60% of respondents had been on a CoC refresher course.

iii. **Complaints Handling**
   The most significant finding was that that 40% of respondents in both locations did not know what to do if they witnessed exploitation, corruption or a breach of the code of conduct. This finding was mirrored by 30% of respondents in Lodwar and 40% respondents in Kakuma indicating that their organisation does not have clear and documented ways through which complaints are supposed to be handled. Moreover, only 30% of respondents in both locations believed staff knew how to apply these procedures.

iv. **PSEA**
   Apart from one individual, all the respondents indicated that SEA was an integral part of their CoC. Although, almost all the respondents stipulated that is was a part of their CoC in Lodwar and Kakuma, only 30% and 20% of respondents respectively indicated that their organisations complaints mechanism was inclusive of reporting of SEA cases. In Kakuma 70% of respondents indicated that there was a PSEA focal person in their organisation and with only 20% indicating similar in Lodwar. This could be due to the difference between humanitarian focused operations in Kakuma and the more development orientated operations in Lodwar.

v. **Participation**
   Half of the participants in both locations indicated they had clear guidelines and processes on how to consult with the community as part of the project cycle. In Lodwar and Kakuma 70% of respondents stated they were able use and reflect on information gathered from beneficiaries in the design of projects and throughout the project cycle.

vi. **Information sharing**
   In Kakuma only 30% of respondents indicated that they were aware of what information to share. Similarly, only 30% were aware of what information not to with beneficiaries.
3.2 Challenges highlighted and recommendations provided by programme site staff

In addition to the questionnaire, focus group discussions (FGDs) were held with staff in order to get a better understanding of the key quality and accountability constraints as perceived by programme site staff.

Lodwar: Participants in Lodwar stressed the importance of needs based programming. They perceived that at times projects were donor driven which resulted in lower impact or ill directed interventions. They stated that disaster affected communities needs have to be understood and aid delivered accordingly. Examples of ill directed programming included; malnourished children being provided with maize, and drought affected communities being given dry foods to cook when they had no access to water.

Recommendations that emerged from the participants included:

- Aid should be needs driven rather than donor or media driven
- Complaints referral system needs to be improved.
- There is a need for capacity building of police and government departments.
- Better information sharing between agencies to improve coordination of services
- Need for better information sharing throughout the project cycle.
- Reporting and communicating changes in the projects to other agencies and affected communities should take place.

Kakuma: In Kakuma were asked participants to break into three groups and look at accountability challenges the face at policy, procedural and practical level. The following boxes consist of the challenges and recommendations the staff who participated and facilitated the mapping exercise.

### Policy Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Recommendations and suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The language of policies can be too technical or vague sometimes.</td>
<td>Policies need to be simplified to enable better understanding and application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies are perceived to be overly punitive, in favour of organisations and at the cost of staff, which can invoke negative feelings. Some staff also felt that these policies were only shared or highlighted when something had occurred and were not shared in an transparent or timely way.</td>
<td>Policies should be revised and reviewed periodically to ensure relevance and applicability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes policies can be too broad, which leaves them open to interpretation, or haven’t been revised and updated to meet the current circumstances.</td>
<td>Some policies should also reflect the changes in existing law e.g the newly promulgated Sex Offences act of Kenya needs to be reflected in the prevention of sexual abuse and human resource policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes of conduct are not legally binding and which means that staff can not be penalised for gross violations.</td>
<td>Policies related to staff safety and security, prevention of sexual abuse and exploitation should equally protect staff and affected communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes of conduct are not legally binding and which means that staff can not be penalised for gross violations.</td>
<td>Gender mainstreaming and positive discrimination should be done in a more balanced and equitable way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Procedural Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Recommendations and suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of systems and structures for accountability and PSEA</td>
<td>Develop systems and guidelines for PSEA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited community involvement in the project cycle.</td>
<td>Establish identification and referral system for complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate resources allocation for the host community and marginalisation.</td>
<td>Conduct baseline study for community involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varying mandates and approaches leads to different levels of awareness and implementation.</td>
<td>Establish community based complaints mechanism and improve identification and referrals for complaints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prioritise and allocate resources, based on needs which are identified through greater community involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undertake joint programming with the communities for sustainable community projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Practice Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Recommendations and suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of commitment to move towards greater level of participation</td>
<td>Raise awareness of staff on importance and impact of community participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of awareness amongst staff</td>
<td>Provide clear guidelines of policies on participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barrier to communicate effectively with community</td>
<td>Build staff capacity to undertake better levels of participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sharing</td>
<td>There is a need to for the translation of policies into local languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Cultural- religious barriers to access women and wider groups</td>
<td>▪ Diversity methods of information delivery, e.g other ways than the committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Access to beneficiaries is difficult due to great distances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Language barrier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Lack of guidance for how information should shared by the organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Lack of confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Misuse of information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Inadequate information tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ There is a need to for the translation of policies into local languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Diversity methods of information delivery, e.g other ways than the committees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Access to beneficiaries is difficult due to great distances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Language barrier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Lack of guidance for how information should shared by the organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Lack of confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Misuse of information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Inadequate information tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ There is a need to for the translation of policies into local languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Diversity methods of information delivery, e.g other ways than the committees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff recruitment</th>
<th>Fair and transparent recruitment process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Nepotism in recruitment</td>
<td>▪ Proper induction of new staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Political interference in recruitment</td>
<td>▪ Committed human resource officers with expertise should be hired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Poor induction/orientation to roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Lack of updated job Descriptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Lack of funds causes doubling of work load</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Fair and transparent recruitment process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Proper induction of new staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Committed human resource officers with expertise should be hired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ There is a need to for the translation of policies into local languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Diversity methods of information delivery, e.g other ways than the committees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Access to beneficiaries is difficult due to great distances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Language barrier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Lack of guidance for how information should shared by the organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Lack of confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Misuse of information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Inadequate information tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ There is a need to for the translation of policies into local languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Diversity methods of information delivery, e.g other ways than the committees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Findings and recommendations & suggestions from affected communities
Below are the summary findings, recommendations and suggestions that emerged from the consultations with various stakeholder groups. These have not be modified and as much as possible provide “first-hand” reflections on how affected community members and stakeholders view accountability issues. These are aimed to serve as primary source data for further research, and point to areas which practitioners and agencies can further review internally to strengthen their accountability systems. Major areas of focus group discussions were related to: information they received (access, content, modes); participation (feedback, change in programmes, impact of programmes) complaints handling and PSEA issues. Stakeholder groups were not obliged to respond to all the questions and they were allowed to go into detail on areas they felt strongly about. At the end they were asked to share any suggestions and recommendations. Where possible, the findings have been clustered according to the emerging themes. See Annex 4 for a sample of questions asked. These questions were tailored to each specific group by the team and facilitators.

3.3.1 Stakeholder Group: District Level Government:
Includes: District Commissioners, District Officers, District Agriculture, Gender, Protection, Education and police officials
Lodwar and Kakuma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations and suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship between District Government and organisations:</strong></td>
<td>1. Involve community in entire project cycle to ensure effective programmes. This involves the community identifying their needs and the kinds of projects that are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Government officials appreciate role of NGOs and want to establish a closer relationship of collaboration and coordination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There has been a positive impact by the arrival or increased activities of I/NGOs in the areas e.g employment opportunities have increased, production and sale of items like food, charcoal, firewood has increased and markets have emerged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of consultation and involvement:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There has been a lack of active and tangible involvement of district government in the assistance programmes- local capacities and expertise, which are available and have not been used. District level officials like agriculture experts of their areas have not been</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. A high level district official commented that “There is a lot of lack of coordination and information sharing between government and I/NGOs and with the community. These forums should represent all stakeholders (chiefs, relevant heads of district departments and NGOs).”

2. Consult government on projects and utilise their technical expertise and advice before designing programmes and projects.

3. Use existing plans, reports, data and such resources available at the district levels to plan and implement effective, needs driven and sustainable projects and to avoid duplication and waste.

4. Increase transparency- share information on how projects are conducted operationally and the finances spent on it.

5. Put in place monitoring systems- at internal level for government programmes and external level for I/NGOs.

6. Assist the district government through technical support to make it more effective monitoring in quality and safety assurance of programmes and aid delivered.

7. Increase decision making and over-sight powers at the district level to manage, administer and oversee projects in the district.

8. Over-sight should increase in field locations, which due to greater distances are more isolated.

9. Establish a joint community and GOK monitoring framework to ensure effective and quality programmes.

10. Ensure effective and robust coordination mechanisms that are created through consultation with the district officials. These forums should represent all stakeholders (chiefs, relevant heads of district departments and NGOs).

11. Put in place/strengthen existing systems in order to have an effective structure that encourages systematic information sharing amongst the government and organisations and to affected communities.

12. Strengthen information sharing and coordination through forums, joint planning and continuous review and improvement.

Issues of coordination
9. Organisations bypass the district government offices due to bureaucracy, lack of awareness and lack of respect, leading to organisations conducting projects on their own without informing them or integrating with other efforts, “agencies come, intervene and leave without informing anyone”.

10. The issue of an effective coordination mechanism was highlighted: There is a lack of coordination and information sharing between government and I/NGOs and with the community as well. The District Steering Group has been established, it however is a weak forum, since it does not adequately represent the various groups and “lacks teeth and necessary powers and regulations to enforce resolutions”. (This point strongly stressed by district officials in Lodwar and Kakuma).

11. In addition, it was highlighted that each organisation creates its own committee and entry point in the community- upsetting the social equilibrium: “how genuine are the forums we use as entry points… each NGO has its own forum and creates its own structure. Committees are as old as the mountains, they are not changed, we need to look at them with new governance structures, where are the youth, women, people with disabilities in them” (GoK district official).

Issues of capacity and oversight:
6. There is a lack of clear structures within the government system. There are disconnects between Nairobi, county, district and field offices.

7. Lack of monitoring and quality assurance mechanisms within the government to monitor its own food distributions and also those delivered by organisations.

8. There is a limited capacity (financial, technical and financial) and powers within the district level government to monitor, guide and approve projects implemented in their districts. This and the fact that the government does not have a strong oversight mechanism resulted its inability and in action to monitor and assure the quality and safety of aid that was delivered- cases of expired or inappropriate items was cited, e.g. distribution of maize for malnourished children who were unable to eat it, issues of duplication and ill directed aid. These issues also resulted in their sense of helplessness to provide explanation to the affected communities, while dealing with the challenge of being viewed as interfering “ Government officials have remained aloof as we don’t want to be seen as detectives” also “we try to change and improve but there is huge resistance, since they (I/NGOs) have resources”.

Consulted before programme design and implementation- issues of seeds unsuitable for the climate distributed by organisations was highlighted. Another case highlighted was that organisations come to the government as last resort or as “fire-fighters” when they have problems with the communities due to ineffective programmes or when officials try to follow up concerns and complaints with an organisation, they find out that the organisation has left.

4. Poor information sharing and consultation with the district officials has resulted in duplication and in some cases dumping. There has been unequal distributions per geographical areas and needs of the affected communities.

5. There has been clear lack of community consultation involvement in project proposal, planning, design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation. “ We respond to journalistic needs assessment” (District official)

Several resolutions and “ We respond to journalistic needs assessment” (District official)
“Publicity” about the Turkana region and increased humanitarian activity, but the coordination is poor and needs a better approach. There has been too much duplication. There is no centre point so feedback can not be given, it is very scattered, politics is not the reserve of the Government only, I/NGOs have engaged in it and caused problems as well.

13. Projects are branded by I/NGO rather than owned by the community as a collective.

**Aid effectiveness - creation of dependency syndrome:**

14. Non-sustainable aid programmes have been delivered. There is an over-concentration on food aid rather than food security.
15. There has been unequal and unfair distribution - primarily due to donor obligations of organisations and media pressures and lack of consultations with the affected communities. Media reportage rather than needs were deciding factors as to where and to whom aid would be delivered.
16. Dependency syndrome has been created by flooding of food aid in Turkana - "a sack of maize is sold cheaper in Kakuma, than in Kitalie (the bread basket of Kenya)". There needs to be food security rather than food aid.
17. "Relief is non-sustainable we need to move towards more sustainable, dignified approach. Relief where it has reached is politicised, moving people away from self-reliance will be increasingly difficult. The mindset of people has become dependent with a bring and deliver to us attitude" (GoK senior district official)
18. "Community is getting poor implementation of programmes that don't stand quality assurance scrutiny - It's a raw deal"

**Views on PSEA**

19. There is limited awareness about issues of prevention of sexual abuse and exploitation that is perpetrated by government officials and I/NGO staff.
20. Cases of SEA are reported at the District Level- with the highest numbers coming from within education and food distribution systems.
21. Protection is not an agenda point during District Steering Group (DSG) meetings and related issues are rarely discussed or brought up at this forum.
22. Gender imbalance impedes reporting of PSEA since there are more male officials or the reporting officer would be a male within the government departments.
23. The officials said they are aware that some SEA is taking place within government departments and I/NGO funded programmes, but most cases are not reported due to stigma, and might not be known to them due to confidentiality reasons.
24. PSEA cases reported at location level are related to academic sponsorships and employment opportunities.
25. The systems to address PSEA are ineffective and there is no external oversight and referral systems in place.
26. There is late reporting of PSEA cases due to fear of retaliation and stigma.

**Recommendations and suggestions**

13. Implement other sustainable long term projects. Mover away from relief and aid to long term, context appropriate solutions: eg livestock, restocking, crop farming, destocking, agro-forestry and Small to medium enterprises, cottage industry etc.
14. Distribute food as per the needs of beneficiaries and taking into account Quality, Quantity and location.
15. Focus on food security and not food aid.
16. Create awareness about PSEA
17. Encourage more reporting especially on food distribution cases
18. Ensure clear supply chain for food aid
19. Build the capacity of personnel both I/NGO and Government to prevent SEA and deal with reports on it.
20. Ensure protection issues are part of DSG agenda and that there is adequate and fair representation of various stakeholders at the DSG.
21. Ensure gender parity to increase ease of reporting
22. Monitor/ ensure transparency in staff recruitment and award of scholarships
23. Put in place effective structures and polices to handle PSEA complaints
24. Encourage early reporting by ensuring confidentiality

### 3.3.2 Stakeholder Group: Internally Displaced People (post-election violence)

#### Lodwar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations and suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficiary selection criteria and process</strong></td>
<td>1. &quot;We don't want to be beggars - we want to work for the aid/assistance received&quot;. Have sustainable projects not relief or food aid have cash for work projects instead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. No specific criteria is given or explained for services</td>
<td>2. Provide education instead of relief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The criteria is explained only on the date of the distribution.</td>
<td>3. Communities should be consulted to prioritise their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Beneficiaries are informed through a baraza (large community meeting)</td>
<td>4. Coordinated and integrated interventions are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultations with affected communities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Effective consultations do not take place before any intervention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Want regular consultations and needs assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Want direct interventions by organisations, since they felt that the DSG was politicised and did not recognise them. They termed themselves as “people who have fallen out of the sky” and. (Due to divergence of opinion between the government and I/NGOs regarding the categorisation and status of the IDPs is a contentious issue).

Complaints handling:
7. No process has been explained
8. There are various and inconsistent actors and organisations
9. No information about their activities is provided
10. No agreed channel or avenue to register a concern or complaint.
11. A complaint was reported to the food monitor and it was resolved by the relief committee.
12. The have internal mechanisms to resolve issues before agencies can as they know each other.

Staff Behaviour Attitudes and access to organisations:
13. Staff introduce themselves and explain their roles and responsibilities.

PSEA
14. Are aware of what PSEA, what it involved but not in detail and no case has been reported.

5. Fair treatment of IDPs - role of government/NGOs should be clearly explained
6. Involve communities in proposal writing of projects
7. For distribution of food: beneficiaries should have final say on the implementing partner.
8. Communities should have final say and acceptance of organisations which work in the camps. This should be done through I/NGO and Community partnerships agreed through MoUs.
9. Community ownership, empowerment and sustainability should be the goal of all the assistance that is provided. 
10. Organisations should inform the community about the changes that take place.
11. Committees to deal with complaints and sensitive issues should be formed from each village and these should have more equitable representation.
12. To prevent SEA there should be a segregation of duties during distribution and there should be no overnight stays of staff.

3.3.3 Stakeholder Group: Internally Displaced People (post-election violence)

Kakuma

Findings

Beneficiary selection criteria and process
1. Clear criteria was provided and people with disabilities and elderly were given priority
2. Consultations with affected communities
3. Well informed of their entitlements
4. Clear community mobilisation for meetings
5. Beneficiaries given update of the project changes
6. Felt updated and informed about programme changes.
7. They were consulted on projects to be done but were not given the choice of what kind of project they needed. They have shelter but no access to WASH, medical and other services.

Handling Complaints:
8. Felt that agencies have a poor attitude towards receiving complaints.
9. No process has been explained
Staff Behaviour Attitudes and access to organisations:
10. Difficulty to access the agency for assistance (lack of gate passes, appointments)

PSEA
11. One community member trained on SEA but no cases reported in the IDP camp

Recommendations and suggestions
1. There should be greater transparency and accountability in projects
2. Impact assessment of the projects should be conducted
3. The organisation staff should visit regularly once a month
4. Consultation should be done before starting projects
5. Employment opportunities that do not require technical skills should be given to local communities
6. Organisations should have a complaints system and this should be shared with all beneficiaries
7. There should be awareness amongst staff and communities that complaints are a right
8. Staff should be aware on how they should respond and deal with complaints
9. Need of water supply for the camp
10. Organisations should improve information sharing with the beneficiaries
11. Discourage corruption and conflict of interest among staff
12. Create multiple initiatives such as loans, technical training, cash for assets for sustainability.

3.3.4 Stakeholder Group: Committees Food Committee

Lodwar

Findings

Beneficiary criteria and selection process: issue of names missed
1. While the entitlements and rations were clear some of the vulnerable groups were left out. The names of the lists were given to the responsible organisations, however explanation or no action was take. Although community leaders were involved in selection of beneficiaries but the organisations had set a pre-determined target which had to be met and no additions could be made. This led to community members voluntarily giving part of their food rations to those who had been missed from the list.

Information sharing and consultations:
2. No distribution schedule has been provided. The information is needed from organisations.

Recommendations and suggestions
1. Make beneficiary selection criteria and process clear and fair
2. Address needs of vulnerable groups, and if one organisation cant deal with it, it should be referred to another one.
3. Improve follow-up, planning and linking the vulnerable and non-benefitting groups into the food cycle
4. Strengthen coordination between agencies themselves and the affected communities to ensure that marginalised group needs are not ignored.
received on date of distribution. Members of the food committee highlighted that they were not informed when the next distribution would take place or if at all it would take place.

3. There has been no consultation, prior, during or after project/distribution and no feedback or explanation is provided about changes.

Complaints Handling:
4. There is no information of any process through which complaints can be channelled. Some issues had been raised by the committee with the distribution clerk, but no action had been taken or explanation provided which made them feel helpless.

Capacity of the committee
5. Capacity of committee is limited since there is no technical support/guidance from organisations nor are there any meetings or trainings. They said that “this is the first time they had discussion with somebody from outside”.

6. There is no formal structure of the committee nor does it have an terms or reference or clear roles and responsibilities.

7. The group also does not have contact information of staff and senior staff, which was serious concern for them as they felt unheard and unsupported by the organisations.

PSEA
8. No information or guidance on PSEA has been provided and the committee relies on cultural norms and community vigilance. The committee knew the food distributors and loaders and kept an eye on them.

Community coping mechanism
9. The committee stressed that they were coping by sharing, since there is a great concern for vulnerable groups or those who had not been added to the distribution lists.

10. The members also highlighted that people with disabilities and elderly had problems accessing and transporting food and other community members had to carry help them with this.

Gender disparities:
11. Male members of the committee highlighted that most organisations are concentrating only on projects targeting women, while men have lost their livelihood and livestock, which has led them to feel disempowered and helpless and this should be rectified.

5. The targets of how many people will be provided with assistance should match ground realities and needs. These are predetermined and many people are left out. If it the needs can not be met then the matter should be referred to cant be another organisation.

6. Empower committees by providing them with:
   - Terms of reference/ roles and responsibilities
   - Guidance and training
   - Regular updates on programme changes
   - Feedback on complaints
   - Proper verbal and written schedules, distribution dates and criteria

7. Clear explanation about the complaints process (how to register complaints, the time it will take to process the complaints etc)

8. Contact details of staff other than ones that meet them should be provided

9. Regular and updated information in local language should be shared through radio, signboard at village level (tree/centre point). Mobiles not good source as not everyone has them.

10. The Committee member stressed that participation needs to increase, and this should be done through regular consultations, joint planning, updates and involvement in decision making process.

11. Staff should explain their code of conduct and provide information on PSEA

12. Projects for men, particularly in livestock should be created to ensure that they are treated in a dignified manner and empowered, this will also increase their participation

13. Better targeting of vulnerable groups particularly those with disabilities and the elderly. Also provide support to them to transport or create food distribution points closer to the communities.

---

### 3.3.5 Stakeholder Group Committees: (Water, Peace, Education, Community Police committee representatives) Kakuma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations and suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Beneficiary criteria and selection process**<br>1. Criteria is pre-determined and not in consultation with the community.<br>2. Agency staff explains the objective of the project through a baraza and committee members select individual beneficiaries | 1. Organisations should do joint planning with the community “They should plan with us”.
2. Sensitize communities on their rights and entitlements
3. The Code of Conduct should be publically displayed and strictly enforced.
4. Frequent staff rotations and reshuffles should take place “ if staff stay here too long they develop impunity, establish business networks and roots”
5. Disciplinary action should be taken against staff involved in SEA and corruption issues. Including dismissal from work.
6. Establish complaints system and install complaints/reporting hotline.

| **Information sharing**<br>3. Food distribution requirements e. entitlements/ration is well known, this is through the baraza and posters pasted on the food distribution point. The Chief and councillors, also provide information, however those that are far away don’t get the information. | |
| **Consultations and Participation**<br>4. There is no information on updates and changes about project activities and organisations start suddenly without prior consultation and end project abruptly. | |
| **Organisations have implemented projects on “hit and run basis”**<br>5. Organisations | |
| **There is a disconnect between the organisations and communities. Sustainability is a major concern because projects are organisation driven rather than community needs driven. There is poor consultation by organisations and communities are not asked to prioritisation their needs.**<br>7. There is poor coordination amongst the organisations. |  |
| **Complaints handling and PSEA issues**<br>9. Not clear about the channels through which concerns and complaints are concentrating only on projects targeting women, while men have lost their livelihood and livestock, which has led them to feel disempowered and helpless and this should be rectified. | |
can be highlighted. There is a strong fear of victimisation, being struck of the beneficiary list and lack of confidentiality. Some community and committee members have been threatened with dire consequences as well.

10. Heard of SEA through the through the accounts of victims and the posters prohibiting SEA within the vicinity of agencies offices. There are no trainings or information campaigns regarding this.

11. PSEA cases occurring, but no one to report to, sometimes the person who should be alerted is the perpetrator.

12. Corruption is happening amongst staff and (us) committees members as well, but feel scared to report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3.6 Stakeholder Group: People With Disabilities</th>
<th>Lodwar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recommendations and suggestions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Beneficiary criteria and selection process** | 1. NGOs should directly support PWD initiatives  
2. Diversification of aid by NGOs to longer term assistance- income generation and livelihoods projects should be implemented. “Self reliance is the key to empowerment”  
3. Involve PWDs in programme design at all levels and provide support for project proposal writing  
4. Representation in committee meetings and humanitarian orgs meeting needed  
5. Ensure safe complaints mechanisms are in place and sensitize and support PWDS on how to use it  
6. Sensitize community on the terms of reference of the relief committee so they can be held accountable  
7. HIV/Aids programming should include PWDS as well  
8. Food distributions points should be increased, and made accessible by being nearer to their homes  
9. Food rations should be reserved for PWDs and support with access, transport should be provided  
10. NGOs should be made aware and sensitized on the vulnerabilities of PWDS  
11. Involve PWDs in trainings and capacity building workshops  
12. View PWDS with persons having skills and talents and promote these  
13. Improve coordination of NGOs and community representatives  
14. Develop a comprehensive data base on the nature of disabilities in Turkana county  
15. Commemorate and involve PWD in World Disability Day and other international events  
16. Genuine selection of beneficiaries through publically known and accountable criteria  
17. Address needs for HIV/TB and other health programmes for PWDS |
| 1. Aware about the major services such as food, cash transfers and NFIs.  
2. Selection is done through committees. Village members select the committees through nominations and the process is led by aid workers.  
3. Information about the targeting criteria or needs assessment, updates/changes not shared with them. “We wait and wait until we find out that the programme does not exist”  
4. Information about entitlements is shared through committee members and community leaders  
5. No direct link or contact with humanitarian organisations staff- only with the food committees and relief committee. Are not aware of any terms of reference for the committees.  
6. They are not consulted or engaged in programme design.  
7. No technical assistance is provided to them about how to get projects that meet their specific needs- “this kills self-reliance, hope and empowerment”.  
8. Have difficulty in accessing assistance due to long queue times, great distance and food being snatched.  
9. Felt discriminated against, in some instances have been chased away from NGO offices.  
10. Felt that they were “not handled with dignity” during food distributions and this needs attention.  
11. Their concerns are referred to other organisations at times, but there is no follow-up or action.  
12. Not aware about HIV/Aids and other such issues since they are not a part of the workshops or trainings.  
13. No knowledge of how and where to complain and support  
14. Unaware of PSEA issues |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3.7 Stakeholder Group: People With Disabilities and Elderly</th>
<th>Kakuma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recommendations and suggestions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Beneficiary criteria and selection process** | 1. Information sharing, involvement and participation should be with community at large not only leaders.  
2. Increase representation of PWDs in existing committee structures  
3. Conduct barazas, so community can come up with own selection criteria and select the most deserving  
4. NGOs staff should meet community directly and coordinate with the PWD and elderly. Support should be provided to set up a committee for them |
| 1. Selection process is unfair and biased. Beneficiaries are selected by chiefs and leaders, who select people of their own community.  
2. Not clear on entitlements. But rations and food baskets, however aren’t sure about who gets additional food items and how much.  
3. Information sharing is the monopoly of chiefs and leaders. They share the information share only with own people, no special effort is made to inform the PWD and elderly. |

**Sharing Information**

- People With Disabilities
- People With Disabilities and Elderly
- Stakeholder Group
4. Do not have a committee of their own nor are represented in other committees.
5. Staff introduce themselves
6. Not properly informed of changes (hear something is done in the community but it end or changes abruptly.

**Consultation and participation**
7. Not consulted on project activities/food or distributions. Details found out on the day of the distribution.
8. Did not participate in any needs assessment.
9. Not represented in the community consultations.
10. Elderly felt excluded, since they don’t fit in any clear category— even the disability criteria doesn’t apply to them.

**Handling Complaints**
11. “We talk but there is no action”. No clear idea of how to raise or channel complaints.
12. There is no direct contact with or access to staff.
13. Strong fear that if they complain future assistance will be stopped or they would be dropped from the list.
14. Access to humanitarian assistance
15. Have to carry food rations for long distances, however FDPs has been moved closer.
16. No specific programmes for PWDs.
17. Felt strongly discriminated against, “even if we are disabled, we are still human beings”. No employment opportunities for PWDs even from the NGOS.

**PSEA**
18. Didn’t cite any case of PSEA.
19. Don’t know of any reporting mechanism.
20. Not heard of PSEA from any agencies in host community, but heard that it “happens in the refugee camps”

---

### 3.3.8 Stakeholder Group: Men
#### Kakuma

**Findings**

- **Information sharing**
  1. Agency staffs do not explain their roles and responsibilities when they visited the community.
  2. There is a lack of awareness on the agencies goals.
  3. Information is mainly shared through barazas and then by word of mouth to the rest of the community.
  4. There was a perception of a lack of transparency on the part of organisations.

- **Coordination**
  5. There is concentration of aid in one area which had resulted in the duplication of activities.

- **Participation**
  6. Few agencies carry out the needs assessment prior to projects.
  7. It is perceived that agencies do not have policies to receive information and relate the communities.
  8. Complaints Handling
  9. The community was not aware of CRM.
  10. There was no feedback on complaints reported.

- **PSEA**
  11. No knowledge of the occurrence of SEA.
  12. Staff attitudes
  13. Some staff take advantage of the lack of awareness of the community with regards the policies of the organisation.

**Recommendations and suggestions**

1. Organisations need to conduct an assessment before starting any project.
2. Agencies should be flexible to avoid duplication of activities.
3. Organisations should share their goals with the community.
4. Agency staff should be honest with the community.
5. Agency staff should explain their roles and responsibilities.
6. Each organisation should sensitize the community on CRM.
7. Organisations should update and give feedback on project changes.
8. There was a recommendation to start PSEA activities within the community.
9. Organisations should be completely transparent with the community.
10. Involve the community in all the stages of project.
11. Continuous empowerment of the community should be done through workshops, training and the strengthening of community based organisation.

---

### 3.3.9 Stakeholder Group: Women
#### Kakuma

**Findings**

- **Information sharing**
  1. Organisations to move from relief assistance to...
1. The most common method of information sharing was through barazas with the chiefs. However, while public barazas were attended by both women and men, the men made the final decisions.

2. Information sharing throughout the project cycle was perceived to be poor. The group stated that information on entitlements were rarely shared and they were not involved in the design of any programmes.

**Beneficiary selection and community consultations**

3. Beneficiary selection process was done through the community by following the criteria set by the NGO.

4. In circumstances when the committee wanted to speak with the organisations they stated that the need to produce a letter of appointment.

5. Only leaders can access organisation managers: i.e political and administrative leaders while the rest of the community has no link with the organisations.

6. Never consulted: organisations go to community when proposals have been funded and designed.

7. Organisations consult when there is a need for improvement or complaints

**Marginalisation**

8. There was the perception that more focus was on refugees populations than host communities

**Complaints**

9. The community has presented complaints to various stakeholders but had not received any feedback.

10. Complaints are dealt with through the chief at community level

11. There are no structural guidelines for complaints.

**PSEA**

12. Heard of PSEA through trainings.

13. Cases written and dropped at local authorities office, some with no feedback.

**3.3.10 Stakeholder Group: Youth Kakuma**

### Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information sharing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organisations barely consult directly with the community throughout project cycle. It was noted that community consultations was better in pervious years. (The programmes were being done by agencies working in refugees operations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Projects change without informing the community. An example was given of a scholarship program that changed right before it was due to commence. Beneficiaries were told they had to pay for transport and accommodation, which meant a majority of the selected beneficiaries, could not attend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There was a perception of broken promises, due to changes in the project without explanation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. NGOs deliver only few projects for host community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The respondents stipulated they did not know what some organisations were doing in their community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Not sure of food entitlement and GOK food allocation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Difficult in accessing information as many are illiterate and they cannot read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Leaders informed but not trusted in certain circumstances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. “The only way we can be heard is by demonstrating.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Felt that projects were imposed, not on the assessment of priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Nepotism for accesses to assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. “The agencies have been here for 20 years and still no good relationship”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations and suggestions

| 1. Direct consultation with the youth is needed. |
| 2. Agreement between agencies working in refugee operation to offer 10% of their jobs to members of the host communities needs to be honoured |
| 3. Need to be included in decision making process |
| 4. Need for better information sharing strategies- greater transparency |
| 5. Need for better community consultation and inclusion of specific groups. |
| 6. Want same entitlements as refugees, “Better to be refugee, than Kenyan” |
| 7. Need for legal awareness for conflicts with refugees. |
| 8. Need for formal complaints mechanism. |
| 9. Cash instead of food - the maize is being sold. |
13. Projects are not in a sustainable way, not taught to maintain, not tailor made to community needs.
14. The group reported that an agreement had been made between the host community and the NGO’s. The agreement stipulated 10% of jobs would go to the host community in 2009. They felt this was not being honoured. They also stated that the 10% should be stated more explicitly because they are unaware of what 10% represents.

**Fit for purpose Quality programming**
15. The food for asset program was perceived to be good because it is providing food for middle aged women who do not benefit from any other support. However the work was viewed as too labour intensive as people were apparently losing their lives due to the strenuous work.

**Complaints handling**
16. Felt there is no way to raise complaints and no dialogue avenues
17. Corruption
18. There was a perception that community leaders would sell government food at the market.

**PSEA**
19. Good awareness of agency CoC and PSEA because of involvement in an investigation, but no prior knowledge before the investigation.
20. Made aware of provisions under Kenyan law in training
21. Complaints originally taken to local leaders and but were dropped.
   The complaint was eventually passed by the police to the NGO.

3.3.11 Stakeholder Group: Cash transfer field monitors Lodwar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations and suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Staff** | 1. A common issue during the disbursement of the cash transfer was beneficiaries having the wrong card. This was due to the high level of illiteracy and their pastoralist lifestyles. Family members would often leave their cash transfer card with a member of the family who was homebound when they went out with their herds. The problem would occur when family members would accidently reclaim the card of another family member upon return. As a result, the individuals name would not match the serial number on the card. The card currently consists of a serial number, which is little use to illiterate communities. The field monitoring believed that the system should be improved to allow easier recognition of the card without
2. Better monitoring of traders and community leaders
3. Their needs to be clear complaint handling mechanisms for beneficiaries and staff members.
4. Information sharing to and participation of vulnerable groups should be improved.
5. The process of beneficiary should be improved.
6. Fairness of entitlements should be looked into.
| **Information sharing** | 4. The field monitors would share the following information
   - That the services are fee.
   - The entitlements
   - The number of beneficiaries:
   - A description of the organisation
   - The complaints mechanism
5. The cash monitors would remain in the field for many weeks at a time, so they would receive regular updates via the radio from their line manager. |
| **Beneficiary selection criteria and process** | 6. The group believed that the 3000 shilling entitlement per household could be improved. The entitlement did not take into consideration the number of individuals living within the household. They explained that this led to great disparities between the purchasing power relative to the number of people in the household within the communities.
7. Part of the beneficiary selection criteria was the individual should not be a beneficiary of any other programme. Therefore, they were considered not to have met vulnerability requirements in previous needs assessment. This resulted in disparities between communities. Certain families were receiving food aid per head within and household and their neighbours were receiving cash transfer irrespective of the number of people within the household. |
Consultations with affected communities
8. The main method of sharing information with the communities was to organise barazas. Due to the remote locations of the projects and the pastoralist lifestyles, the field monitors stated that community mobilisation would take 2 days to allow people to travel back to the village. Community mobilisation was therefore for those who could be reached and those who were acquaintances or family members of the village residents. When the group was asked about making special provisions for the vulnerable, they stated that the communities are very tight knit and the information would get to the people who are unable to attend.

Complaints handling:
9. The field monitors stated that they had a complaint form that beneficiaries could fill out or they would. They stated that complaints that could not be dealt immediately were recorded on the form and a response was given on the following visit to the project site. The feedback mechanism was through a bazara. This system did not encourage sensitive complaints as most of the communities visited were illiterate and would have to use a field monitor to record their complaint. Also, the use of a Baraza as a feedback mechanism does not allow for individual concerns to be dealt with in an individual and confidential manner. The lack of a clear set of complaint handling procedures was of concern. The field monitors discussed how a case of secondary beneficiary had been using an orphan in order to secure the cash transfer was discovered by chance.

10. As previously mentioned, the staff demonstrated good awareness of their roles, responsibilities and their CoC. However, when questioned on how to report an abuse or infringement of the CoC they displayed little awareness beyond reporting the issue to their line manager and they were not aware of any formal procedure to follow when reporting a complaint.

Monitoring
11. The process of cash transfer was delivered through a local trader who was in turn was subsidised to ensure the availability of food. The trader would disburse his own money, which would then be reimbursed at a later date by the NGO. The field monitors believed that traders were not made to sign a code of conduct or a MoU. The traders however are given a significant amount of authority and responsibility within the projects. The field monitors were present during the disbursement of cash by the traders, but without a functional complaint handling mechanism other means of monitoring the traders could easily use their position to their advantage when the monitors were not present.

Continual Learning
12. The field monitors said they had been on several evaluations but had never been provided with the feedback from the evaluations. They were also not sure what information they could share and could not share with the community.
SECTION 4: NEXT STEPS

4.1 What can be done with the findings and recommendations?

The findings and recommendations from the inter-agency mapping exercise are for sharing and learning purposes with the humanitarian community in Kenya and sector at large. The aim is to share the consolidated views from affected community members, government officials and staff as primary source data. The findings and recommendations can be used by various stakeholders including researchers, and policy-makers for further analysis and action. Organisations are encouraged to reflect on the findings and integrate the learning into on-going and future interventions. Technical advice, resources and material will be shared with organisations interested in acting upon these findings.

The ICN on PSEA has developed a 3 year concept paper, work plan, and budget (2012 – 2014), which prioritises the completion of a nation-wide PSEA review. During the first monthly meeting of the ICN on PSEA held on the 1st February 2012, focal Points agreed to strengthen country-wide coordination of PSEA working groups. The Network will now focus on establishing stronger linkages with (Dadaab and Kakuma) field-based PSEA networks. In Turkana, the Network will coordinate with the Child Protection Working Group and Nakuru & Eldoret Protection Working Groups on Internal Displacement. In the longer run, the ICN wishes to establish closer links to the other networks and working groups in order to mainstream PSEA.

The findings from Turkana have been shared with the Real Time Evaluation for Kenya and the Horn of Africa Region.⁸

The Joint Deployment team continues to provide remote support within the region and encourages local networks and working groups to consider the findings of this report in the design and planning of future activities. For further information, please contact the authors.

## ANNEX 1: INTER-AGENCY ACCOUNTABILITY AND QUALITY MAPPING EXERCISE – AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose Of The Mapping Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Accountability And Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>People In Aid,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sphere Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humanitarian Accountability Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tea break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Prevention of Sexual Abuse and Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question and Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Focus group Discussion on challenges and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dividing into teams according to stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewing questions and finalising schedule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td></td>
<td>All teams to meet at assigned location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teams ( agency staff) to conduct mapping exercise with assigned stakeholder group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrival and lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td></td>
<td>Debrief- sharing findings from the consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation and Action planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What next?- Planning together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wrap up &amp; Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 2: SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS OF THE INTER-AGENCY ACCOUNTABILITY AND QUALITY MAPPING EXERCISE

At the end of the workshops in Lodwar and Kakuma, the participants were requested to fill out an anonymous evaluation form. The following represents their views and thoughts:

I. Comments and suggestions for further improvement: (e.g. content, format etc.)
   - The need for more time and longer sessions was commonly cited as an area for improvement. A number of participants felt the one day workshop was too short, and recommended spreading the workshop over a period of a week. Similarly, a few participants felt more time should have been allocated to discussion between participants on issues such as accountability mechanisms, and establishing complaints and response mechanisms. In a similar vein, one participant felt that the workshop should have focused more on accountability mechanisms rather than focussing on assessing accountability challenges. For two participants the linkage between PSEA and accountability could have been more explicit and discussed in greater depth.
   - Another recommendation for improvement was to provide more examples of accountability in practice from other geographical locations and organisations.
   - With regards to the feedback from mapping exercise community consultations one participant felt that the linkages between the information gathered from the consultation and the workshop could be improved.

II. List the 3 most important outcomes of this workshop for you or steps you would take in your agency after attending this workshop.

The most salient outcome was that participants would brief colleagues and sensitise them on the lessons learnt during the mapping exercise. A need for improved accountability transpired through the evaluations. The comments and recommendations gathered have compiled into themes:

Complaints Handling
   - Developing an effective interagency complaints mechanism was put forward by one participant while several other participants recommended the streamlining of complaints and exploring ways of setting up complaints mechanisms.
   - The importance of complaint and response mechanisms was acknowledged with one participating stipulating the need for a system for reporting SEA.
   - To create awareness in my organisation on the grievances of the host the community

Prevent Duplication
   - The issue of duplication of projects was seen as a major challenge with a participant stating he would, “Urge my organisation to improve co-ordinating functions with other agencies to prevent duplication of work.”

Participation
   - Participation was seen as a major challenge with regards to correctly identifying what the beneficiaries need and their problems. Further, participants stated the need for correct planning and the development of programmes that address the needs of the beneficiaries. One participant stated the need for, “Proper follow up”.

Information sharing
   - Participants stipulated an acknowledgment for the importance of information sharing, “Information systems is key to success of project” and “For any successful project, the beneficiaries, must be involved”. Also one participant acknowledged of information sharing as risk management by emphasising the need to share accurate information with beneficiaries. A recommendation for better information sharing between agencies was put forward as an issue with coordination between NGOs.
   - The importance of feedback to the community was noted as an important element of accountability.

Promote Sustainability and Self reliance
   - Several participants commented on the importance the community placed on self reliance during the consultations, “What came out so clearly is community wants to be self reliable”, another participant stated, “Let the community own projects for sustainability”.

Improve accountability in partners
   - One participant indicated they would verify the code of conduct of their partners.

Review policies
   - One participants stated they would review policies of their organisation with reference to accountability

Taking responsibility for being accountable
   - One participant stated a recognition for the responsibility of their personal actions- “I will be accountable for the roles/responsibilities that I do for the organisation”

Assessments and monitoring
   - One participant stated they would assess a food distribution site as a result of the mapping exercise.

Participation
The need for more community involvement and the need to improve interaction between the host community and agency were noted. A participant stipulated that agencies should respect the needs of the host community. Further the importance of adequate needs assessment was also stipulated by one participant.

**Putting PSEA on the agenda**
- And one participant stated their organisation should take PSEA more seriously

### III. Specify the additional support you or your agency would need

Further training and capacity building on accountability and PSEA was the most prevalent request for additional support. Also, additional materials on best practices, including the core standards of JSI and material on PSEA, along with the provision of guidelines on CRMs and a request to be available online for further queries was requested.

### IV. Comments/ complaints/suggestions regarding the workshop

Comments alluded to the concerns noted previously with participants highlighting the need for more time to better understand the concepts. Also, one participant thought the notice for participation was too short.

On the other hand several participants shared their satisfaction with the workshop:
- “Excellent presentations and innovative teaching. I am a different person”
- “I think the facilitators had great chemistry and helped foster a safe zone for discussion”
- “Very educative, an eye opener”
- “The context and the formatting was excellent and well presented”
- One participant stated that the host community felt they should have been part of the workshop
- One participant wanted certificates for the participants.
- “Quite an eye opener, thanks a lot”
- “The workshop was well conducted and I really enjoyed and learnt more”
## ANNEX 3: STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Questionnaire</th>
<th>Lodwar</th>
<th>Kakuma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When you joined the organisation did you get an induction into the organisation and your role and responsibilities?</td>
<td>90%  10%  100%</td>
<td>70%  30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Were you provided guidance from the senior management about your role, responsibility for the current emergency?</td>
<td>90%  10%</td>
<td>60%  40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you have an up to date job description that reflects the work you are doing right now?</td>
<td>90%  10%</td>
<td>80%  20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does your job description say anything about your role in helping the organization to be accountable to affected populations?</td>
<td>90%  10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did you ever sign a code of conduct or staff guidelines?</td>
<td>90%  10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you have refresher courses on your CoC?</td>
<td>60%  30%  10%</td>
<td>60%  20%  20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the CoC mention anything about corruption, sexual abuse and exploitation?</td>
<td>90%  10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. If you witnessed exploitation, corruption and/or a breach of the code of conduct, do you know how and where to report this?</td>
<td>20%  50%  30%</td>
<td>70%  20%  10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you think feedbacks/complaints are encouraged or welcome in your organization?</td>
<td>60%  40%</td>
<td>60%  30%  10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Does your agency have clear and documented ways (policy/guidelines) through which complaints are supposed to be handled?</td>
<td>70%  30%</td>
<td>60%  30%  10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Does the complaints mechanism include reporting on SEA cases?</td>
<td>30%  50%  20%</td>
<td>70%  10%  20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Does project evaluations in your agency include PSEA component?</td>
<td>40%  20%  40%</td>
<td>30%  40%  30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Do you think staff know and apply these procedures in their work?</td>
<td>30%  40%  30%</td>
<td>30%  20%  50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do you think lessons learnt from previous projects, evaluations or any other relevant sources were considered when designing and implementing the current projects?</td>
<td>80%  20%</td>
<td>70%  10%  20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Are you able to use and reflect on the information gathered from affected communities in the design of your projects and throughout the project cycle?</td>
<td>70%  30%</td>
<td>70%  10%  20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Are you given guidance on what information needs to be shared with affected communities?</td>
<td>90%  10%</td>
<td>30%  40%  30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Are you given guidance on what information NOT to share with affected communities?</td>
<td>60%  40%</td>
<td>30%  50%  20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Are you trained on the following regarding your work?</td>
<td>60%  20%  20%</td>
<td>60%  20%  20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The standards your agency has signed to</td>
<td>50%  20%  20%</td>
<td>80%  20%  20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Codes it follows</td>
<td>50%  30%  20%</td>
<td>70%  10%  20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Best practices</td>
<td>90%  10%</td>
<td>80%  20%  20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Tools relevant to your work</td>
<td>80%  20%</td>
<td>50%  30%  20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Do you have a safe and confidential complaints system for staff in your organisation?</td>
<td>80%  40%  10%</td>
<td>50%  30%  20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 4: SAMPLE OF FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

Discussion Guide – Community (Adapt Accordingly)

INTerviewers

Name and Agency/Agencies:

Date:

Location:

Translator used: Yes ☐ No ☐

PARTICIPANTS

No. of participants ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

female ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

male ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

children ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Comments: (identify what kind of group it is ie: Field monitors, IDPs, women, community representatives, children, persons with disability, elderly, government officials etc)

Methodology Used:

Focus group discussion:

Direct Interviews:

Other:

Introduction (to be given by lead facilitator of the FDG)

1. Good Morning/afternoon. My name is ……………………………… I work with …………………………which is an organization that works in …… These are my colleagues….. (name and agency).
2. We are here to better understand how to improve our work and so we are carrying out discussions with various members of the community.
3. To participate in the discussion we will ask you some questions related to the aid/services you have received since June this year. Your participation will not cause any bad thing/disadvantage to you, or the community/school etc.
4. We are asking you to answer the questions simply to help our understanding and on a voluntary basis (there is no gain or reward etc).
5. We will take notes but we will not record or share your personal information with anyone. We will put the feedback we receive from you and other community members together to see what are the important issues on the delivery of aid and services in your community.
6. This information will be used to help plan some improvement in the way we work and will also be put into a report about our work-but the report will never mention names or who said what.
7. You are free to ask questions as we do the discussion and you are also free to not respond to questions you do not feel comfortable responding to. This interview will take about 1 hour.
8. We will not be able to give you feedback personally but will try to let you know what happens next as soon as we can through (leaders/representatives/etc).
9. Would you be willing to support us in this activity by answering a few questions?

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.
Community Questions (to be adapted per stakeholder group during the workshop)

*Please explain that you are asking questions of their experiences of aid/service delivery in their communities since June of this year until now*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Answers (ask for recommendations, suggestions for improvement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can you name some of the organisations that have provided aid/services in your area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What type of aid have you received since June 2011? Please circle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Cash transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Medical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Shelter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Hygiene promotion/sanitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you know how communities or individuals were selected for projects?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so how?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Has anyone explained to what you are entitled to in the services you receive?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If yes, how was this information given to you and how do you pass it on? E.g. through community elders, IEC materials, radio, e.t.c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do the committee and or staff inform you about the meetings? If so who participates in them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you get information on any updates and changes about project activities? If so how?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What do you think is the best way an organisation can share information about their activities with you and your community?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Are their difficulties in accessing assistance from the organisations?</td>
<td>If yes, please explain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Before the aid was delivered, did anyone ask the community members what they needed? (Check for Needs assessment, community consultation etc and how many times, was it by many agencies?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do staff members introduce themselves and explain their responsibilities /role when they meet you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Has anyone told you about how and where to make a complaint or talk about a problem? Who told you? Where do you make a complaint?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Are there any cases you know that were reported about aid workers? Who was it reported to?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What happened after the case was reported?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. What support is given to those who report?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Have you heard of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse? How? (e.g training etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. How are committees selected or elected?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do you know their role and responsibilities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Do you have any recommendations about how organisations can improve their services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to ask a member of the group to summarize what has been discussed during this meeting briefly. *If no, the facilitator should summarise*

Are there any questions that you believe should have been asked and were not or anything you think we missed? *Thank the participants for their valuable insights, time and participation*